108TH CONGRESS
*2d Session*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
108–491

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

---

## R E P O R T

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

## H.R. 4200

together with

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including committee cost estimate]

MAY 14, 2004.—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 2005

108TH CONGRESS
*2d Session*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
108–491

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

---

## R E P O R T

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

## H.R. 4200

together with

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including committee cost estimate]

MAY 14, 2004.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

93–654 WASHINGTON : 2004

## HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH 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
HEATHER WILSON, New Mexico
KEN CALVERT, California
ROB SIMMONS, Connecticut
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
ED SCHROCK, Virginia
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
TOM COLE, Oklahoma
JEB BRADLEY, New Hampshire
ROB BISHOP, Utah
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
PHIL GINGREY, Georgia
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona

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
JIM TURNER, Texas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ, Texas
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
BARON P. HILL, Indiana
JOHN B. LARSON, Connecticut
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
RODNEY ALEXANDER, Louisiana
TIM RYAN, Ohio

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 | 12 |
| Hearings | 14 |
| DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION | 14 |
| TITLE I—PROCUREMENT | 14 |
| OVERVIEW | 14 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 17 |
| Overview | 17 |
| Items of Special Interest | 20 |
| Airborne communications | 20 |
| Blackhawk helicopter de-icing system upgrade | 20 |
| Cashworthy crew seats | 20 |
| Modern signal processing unit | 20 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 21 |
| Overview | 21 |
| Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 24 |
| Overview | 24 |
| Items of Special Interest | 28 |
| Air-droppable, lightweight armored direct fires system | 28 |
| Armor and vehicle protection kits | 28 |
| Bradley fighting vehicle integrated management | 28 |
| M1A2 system enhancement package | 28 |
| M777 lightweight 155 millimeter howitzer | 29 |
| Ammunition Procurement, Army | 29 |
| Overview | 29 |
| Items of Special Interest | 33 |
| Ammunition production base upgrades | 33 |
| Conventional munitions demilitarization | 33 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 34 |
| Overview | 34 |
| Items of Special Interest | 44 |
| Common system open architecture | 44 |
| Digital soldier | 44 |
| Distributed common ground system | 44 |
| Logistics support vessel | 45 |
| Physical security systems | 46 |
| Movement tracking system | 46 |
| Shortstop electronic protection system | 46 |
| Small Tugs | 47 |
| Tactical unmanned aerial vehicle | 47 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 47 |
| Overview | 47 |
| Items of Special Interest | 52 |
| AN/USC-42 miniaturized-demand assigned multiple access terminals | 52 |
| F/A-18E/F shared reconnaissance pod | 52 |
| H-1 series modifications | 52 |
| Joint primary air training system | 53 |
| Metrology and calibration program | 53 |
| P-3 series modifications | 53 |
| T-45TS and T-48 | 54 |

Page

Weapons Procurement, Navy ..... 54
Overview ..... 54
Items of Special Interest ..... 58
Close-in weapon system block 1B ..... 58
Evolved sea sparrow missile ..... 58
Hellfire II missile ..... 58
Pioneer unmanned aerial vehicle ..... 59
Tomahawk missile ..... 59
Ammunition Procurement, Navy & Marine Corps ..... 59
Overview ..... 59
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy ..... 63
Overview ..... 63
Items of Special Interest ..... 66
Aft ramp range retriever craft ..... 66
Amphibious assault ship replacement program ..... 66
Other Procurement, Navy ..... 66
Overview ..... 66
Items of Special Interest ..... 75
Chemical biological defense for aviation and explosive ordnance disposal ..... 75
Complementary acoustic system improvements ..... 75
CVN replacement propeller program ..... 75
Envelop protective covers ..... 76
Integrated bridge system ..... 76
Integrated condition assessment system ..... 76
Man overboard identification program ..... 76
Multi-climate protection clothing system ..... 77
Programmable integrated communications terminal ..... 77
Serial number tracking system ..... 77
Weapons elevator automation ..... 77
Procurement, Marine Corps ..... 78
Overview ..... 78
Items of Special Interest ..... 84
Assault breacher vehicle ..... 84
Improved recovery vehicle ..... 84
Marines global command and control systems and integrated imagery and intelligence analysis system ..... 84
Nitrile rubber collapsible storage units ..... 84
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force ..... 85
Overview ..... 85
Items of Special Interest ..... 91
Advanced targeting pod ..... 91
B-1B modifications ..... 91
C-5 modifications ..... 92
C-17 ..... 92
C-17 maintenance training system ..... 92
C-130E engine upgrades ..... 93
F-15 modifications ..... 93
F-16 air national guard force structure ..... 93
F-16 modifications ..... 94
KC-767 aerial refueling tanker aircraft ..... 94
Predator unmanned aerial vehicle ..... 96
Senior scout permanent carrier ..... 96
T-38 modifications ..... 96
Ammunition Procurement, Air Force ..... 97
Overview ..... 97
Missile Procurement, Air Force ..... 99
Overview ..... 99
Items of Special Interest ..... 103
Advanced extremely high frequency satellite ..... 103
Evolved expendable launch vehicle ..... 103
Other Procurement, Air Force ..... 103
Overview ..... 103
Items of Special Interest ..... 110
Combat training ranges ..... 110
Advanced compression of tactical sensor information ..... 110
Fixed aircrew standardized seats ..... 110

Page

General information technology ..... 110
Point of maintenance and combat ammunition system initiative ..... 111
Procurement, Defense-Wide ..... 111
Overview ..... 111
Items of Special Interest ..... 117
Chemical agents and munitions destruction ..... 117
Chemical and biological defense procurement program ..... 118
Countering improvised explosive devices ..... 119
Guard and Reserve equipment ..... 119
Indexing of class A mishaps ..... 119
Joint threat work station, ground signals intelligence kits ..... 120
Military specifications for radomes ..... 120
Special Operations Forces binocular goggle system ..... 120
Special Operations Forces MH-47 infrared engine exhaust suppressor ..... 121
Use of capability-based acquisition ..... 121
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 122
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 122
Sections 101-104—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 122
Subtitle B—Program Matters ..... 122
Section 111—Multiyear procurement authority for the M777 lightweight 155mm howitzer program ..... 122
Section 112—DDG-51 Modernization Program ..... 122
Section 113—Repeal of Authority for Pilot Program for Flexible Funding of Cruiser Conversions and Overhauls ..... 124
Section 114—Force Protection for Asymmetric Threat Environment ..... 124
Section 115—Allocation of Equipment Authorized by this Title to be Made on Basis of Units Deployed or Preparing to Deploy ..... 124
Section 116—KC-767 Tanker Multiyear Procurement ..... 124
Section 117—Other Matters Relating to KC-767 Tanker Acquisition Program ..... 125
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION ..... 125
OVERVIEW ..... 125
Army Research, Development, Test, & Evaluation ..... 129
Overview ..... 129
Items of Special Interest ..... 140
Advanced amputee treatment research and development ..... 140
Advanced battery technology initiative ..... 140
Advanced carbon nano technology ..... 141
Advanced weapons technology ..... 141
Aerostat joint project office ..... 141
Applied communications and information networking ..... 142
Center for rotorcraft innovation ..... 142
Center for tribology ..... 143
Centers of excellence ..... 143
Combat vehicle electronics ..... 143
Defense language institute/foreign language center ..... 143
Digital array radar technology development ..... 144
Electronic flight planning ..... 144
Flexible display initiative ..... 144
Force XXI battle command brigade and below blue force tracking system ..... 145
Future combat systems ..... 145
Geospatial information decision support for single integrated air picture ..... 145
Human systems integration ..... 146
Hydrogen proton exchange membrane ..... 146
Information dominance center ..... 147
Institute for creative technologies ..... 147
Integrated communications navigation identification avionics program ..... 147
Joint and combined communications test tool product suite ..... 148
JP-8 soldier fuel cell ..... 148
LEAN munitions ..... 148
Light unmanned aerial vehicle weaponization ..... 148
Light utility vehicle ..... 149
Lightweight structures initiative ..... 149

Page

Low cost course correction ..... 149
M5 high performance fiber for personnel armor systems ..... 149
Medical technology applied research initiative ..... 150
Clinical research programs ..... 150
Medium tactical truck development ..... 151
Miniature sensor development for small and tactical unmanned aerial vehicles ..... 151
Modeling and analysis of the response of structures ..... 151
Night vision fusion ..... 151
Patient monitor with defibrillator ..... 152
Portable and mobile emergency broadband system ..... 152
Shadow tactical unmanned aerial vehicle ..... 152
Smart responsive nanocomposites ..... 152
Space and missile defense architecture analysis program ..... 153
Strategic materials strategic manufacturing initiative ..... 153
Titanium alloy powder ..... 153
Titanium extraction, mining, and process engineering research ..... 153
Unmanned systems initiative ..... 153
Navy Research, Development, Test & Evaluation ..... 154
Overview ..... 154
Items of Special Interest ..... 166
Advanced composite structures program ..... 166
Advanced gun system for DD(X) multi-mission destroyer ..... 166
Advanced laser diode arrays ..... 166
Advanced mine detection program ..... 167
Advanced processor build integration ..... 167
Aegis open architecture ..... 167
Affordable towed array construction ..... 168
Affordable weapon system ..... 168
Airborne mine neutralization system ..... 169
Airborne reconnaissance systems ..... 169
AN/BLQ-10 test and support ..... 170
Anti-torpedo torpedo ..... 170
Automatic radar periscope detection and discrimination ..... 170
Aviation ship integration center ..... 171
Aviation shipboard information technology initiative ..... 171
Biomedical research imaging ..... 172
Center for critical infrastructure protection ..... 172
Claymore marine ..... 172
Common submarine radio room ..... 172
Composite ceramic unmanned underwater vehicle ..... 173
Consolidated undersea situational awareness ..... 173
DD(X) multi-mission destroyer ..... 174
Deployable joint command and control ..... 175
Digital modular radio ..... 176
DP-2 thrust vectoring system ..... 176
Electromagnetic gun program ..... 176
Embedded national tactical receiver integration with advanced anti-radiation guided missile ..... 177
Emerging/critical interconnection technology ..... 177
Enterprise resource planning ..... 178
Enterprise targeting and strike system ..... 178
Evolved sea sparrow missile capability for large decks ..... 178
Formable aligned carbon thermosets ..... 179
Gallium nitride radio-frequency power technology ..... 179
Hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier ..... 180
High temperature superconducting AC synchronous ship propulsion motor ..... 180
Hybrid POSS composites development ..... 181
Integrated personnel protection system ..... 181
Integrated radar optical surveillance and sighting system ..... 181
Intermediate modulus carbon fiber qualification ..... 182
Interrogator for high-speed retro-reflective communications ..... 182
Joint integrated systems technology ..... 183
Joint Strike Fighter ..... 183
Laser radar data exploitation ..... 183
Littoral combat ship ..... 184

Page

Littoral support craft-experimental ..... 185
Low acoustic signature motor/propulsor ..... 185
Low-cost terminal imaging seeker ..... 186
Low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines ..... 186
Marine mammal research program ..... 186
Nanoscience and nanomaterials ..... 187
One megawatt molten carbonate fuel cell demonstrator ..... 187
Open architecture warfare systems ..... 187
Open architecture wireless sensors ..... 188
Organ transplant technology ..... 188
Project M ..... 189
Rapid deployment fortification wall ..... 189
Real-time precision targeting radar ..... 189
Reduced risk ordnance ..... 190
Remote ocean surveillance system ..... 190
Ship system component development ..... 191
Spectral beam combining fiber lasers ..... 191
Submarine payloads and sensors program ..... 191
Superconducting direct current homopolar motor ..... 192
Tactical E-field buoy development ..... 192
Task force anti-submarine warfare ..... 192
Theater undersea warfare initiative ..... 193
Ultrasonic detection equipment ..... 193
VH-XX executive helicopter development ..... 194
Virginia class multi-mission modules ..... 194
Virtual at-sea training initiative ..... 195
Wide band gap semiconductor power electronics ..... 195
Air Force Research, Development, Test, & Evaluation ..... 195
Overview ..... 195
Items of Special Interest ..... 206
Advanced vehicle and propulsion center and engineering research lab equipment upgrade ..... 206
Advanced wideband signals intelligence geo-processor ..... 206
B-2 development ..... 206
Blue MAJIC ..... 207
Cobra Ball ..... 207
Combat optical receiver for smart and loitering standoff weapons ..... 207
Collaborative information technologies ..... 208
Common aero vehicle ..... 208
Defensive electro-optical tracker countermeasures technologies ..... 208
Distributed mission interoperability toolkit ..... 208
Enterprise availability and cost optimization system ..... 208
F-15C/D active electronically scanned array radar ..... 209
Global Hawk United States Southern Command demonstration ..... 209
Global positioning system ..... 210
High accuracy network determination system ..... 210
Identification of time critical targets ..... 210
Integrated cooling and power system magnetic bearing technology ..... 211
Integrated control for autonomous space systems ..... 211
Intelligent free space optical satellite communication node ..... 211
Joint surveillance target attack radar system blue force tracking and combat identification ..... 211
KC-10 global air traffic management development ..... 212
Lightweight modular support jammer ..... 212
Metals affordability ..... 212
Next generation bomber program ..... 213
Operationally responsive launch ..... 213
Satellite simulation toolkit ..... 214
Satellite tool kit technical integration concept of operations for tactical satellite ..... 214
Space-based infrared system ..... 214
Space-based radar ..... 215
Space cadre ..... 215
Space situational awareness initiative ..... 215
Streaker small launch vehicle ..... 215
Transformational satellite communications ..... 216

Page

Ultra short pulse laser technology ..... 216
Upper stage engine technology ..... 216
Wideband gapfiller system ..... 216
Worldwide infrastructure security environment ..... 217
Defense-Wide Research, Development, Test, & Evaluation ..... 217
Overview ..... 217
Items of Special Interest ..... 228
Accelerating transition and fielding of advanced technologies for emerging critical operational needs ..... 228
Advanced metal casting technology ..... 229
Advanced sensor applications program ..... 229
Advanced tactical laser program ..... 229
Anti-radiation drug and trials program ..... 230
Asymmetric protocols for biological defense ..... 230
Ballistic missile defense ..... 231
Advanced concepts ..... 231
Boost defense segment ..... 231
Core ..... 231
Midcourse defense segment ..... 232
Post Ramos Project ..... 232
Products ..... 232
Sensors ..... 232
System interceptor ..... 233
Technology ..... 234
Terminal defense segment ..... 234
Business management modernization program ..... 234
Chemical/biological defense research, development, test and evaluation program ..... 235
Accelerating the research, development, and acquisition of medical countermeasures against biological warfare agents ..... 235
Chemical/biological defense basic research initiative ..... 236
Chemical/biological defense applied research initiative ..... 237
Chemical/biological defense advanced technology development initiative ..... 237
Joint biological point detection system ..... 237
Joint service lightweight standoff chemical agent detector ..... 237
Connectory for rapid identification of technology resources ..... 238
Counter-terrorism technology support ..... 238
Defense advanced research projects agency ..... 238
Defense science and technology funding ..... 240
Expanding the role of small businesses in the defense acquisition process ..... 241
High-speed/hypersonic reusable demonstration ..... 242
Horizontal fusion ..... 242
Implementation of defense biomedical countermeasures ..... 243
Man portable air defense system defense program ..... 243
Measures and signatures intelligence consortium ..... 244
Medical free electron laser ..... 244
Multi-wavelength surface scanning biologics sensor ..... 244
National Defense University technology pilot program ..... 245
Nuclear weapons effects applied research ..... 245
Operationally responsive satellite ..... 246
Smart machine platform initiative ..... 246
Space and missile defense command simulation center ..... 246
Special operations advanced technology development ..... 247
Special operations technology development ..... 247
Stimulated isomer energy release ..... 248
Tasking, processing, exploitation, and dissemination of SYERS-2 data ..... 248
Use of research and development funds to procure systems ..... 248
Walrus ..... 249
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense ..... 250
Overview ..... 250
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 252
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 252
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 252
Section 202—Amount for Defense Science and Technology ..... 252

Page

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations ..... 252
Section 211—Future Combat Systems Program Strategy ..... 252
Section 212—Collaborative Program for Research and Development of Vacuum Electronics Technologies ..... 253
Section 213—Annual Comptroller General Report on Joint Strike Fighter Program ..... 254
Section 214—Amounts for United States Joint Forces Command to be Derived Only from Defense-wide Amounts ..... 254
Section 215—Authority of Director of Defense Research and Engineering to Award Prizes for Advanced Technology Achievements ..... 255
Section 216—Space Based Radar ..... 255
Section 217—Mark-54 Torpedo Product Improvement Program ..... 255
Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense ..... 255
Section 221—Fielding of Ballistic Missile Defense Capabilities ..... 255
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ..... 256
OVERVIEW ..... 256
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 290
Budget Request Adjustments—Readiness ..... 290
Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities ..... 291
Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan ..... 291
Paralyzed Veterans of America ..... 291
Spare Engines ..... 291
Working Capital Funds ..... 292
Information Technology Issues ..... 292
Overview ..... 292
Information Technology Specific Reductions ..... 293
Enterprise Resource Planning Program—Army National Guard ..... 294
Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network ..... 294
Navy Marine Corps Intranet ..... 295
Other Matters ..... 295
Core Logistics Capability ..... 295
Fire Emergency and Services Program ..... 296
Jinapsan Beach Properties in Guam ..... 296
Moving Household Goods—Families First ..... 296
New Mexico Training Range Initiative ..... 297
Tents ..... 297
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 297
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 297
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding ..... 297
Section 302—Working Capital Funds ..... 297
Section 303—Other Department of Defense Programs ..... 297
Section 304—Reimbursement of Members of the Armed Forces Who Purchased Protective Body Armor during Shortage of Defense Stocks of Body Armor ..... 297
Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions ..... 298
Section 311—Report Regarding Encroachment Issues Affecting Utah Test and Training Range, Utah ..... 298
Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot Issues ..... 298
Section 321—Simplification of Annual Reporting Requirements Concerning Funds Expended for Depot Maintenance and Repair Workloads ..... 298
Section 322—Repeal of Annual Reporting Requirement Concerning Management of Depot Employees ..... 298
Section 323—Public-Private Competition for Work Performed by Civilian Employees of Department of Defense ..... 298
Section 324—Public-Private Competition Pilot Program ..... 299
Section 325—Sense of Congress on Equitable Legal Standing for Civilian Employees ..... 299
Section 326—Competitive Sourcing Reporting Requirement ..... 299
Subtitle D—Information Technology ..... 300
Section 331—Preparation of Department of Defense Plan for Transition to Internet Protocol Version 6 ..... 300
Section 332—Defense Business Enterprise Architecture, System Accountability, and Conditions for Obligation of Funds for Defense Business System Modernization ..... 300

Page

Section 333—Establishment of Joint Program Office to Improve Interoperability of Battlefield Management Command and Control Systems ... 301
Subtitle E—Readiness Reporting Requirements ... 301
Section 341—Annual Report on Department of Defense Operation and Financial Support for Military Museums ... 301
Section 342—Report on Department of Defense Programs for Prepositioning of Material and Equipment ... 302
Subtitle F—Other Matters ... 302
Section 351—Extension of the Arsenal Support Program Initiative ... 302
Section 352—Limitation on Preparation or Implementation of Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan ... 302
Section 353—Procurement of Follow-On Contracts for the Operation of Five Champion-Class T-5 Tank Vessels ... 303
Section 354—Sense of Congress on America's National World War I Museum ... 303
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS ... 303
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 303
Study of High Demand Low Density Military Units and Personnel ... 303
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 304
Subtitle A—Active Forces ... 304
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces ... 304
Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels ... 304
Section 403—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized to be on Active Duty for Operational Support ... 304
Section 404—Accounting and Mangement of Reserve Component Personnel Performing Active Duty or Full-Time National Guard Duty for Operations Support ... 304
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces ... 305
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve ... 305
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves ... 305
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) ... 306
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2005 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Satus Technicians ... 306
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations ... 306
Section 421—Military Personnel ... 306
Section 422—Armed Forces Retirement Home ... 307
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY ... 307
OVERVIEW ... 307
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 308
Civilianization or Contracting Out of Military Chaplain Positions ... 308
Curricula for Post-conflict Resolution ... 308
Federal Voting Assistance Program ... 308
Joint Advertising and Market Research ... 309
Meeting Department of Defense Requirements for Personnel with Foreign Language and Regional Expertise ... 310
National Program for Citizen Soldier Support ... 310
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 311
Subtitle A—General and Flag Officer Matters ... 311
Section 501—Length of Service for Service Chiefs ... 311
Section 502—Repeal of Requirement that Deputy Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs of Naval Operations Be Selected from Officers in the Line of the Navy ... 311
Section 503—Increase in Age Limit for Deferral of Mandatory Retirement for Up to 10 Senior General and Flag Officers ... 311
Section 504—Increased Flexibility for Voluntary Retirement for Military Officers ... 311
Section 505—Repeal of Requirement that No More than 50 Percent of Active Duty General and Flag Officers be in Grades Above Brigadier General and Rear Admiral (Lower Half) ... 312
Section 506—Revision to Terms for Assistants to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for National Guard and Reserve Matters ... 312
Section 507—Succession for Position of Chief, National Guard Bureau ... 312
Section 508—Title of Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau Changed to Director of the Joint Staff of the National Guard Bureau ... 312

Page

Section 509—Two-Year Extension of Authority to Waive Requirement that Reserve Chiefs and National Guard Directors Have Significant Joint Duty Experience ..... 313
Section 510—Repeal of Distribution Requirements for Naval Reserve Flag Officers ..... 313
Subtitle B—Other Officer Personnel Policy Matters ..... 313
Section 511—Transition of the Active-Duty List Officer Force to All Regular Status ..... 313
Section 512—Mandatory Retention on Active duty to Qualify for Retired Pay ..... 313
Section 513—Distribution in Grade of Marine Corps Reserve Officers in an Active Status in Grades Below Brigadier General ..... 314
Section 514—Tuition Assistance for Officers ..... 314
Subtitle C—Reserve Component Matters ..... 314
Section 521—Revision to Statutory Purpose of the Reserve Components ..... 314
Section 522—Improved Access to Reserve Component Members for Enhanced Training ..... 314
Section 523—Status Under Disability Retirement System for Reserve Members Released from Active Duty Due to Inability to Perform within 30 Days of Call to Active Duty ..... 315
Section 524—Federal Civil Service Military Leave for Reserve and National Guard Civilian Technicians ..... 315
Section 525—Expanded Educational Assistance Authority for Officers Commissioned Through ROTC Program at Military Junior College ..... 315
Section 526—Effect of Appointment or Commission as Officer on Eligibility for Selected Reserve Education Loan Repayment Program for Enlisted Members ..... 315
Section 527—Number of Starbase Academies in a State ..... 315
Section 528—Comptroller General Assessment of Integration of Active and Reserve Components of the Navy ..... 315
Section 529—Operational Activities Conducted by the National Guard Under Authority of Title 32 ..... 316
Section 530—Army Program for Assignment of Active Component Advisers to Units of the Selected Reserve ..... 316
Subtitle D—Joint Officer Management ..... 316
Section 531—Strategic Plan to Link Joint Officer Development to Overall Missions and Goals of Department of Defense ..... 316
Section 532—Joint Requirements for Promotion to Flag or General Officer Grade ..... 317
Section 533—Clarification of Tours of Duty Qualifying as a Joint Duty Assignment ..... 317
Section 534—Reserve Joint Special Officer Qualifications ..... 317
Subtitle E—Professional Military Education ..... 318
Section 541—Improvement to Professional Military Education in the Department of Defense ..... 318
Section 542—Ribbons to Recognize Completion of Joint Professional Military Education ..... 319
Section 543—Increase in Number of Private-Sector Civilians Who May Be Enrolled for Instruction at National Defense University ..... 319
Section 544—Requirement for Completion of Phase I Joint Professional Military Education before Promotion to Colonel or Navy Captain ..... 320
Subtitle F—Other Education and Training Matters ..... 320
Section 551—College First Delayed Enlistment Program ..... 320
Section 552—Standardization of Authority to Confer Degrees on Graduates of Community College of the Air Force with Authority for Other Schools of Air University ..... 320
Section 553—Change in Titles of Heads of the Naval Postgraduate School ..... 320
Section 554—Increase from Two Years to Three Years in Period for which Educational Leave of Absence May Be Authorized ..... 320
Section 555—Correction to Disparate Treatment of Disabilities Sustained During Accession Training ..... 320
Section 556—Prayer at Military Service Academy Activities ..... 321
Section 557—Revision to Conditions on Service of Officers as Service Academy Superintendents ..... 321

Page

Section 558—Codification of Prohibition on Imposition of Certain Charges and Fees at Service Academies ..... 321
Section 559—Qualifications of the Dean of the Faculty of United States Air Force Academy ..... 321
Subtitle G—Medals and Decorations and Special Promotions and Appointments ..... 322
Section 561—Separate Military Campaign Medals to Recognize Service in Operation Enduring Freedom and Service in Operation Iraqi Freedom ..... 322
Section 562—Eligibility of All Uniformed Services Personnel for National Defense Service Medal ..... 322
Section 563—Authority to Appoint Brigadier General Charles E. Yeager, United States Air Force (retired), to the Grade of Major General on the Retired List ..... 322
Section 564—Posthumous Commission of William Mitchell in the Grade of Major General in the Army ..... 322
Subtitle H—Military Justice Matters ..... 322
Section 571—Review on How Sexual Offenses Are Covered by Uniformed Code of Military Justice ..... 322
Section 572—Service Time Not Lost When Confined in Connection with Trial if Confinement Excused as Unavoidable ..... 322
Section 573—Clarification of Authority of Military Legal Assistance Counsel to Provide Military Legal Assistance without Regard to Licensing Requirements ..... 323
Subtitle I—Administrative and Management Matters ..... 323
Section 581—Three-Year Extension of Limitation on Reductions of Personnel of Agencies Responsible for Review and Correction of Military Records ..... 323
Section 582—Staffing and Funding for Defense Prisoner of War/Missing Personnel Office ..... 323
Section 583—Permanent ID Cards for Retiree Dependents Age 70 and Older ..... 324
Section 584—Authority to Provide Civilian Clothing to Members Traveling in Connection with Medical Evacuation ..... 324
Section 585—Authority to Accept Donation of Frequent Flyer Miles, Credits, and Tickets to Facilitate Rest and Recuperation Travel of Deployed Members of the Armed Forces and Their Families ..... 324
Section 586—Limitation on Amendment or Cancellation of Department of Defense Directive Relating to Reasonable Access to Military Installations for Certain Personal Commercial Solicitation ..... 324
Section 587—Annual Identification of Reasons for Discharges from the Armed Services During Preceding Fiscal Years ..... 324
Section 588—Authority for Federal Recognition of National Guard Commissioned Officers Appointed from Former Coast Guard Personnel ..... 325
Section 589—Study of Blended Wing Concept for the Air Force ..... 325
Section 590—Continuation of Impact Aid Assistance on Behalf of Dependents of Certain Members Despite Change in Status of Member ... 325
Subtitle J—Other Matters .....
Section 591—Employment Preferences for Spouses of Certain Department of Defense Civilian Employees Subject to Relocation Agreements ..... 325
Section 592—Repeal of Requirement to Conduct Electronic Voting Demonstration Project for the Federal Election to be Held in November 2004 ..... 326
Section 593—Examination of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces by the Defense Task Force Established to Examine Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies ..... 326
Section 594—Renewal of Pilot Program for Treating GED and Home School Diploma Recipients as High School Graduates for Determinations of Eligibility for Enlistment ..... 326
Section 595—Assistance to Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees ..... 327
Section 596—Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Recruiter Access at Institutions of Higher Education ..... 327
Section 597—Reports on Transformation Milestones ..... 327

Page

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS ..... 327
OVERVIEW ..... 327
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 328
Combat-Related Special Compensation ..... 328
Commissary Funding After Closure of a Store ..... 328
Consolidation of the Military Exchanges ..... 328
Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida, Combined Commissary and Exchange Store ..... 329
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 329
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances ..... 329
Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 2005 ..... 329
Section 602—Authority to Provide Family Separation Basic Allowance for Housing ..... 329
Section 603—Geographic Basis for Basic Allowance for Housing during Short Changes of Station for Professional Military Education or Training ..... 329
Section 604—Immediate Lump-Sum Reimbursement for Unusual Nonrecurring Expenses Incurred by Members Serving Outside Continental United States ..... 330
Section 605—Income Replacement Payments for Reserves Experiencing Extended and Frequent Mobilization for Active Duty Service ..... 330
Section 606—Authority for Certain Members Deployed in Combat Zones to Receive Limited Advances on Their Future Base Pay ..... 330
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays ..... 330
Section 611—One-Year Extension of Bonus and Special Pay Authorities ..... 330
Section 612—Reduction in Required Service Commitment to Receive Accession Bonus for Registered Nurses ..... 331
Section 613—Increase in Maximum Monthly Rate Authorized for Hardship Duty Pay ..... 331
Section 614—Termination of Assignment Incentive Pay for Members Placed on Terminal Leave ..... 331
Section 615—Consolidation of Reenlistment and Enlistment Bonus Authorities for Regular and Reserve Components ..... 331
Section 616—Revision of Authority to Provide Foreign Language Proficiency Pay ..... 331
Section 617—Eligibility of Reserve Component Members for Critical Skills Retention Bonus and Expansion of Authority to Provide Bonus 332
Section 618—Eligibility of New Reserve Component Officers for Accession or Affiliation Bonus for Officers in Critical Skills ..... 332
Section 619—Eligibility of Reserve Component Members for Incentive Bonus for Conversion to Military Occupational Specialty to Ease Personnel Shortage ..... 332
Section 620—Availability of Hazardous Duty Incentive Pay for Military Firefighters ..... 332
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowance ..... 332
Section 631—Expansion of Travel and Transportation Allowances to Assist Survivors of a Deceased Member to Attend Burial Ceremony of the Member ..... 332
Section 632—Transportation of Family Members Incident to the Serious Illness or Injury of Members of the Uniformed Services ..... 332
Section 633—Reimbursement of Members for Certain Lodging Costs Incurred in Connection with Student Dependent Travel ..... 333
Subtitle D—Survivors Benefits ..... 333
Section 641—Computation of Benefits Under Survivor Benefit Plan for Surviving Spouses Over Age 62 ..... 333
Section 642—Open Enrollment Period for Survivor Benefit Plan Commencing October 1, 2005 ..... 333
Section 643—Source of Funds for Survivor Benefit Plan Annuities for Department of Defense Beneficiaries Over Age 62 ..... 333
Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits ..... 333
Section 651—Consolidation and Reorganization of Legislative Provisions Regarding Defense Commissary System and Exchanges and other Morale, Welfare, and Recreational Activities ..... 333
Section 652—Consistent State Treatment of Department of Defense Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefits Program ..... 334

Page

Section 653—Cooperation and Assistance for Qualified Scouting Organizations Serving Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Civilian Employees Overseas ..... 334
Subtitle F—Other Matters ..... 335
Section 661—Repeal of Requirement that Members Entitled to Basic Allowance for Subsistence Pay Subsistence Charges while Hospitalized ..... 335
Section 662—Clarification of Education Loans Qualifying for Education Loan Repayment Program for Reserve Component Health Professions Officers ..... 335
Section 663—Survey and Analysis of Effect of Extended and Frequent Mobilization of Reservists for Active Duty Service on Reservist Income ..... 335
TITLE VII—HEALTHCARE MATTERS ..... 335
OVERVIEW ..... 335
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 336
Collection of Perinatal Information ..... 336
Coordination of TRICARE and Medicare Benefits and Provider Payments ..... 336
Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Test Review ..... 337
Landstuhl Regional Medical Center Alteration ..... 337
Military-Civilian Education Programs Related to Sexual Health Decision-Making ..... 338
Nurse Triage and Health Information Line Services ..... 338
Reserve Component Requirement for Medical and Dental Readiness Accountability ..... 339
Resource Sharing Agreements ..... 339
State-of-the-Art Mobility Equipment ..... 339
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 339
Subtitle A—Enhanced Health Care Benefits for Reserves ..... 339
Section 701—Demonstration Project for TRICARE Coverage for Ready Reserve Members ..... 339
Section 702—Comptroller General Report on the Cost and Feasibility of Providing Private Health Insurance Stipends for Members of the Ready Reserve ..... 340
Section 703—Improvement of Medical Services for Activated Members of the Ready Reserve and Their Families ..... 340
Section 704—Modification of Waiver of Certain Deductibles Under TRICARE Program ..... 340
Section 705—Authority for Payment by United States of Additional Amounts Billed by Health Care Providers to Activated Reserve Members ..... 340
Section 706—Extension of Transitional Health Care Benefits After Separation from Active Duty ..... 341
Subtitle B—Other Benefits Improvements ..... 341
Section 711—Coverage of Certain Young Children Under TRICARE Dental Program ..... 341
Section 712—Comptroller General Report on Provision of Health and Support Services for Exceptional Family Member Program Enrollees . 341
Section 713—Exceptional Eligibility for TRICARE Prime Remote ..... 342
Section 714—Transition to Home Health Care Benefit Under Sub-acute Care Program ..... 342
Section 715—Requirement Relating to Prescription Drug Benefits for Medicare-Eligible Enrollees Under Defense Health Care Plans ..... 342
Section 716—Professional Accreditation of Military Dentists ..... 342
Section 717—Addition of Certain Unremarried Former Spouses to Persons Eligible for Dental Insurance Plan of Retirees of the Uniformed Services ..... 342
Section 718—Waiver of Collection of Payments Due from Certain Persons Unaware of Loss of CHAMPUS Eligibility ..... 343
Subtitle C—Planning, Programming, and Management ..... 343
Section 721—Pilot Program for Transformation of Health Care Delivery ..... 343
Section 722—Study of Provision of Travel Reimbursement to Hospitals for Certain Military Disability Retirees ..... 343
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS ..... 344

Page

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 344
Subtitle A—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations ..... 344
Section 801—Rapid Acquisition Authority to Respond to Combat Emergencies ..... 344
Section 802—Defense Acquisition Workforce Changes ..... 344
Section 803—Limitation on Task and Delivery Order Contracts ..... 344
Section 804—Funding for Contract Cancellation Ceilings for Certain Multiyear Procurement Contracts ..... 344
Section 805—Increased Threshold for Requiring Contractors to Provide Specified Employee Information to Cooperative Agreement Holders ..... 345
Section 806—Extension of Authority for Use of Simplified Acquisition Procedures ..... 345
Section 807—Authority to Adjust Acquisition-Related Dollar Thresholds for Inflation ..... 345
Subtitle B—United States Defense Industrial Base Provisions ..... 345
Section 811—Defense Reciprocity Trade ..... 345
Section 812—Amendments to Domestic Source Requirements ..... 346
Section 813—Three-Year Extension of Restriction on Acquisition of Polyacrylonitrile (PAN) Carbon Fiber from Foreign Sources ..... 346
Section 814—Grant Program for Defense Contractors to Implement Strategies to Avoid Outsourcing of Jobs ..... 346
Section 815—Preference for Domestic Freight Forwarding Services ..... 346
Subtitle C—Other Acquisition Matters ..... 346
Section 821—Sustainment and Modernization Plans for Existing Systems while Replacement Systems are Under Development ..... 346
Section 822—Review and Demonstration Project Relating to Contractor Employees ..... 347
Section 823—Defense Acquisition Workforce Limitation and Reports ..... 348
Section 824—Provision of Information to Congress to Enhance Transparency in Contracting ..... 348
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT ..... 348
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 348
National Defense University ..... 348
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 348
Section 901—Change in Title of Secretary of the Navy to Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps ..... 348
Section 902—Transfer of Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs from National Defense University to United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission ..... 348
Section 903—Transfer to the Secretary of the Army of Responsibility for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program ..... 349
Section 904—Modification of Obligated Service Requirements under National Security Education Program ..... 350
Section 905—Change of Membership of Certain Councils ..... 350
Section 906—Actions to Prevent the Abuse of Detainees ..... 350
Section 907—Responses to Congressional Inquiries ..... 350
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS ..... 351
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 351
Counter-Drug Activities ..... 351
Overview ..... 351
Items of Special Interest ..... 351
Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and tanker support ..... 351
Northern Command counter-narcotics support ..... 351
Southwest Border Fence ..... 352
Tethered Aerostat Radar System ..... 352
Other Activities ..... 352
Airlift Support for Homeland Defense Missions ..... 352
Civil Reserve Air Fleet ..... 353
Defense Transformation ..... 353
Global War on Terrorism ..... 353
Homeland Defense Forces ..... 354
Wisconsin Project's International Export Control Center ..... 354
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 355
Subtitle A—Financial Matters ..... 355
Section 1001—Transfer Authority ..... 355

Page

Section 1002—Budget Justification Documents for Operation and Maintenance ..... 355
Section 1003—Retention of Fees from Intellectual Property Licenses ..... 356
Section 1004—Authority to Waive Claims of the United States when Amounts Recoverable are Less than Costs of Collection ..... 356
Section 1005—Repeal of Funding Restrictions Concerning Development of Medical Countermeasures against Biological Warfare Threats ..... 356
Section 1006—Report on Budgeting for Exchange Rates for Foreign Currency Fluctuations ..... 357
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards ..... 357
Section 1011—Authority for Award of Contracts for Ship Dismantling on Net-Cost Basis ..... 357
Section 1012—Independent Study to Assess Cost Effectiveness of the Navy Ship Construction Program ..... 357
Section 1013—Authority to Transfer Specified Former Naval Vessels to Certain Foreign Countries ..... 357
Section 1014—Limitation on Leasing of Foreign-Built Vessels ..... 357
Subtitle C—Sunken Military Craft ..... 358
Section 1021-28—Protection of Sunken Military Craft ..... 358
Subtitle D—Counter-Drug Activities ..... 358
Section 1031—Continuation of Authority to Use Dapartment of Defense Funds for Unified Counter-Drug and Counter-Terrorism Campaign in Colombia ..... 358
Section 1032—Limitation on Number of United States Military Personnel in Colombia ..... 358
Subtitle E—Reports ..... 359
Section 1041—Study of Continued Requirement for Two-Crew Manning for Ballistic Missile Submarines ..... 359
Section 1042—Study of Effect on Defense Industrial Base of Elimination of United States Domestic Firearms Manufacturing Base ..... 359
Section 1043—Study of Extent and Quality of Training Provided to Members of the Armed Services to Prepare for Post-Conflict Operations ..... 359
Subtitle F—Security Matters ..... 359
Section 1051—Use of National Driver Register for Personnel Security Investigations and Determinations ..... 359
Section 1052—Standards for Disqualification from Eligibility for Department of Defense Security Clearances ..... 359
Subtitle G—Transportation Matters ..... 360
Section 1061—Use of Military Aircraft to Transport Mail to and from Overseas Locations ..... 360
Section 1062—Reorganization and Clarification of Certain Provisions Relating to Control and Supervision of Transportation within the Department of Defense ..... 360
Section 1063—Determination of Whether Private Air Carriers are Controlled by United States Citizens for Purposes of Eligibility for Government Contract for Transportation of Passengers or Supplies ..... 360
Section 1064—Evaluation of Whether to Prohibit Certain Offers for Transportation of Security-Sensitive Cargo ..... 360
Subtitle H—Other Matters ..... 361
Section 1071—Two-Year Extension of Authority of the Secretary of Defense to Engage in Commercial Activities as Security for Intelligence Collection Activities Abroad ..... 361
Section 1072—Assistance for Study of Feasibility of Biennial International Air Trade Show in the United States and for Initial Implementation ..... 361
Section 1073—Technical and Clerical Amendments ..... 361
Section 1074—Commission on the Long-Term Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States ..... 361
Section 1075—Liability Protection for Certain Department of Defense Volunteers Working in the Maritime Environment ..... 361
Section 1076—Transfer of Historic F3A-1 Brewster Corsair Aircraft ..... 361
TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL ..... 362
OVERVIEW ..... 362
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 362
Section 1101—Payment of Federal Employee Health Benefit Premiums for Mobilized Federal Employees ..... 362

Page

Section 1102—Foreign Language Proficiency Pay ..... 362
Section 1103—Pay Parity for Civilian Intelligence Personnel ..... 362
Section 1104—Pay Parity for Senior Executives in Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities ..... 363
Section 1105—Prohibition of Unauthorized Wearing or Use of Civilian Medals or Decorations ..... 363

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS ..... 363
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 363
Subtitle A—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Global War on Terrorism ..... 363
Section 1201—Documentation of Conditions in Iraq under Former Dictatorial Government as Part of Transition to Post-Dictatorial Government ..... 363
Section 1202—Support of Military Operations to Combat Terrorism ..... 363
Section 1203—Commander's Emergency Response Program ..... 364
Section 1204—Status of Iraqi Security Forces ..... 364
Section 1205—Guidance and Report Required on Contractors Supporting Deployed Forces in Iraq ..... 364
Section 1206—Findings and Sense of Congress Concerning Army Specialist Joseph Darby ..... 364
Subtitle B—Other Matters ..... 364
Section 1211—Assignment of Allied Naval Personnel to Submarine Safety Programs ..... 364
Section 1212—Expansion of Entities of the People's Republic of China Subject to Certain Presidential Authorities when Operating in the United States ..... 365
Section 1213—Report by President on Global Peace Operations Initiative ..... 365
Section 1214—Procurement Sanctions against Foreign Persons that Transfer Certain Defense Articles and Services to the People's Republic of China ..... 366

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION ..... 366
OVERVIEW ..... 366
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 368
Visa Requirements ..... 368
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 368
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds ..... 368
Section 1302—Funding Allocations ..... 368
Section 1303—Temporary Authority to Waive Limitation on Funding for Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Russia ..... 368

TITLE XIV—EXPORT CONTROLS AND COUNTERPROLIFERATION MATTERS ..... 368
OVERVIEW ..... 368
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 369
Defense Technology Security Administration ..... 369
Defense Threat Reduction Agency ..... 369
Nonproliferation Education ..... 370
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 370
Subtitle A—Export Controls ..... 370
Section 1401—Definitions under Arms Export Control Act ..... 370
Section 1402—Exemption from Licensing Requirements for Export of Significant Military Equipment ..... 371
Section 1403—Cooperative Projects with Friendly Foreign Countries ..... 371
Section 1404—Licensing Requirement for Export of Militarily Critical Technologies ..... 372
Section 1405—Control of Exports of United States Weapons Technology to the People's Republic of China ..... 373
Section 1406—Strengthening International Export Controls ..... 373
Subtitle B—Counterproliferation Matters ..... 373
Section 1411—Defense International Counterproliferation Programs ..... 373
Section 1412—Defense Counterproliferation Fellowship Program ..... 374
Subtitle C—Initiatives Relating to Countries of the Former Soviet Union . 374
Section 1421—Silk Road Initiative ..... 374
Section 1422—Teller-Kurchatov Nonproliferation Fellowships ..... 374

Page

Section 1423—Collaboration to Reduce the Risks of a Launch of Russian Nuclear Weapons ..... 374

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION FOR INCREASED COSTS DUE TO OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM ..... 375
OVERVIEW ..... 375
SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATION ..... 375
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 378
Procurement ..... 378
Operations and Maintenance ..... 378
Military Personnel ..... 379
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 380
Section 1501—Purpose ..... 380
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 380
Section 1511—Army Procurement ..... 380
Section 1512—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement ..... 380
Section 1513—Air Force Procurement ..... 380
Section 1514—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement ..... 380
Section 1515—Operation and Maintenance ..... 380
Section 1516—Defense Health Program ..... 380
Section 1517—Military Personnel ..... 380
Section 1518—Treatment as Additional Authorization ..... 381
Section 1519—Transfer Authority ..... 381
Section 1520—Designation of Emergency Authorization ..... 381
Subtitle B—Personnel Provisions ..... 381
Section 1531—Three Year Increase in Active Army Strength Levels ..... 381
Section 1532—Three Year Increase in Active Marine Corps Strength Levels ..... 381
Section 1533—Extension of Increased Rates for Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance ..... 382
Subtitle C—Financial Management Matters ..... 382
Section 1541—Revised Funding Methodology for Military Retiree Health Care Benefits ..... 382
DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 382
PURPOSE ..... 382
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW ..... 382
TITLE XXI—ARMY ..... 400
SUMMARY ..... 400
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 400
Planning and Design ..... 400
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 400
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 400
Section 2102—Family Housing ..... 400
Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 400
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army ..... 400
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2004 Projects ..... 401
Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2003 Projects ..... 401

TITLE XXII—NAVY ..... 401
SUMMARY ..... 401
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 401
Planning and Design ..... 401
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 401
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 401
Section 2202—Family Housing ..... 401
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 402
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy ..... 402

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE ..... 402
SUMMARY ..... 402
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 402
Planning and Design ..... 402
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 402
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 402

Page

Section 2302—Family Housing ..... 402
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 403
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force ..... 403
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES ..... 403
SUMMARY ..... 403
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 403
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 403
Section 2402—Improvements to Family Housing Units ..... 403
Section 2403—Energy Conservation Projects ..... 403
Section 2404—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies ..... 403
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM ..... 404
SUMMARY ..... 404
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 404
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 404
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO ..... 404
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES ..... 404
SUMMARY ..... 404
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 404
Planning and Design, Air National Guard ..... 404
Planning and Design, Air Reserve ..... 405
Planning and Design, Army National Guard ..... 405
Planning and Design, Army Reserve ..... 405
Unspecified Minor Construction, Army National Guard ..... 405
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 405
Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 405
TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 406
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 406
Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law ..... 406
Section 2702—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2002 Projects ..... 406
Section 2703—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2001 Projects ..... 406
Section 2704—Effective Date ..... 406
TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS ..... 407
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 407
Base Realignment and Closure ..... 407
Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs Health Care Facility Sharing ..... 407
Housing Requirements Analyses ..... 408
Military Housing Privatization Program ..... 408
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 409
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes ..... 409
Section 2801—Increase in Certain Thresholds for Carrying Out Unspecified Minor Military Construction Projects ..... 409
Section 2802—Assessment of Vulnerability of Military Installations to Terrorist Attack and Annual Report on Military Construction Requirements Related to Antiterrorism and Force Protection ..... 409
Section 2803—Changes in Threshold for Congressional Notification Regarding Use of Operation and Maintenance Funds for Facility Repair ..... 409
Section 2804—Reporting Requirements Regarding Military Family Housing Requirements for General Officers and Flag Officers ..... 409
Section 2805—Congressional Notification of Deviations from Authorized Cost Variations for Military Construction Projects and Military Family Housing Projects ..... 410
Section 2806—Repeal of Limitation on Use of Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Family Housing ..... 410
Section 2807—Temporary Authority to Accelerate Design Efforts for Military Construction Projects Carried Out Using Design-Build Selection Procedures ..... 410

Page

Section 2808—Exchange or Sale of Reserve Component Facilities to Acquire Replacement Facilities ..... 411
Section 2809—One-Year Extension of Temporary, Limited Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects Outside the United States ..... 411
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration ..... 411
Section 2811—Increase in Certain Thresholds for Reporting Real Property Transactions ..... 411
Section 2812—Reorganization of Existing Administrative Provisions Relating to Real Property Transactions ..... 411
Section 2813—Treatment of Money Rentals from Golf Course at Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois ..... 411
Section 2814—Number of Contracts Authorized Department-Wide Under Demonstration Program on Reduction in Long-Term Facility Maintenance Costs ..... 411
Section 2815—Repeal of Commission on Review of Overseas Military Facility Sturcture of the United States ..... 412
Section 2816—Designation of Airmen Leadership School at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, in Honor of John J. Rhodes, a Former Minority Leader of the House of Representatives ..... 412
Section 2817—Elimination of Reversionary Interests Clouding United States Title to Property Used as Navy Homeports ..... 412
Section 2818—Report on Real Property Disposal at Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California ..... 412
Subtitle C—Base Closure and Realignment ..... 412
Section 2821—Two-Year Postponement of 2005 Base Closure and Relignment Round and Submission of Reports Regarding Future Infrastructure Requirements for the Armed Forces ..... 412
Section 2822—Establishment of Specific Deadline for Submission of Revisions to Force-Structure Plan and Infrastructure Inventory for Next Base Closure Round ..... 413
Section 2823—Specification of Final Selection Criteria for Next Base Closure Round ..... 414
Section 2824—Requirement for Unanimous Vote of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission to Add to or Otherwise Expand Closure and Realignment Recommendations made by Secretary of Defense ..... 414
Section 2825—Adherence to Certain Authorities on Preservation of Military Depot Capabilities During Any subsequent Round of Base Closures and Realignments ..... 414
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances ..... 415
Part I—Army Conveyances ..... 415
Section 2831—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio ..... 415
Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Fort Hood, Texas ..... 415
Section 2833—Land Conveyance, Army National Guard Facility, Seattle, Washington ..... 415
Part II—Navy Conveyances .....
Section 2841—Transfer of Jurisdiction, Nebraska Avenue Naval Complex, District of Columbia ..... 415
Section 2842—Land Conveyance, Navy Property, Former Fort Sheridan, Illinois ..... 416
Section 2843—Land Exchange, Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland .....
Part III—Air Force Conveyances ..... 416
Section 2851—Land Exchange, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama ..... 416

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 416

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ..... 416
OVERVIEW ..... 416
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 427
National Nuclear Security Administration ..... 427
Overview ..... 427
Adjustments to the Budget Request ..... 427
Reductions ..... 427
Directed stockpile work ..... 427

Page

Campaigns ..... 427
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation ..... 427
Increases ..... 428
Engineering campaign ..... 428
Readiness in technical base and facilities ..... 428
Advanced Concepts and Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator ..... 428
Advanced Technology Research and Development ..... 429
Los Alamos Public Schools ..... 429
Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility ..... 430
Environmental and Other Defense Activities ..... 430
Overview ..... 430
Adjustments to the Budget Request ..... 430
Reductions ..... 430
Waste incidental to reprocessing ..... 430
Worker and community transition ..... 431
Office of future liabilities ..... 431
Increases ..... 432
2035 defense site accelerated completions ..... 432
Non-closure environmental activities ..... 432
Idaho facilities management-other defense activities ..... 432
Technology Deployment and Development ..... 433
Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program ..... 433
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 433
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations ..... 433
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration ..... 433
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Management ..... 434
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities ..... 434
Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal ..... 434
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations ..... 434
Section 3111—Extension of Authority for Appointment of Certain Scientific, Engineering and Technical Personnel ..... 434
Section 3112—Requirements for Baseline of Projects under Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program ..... 434
Subtitle C—Other Matters ..... 434
Section 3131—Transfers and reprogrammings of National Nuclear Security Administration Funds ..... 434
Section 3132—National Academy of Sciences study on management by Department of Energy of high-level radioactive waste ..... 435
Section 3133—Contract to Review Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, New Mexico ..... 435
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD ..... 436
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 436
Section 3201—Authorization ..... 436
TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE ..... 436
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 436
Section 3301—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds ..... 436
Section 3302—Revisions of Limitations on Required Disposals of Certain Materials in National Defense Stockpile ..... 436
Section 3303—Authority to Dispose of Certain Materials in National Defense Stockpile ..... 436
TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES ..... 437
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 437
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 437
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION ..... 437
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 437
Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for Maritime Administration for Fiscal Year 2005 ..... 437
Section 3502—Extension of Authority to Provide War Risk Insurance for Merchant Marine Vessels ..... 437
Departmental Data ..... 437
Department of Defense Authorization Request ..... 438
Committee Position ..... 438
Communications From Other Committees ..... 438
Fiscal Data ..... 448
Congressional Budget Office Estimate ..... 448
Committee Cost Estimate ..... 448

Page
Oversight Findings ..... 449
General Performance Goals and Objectives ..... 449
Constitutional Authority Statement ..... 450
Statement of Federal Mandates ..... 450
Roll Call Votes ..... 450
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported ..... 459
Additional Views ..... 462
Additional views of Ike Skelton ..... 462
Additional views of Solomon P. Ortiz ..... 464
Additional views of Steve Israel ..... 465
Additional views of Kendrick B. Meek ..... 466
Additional views of Mike D. Rogers ..... 469
Additional views of Vic Snyder and Mac Thornberry ..... 471
Additional views of Jim Cooper and Tim Ryan of Ohio ..... 473

108TH CONGRESS 2d Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 108–491

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

MAY 14, 2004.—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 VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4200]

[Includes committee cost estimate]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, 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. 4200. 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 2005 for procurement and for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3)

93–654

Authorize for fiscal year 2005: (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 2005 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 2005 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 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 $423.1 billion for the national defense budget function for fiscal year 2005. Of this amount, the President requested $402.6 billion for the Department of Defense, including $9.5 billion for military construction and family housing. The defense budget request for fiscal year 2004 also included $17.2 billion for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The committee recommends an overall level of $422.1 billion in budget authority. This amount represents an increase of approximately $21.7 billion from the amount authorized for appropriation by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136).

In addition, the committee recommends $25.0 billion in budget authority for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005, 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 following table provides a summary of the amounts requested and that would be authorized for appropriation in the bill (in the column labeled "Budget Authority Implication of Committee

Recommendation") and the committee's estimate of how the committee's recommendations relate to the budget totals for the national defense function. For purposes of estimating the budget authority implications of committee action, the table reflects the numbers contained in the President's budget for proposals not in the committee's legislative jurisdiction.

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2005**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | FY 2005 Budget Authority Request | Committee Authorization Change | Committee Budget Authority Change | Committee Authorization Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PROCUREMENT** | | | | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 2,658,241 | 2,658,241 | 147,700 | | 2,805,941 | 2,805,941 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 1,398,321 | 1,398,321 | 16,000 | | 1,414,321 | 1,414,321 |
| Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 1,639,695 | 1,639,695 | 100,000 | | 1,739,695 | 1,739,695 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | 1,556,902 | 1,556,902 | 172,500 | | 1,729,402 | 1,729,402 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 4,240,896 | 4,240,896 | 72,744 | | 4,313,640 | 4,313,640 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 8,767,867 | 8,767,867 | 144,800 | | 8,912,667 | 8,912,667 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 2,101,529 | 2,101,529 | 151,925 | | 2,253,454 | 2,253,454 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps | 858,640 | 858,640 | 12,200 | | 870,840 | 870,840 |
| Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy | 9,962,027 | 9,962,027 | 158,000 | | 10,120,027 | 10,120,027 |
| Other Procurement, Navy | 4,834,278 | 4,834,278 | 42,447 | | 4,876,725 | 4,876,725 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | 1,190,103 | 1,190,103 | 125,000 | | 1,315,103 | 1,315,103 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 13,163,174 | 13,163,174 | 486,000 | | 13,649,174 | 13,649,174 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force | 1,396,457 | 1,396,457 | | | 1,396,457 | 1,396,457 |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force | 4,718,313 | 4,718,313 | (80,000) | | 4,638,313 | 4,638,313 |
| Other Procurement, Air Force | 13,283,557 | 13,283,557 | (54,300) | | 13,229,257 | 13,229,257 |
| Procurement, Defense-wide | 2,883,302 | 2,883,302 | 67,400 | | 2,950,702 | 2,950,702 |
| Defense Production Act Purchases | | 9,015 | | | | 9,015 |
| Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction | 1,371,990 | 1,371,990 | (1,371,990) | | | |
| **Total Procurement** | **76,025,292** | **76,034,307** | **190,426** | | **76,215,718** | **76,224,733** |
| **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION** | | | | | | |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army | 9,266,258 | 9,266,258 | 211,906 | 17,000 | 9,478,164 | 9,495,164 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy | 16,346,391 | 16,346,391 | (298,550) | | 16,047,841 | 16,047,841 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force | 21,114,667 | 21,114,667 | 413,300 | | 21,527,967 | 21,527,967 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide | 20,739,837 | 20,739,837 | 29,417 | | 20,769,254 | 20,769,254 |
| Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense | 305,135 | 305,135 | | | 305,135 | 305,135 |
| **Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation** | **67,772,288** | **67,772,288** | **356,073** | **17,000** | **68,128,361** | **68,145,361** |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2005

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | FY 2005 Budget Authority Request | Committee Authorization Change | Committee Budget Authority Change | Committee Authorization Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE & OTHER PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| **Operation and Maintenance** | | | | | | |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army | 26,133,411 | 26,133,411 | (294,800) | | 25,838,611 | 25,838,611 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy | 29,789,190 | 29,789,190 | (265,700) | | 29,523,490 | 29,523,490 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps | 3,632,115 | 3,632,115 | 5,500 | | 3,637,615 | 3,637,615 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force | 28,471,260 | 28,471,260 | (1,327,694) | | 27,143,566 | 27,143,566 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide | 17,494,076 | 17,494,076 | (176,670) | | 17,317,406 | 17,317,406 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve | 2,008,128 | 2,008,128 | (4,400) | | 2,003,728 | 2,003,728 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve | 1,240,038 | 1,240,038 | | | 1,240,038 | 1,240,038 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve | 188,696 | 188,696 | | | 188,696 | 188,696 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve | 2,239,790 | 2,239,790 | (13,000) | | 2,226,790 | 2,226,790 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard | 4,440,686 | 4,440,686 | (15,000) | | 4,425,686 | 4,425,686 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard | 4,422,838 | 4,422,838 | 26,100 | | 4,448,938 | 4,448,938 |
| Transfer Accounts | 1,305,336 | 1,305,336 | | | 1,305,336 | 1,305,336 |
| Miscellaneous Appropriations | 509,025 | 509,025 | 25,000 | | 534,025 | 534,025 |
| **Subtotal Operation and Maintenance** | **121,874,589** | **121,874,589** | **(2,040,664)** | | **119,833,925** | **119,833,925** |
| **Other Programs** | | | | | | |
| Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense | 852,697 | 852,697 | | | 852,697 | 852,697 |
| Defense Health Program | 17,640,411 | 17,640,411 | 171,175 | | 17,811,586 | 17,811,586 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 244,562 | 244,562 | (51,000) | | 193,562 | 193,562 |
| Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense | | | 1,371,990 | | 1,371,990 | 1,371,990 |
| **Subtotal Other Programs** | **18,737,670** | **18,737,670** | **1,492,165** | | **20,229,835** | **20,229,835** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance & Other Programs** | **140,612,259** | **140,612,259** | **(548,499)** | | **140,063,760** | **140,063,760** |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2005

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | FY 2005 Budget Authority Request | Committee Authorization Change | Committee Budget Authority Change | Committee Authorization Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS** | | | | | | |
| Defense Working Capital Funds - Services and Defense-wide | 510,886 | 510,886 | (138,000) | | 372,886 | 372,886 |
| Defense Working Capital Funds - DECA | 1,175,000 | 1,175,000 | | | 1,175,000 | 1,175,000 |
| National Defense Sealift Fund | 1,269,252 | 1,269,252 | (50,000) | | 1,219,252 | 1,219,252 |
| National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund | | | | | | |
| Armed Forces Retirement Home Fund | 61,195 | | | | 61,195 | |
| **Total Revolving and Management Funds** | **3,016,333** | **2,955,138** | **(188,000)** | | **2,828,333** | **2,767,138** |
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL** | | | | | | |
| **Total Military Personnel** | **104,811,558** | **104,811,558** | **(164,000)** | | **104,647,558** | **104,647,558** |
| **MILITARY CONSTRUCTION** | | | | | | |
| Military Construction, Army | 1,771,285 | 1,771,285 | 94,924 | | 1,866,209 | 1,866,209 |
| Military Construction, Navy | 1,060,455 | 1,060,455 | 17,407 | | 1,077,862 | 1,077,862 |
| Military Construction, Air Force | 663,964 | 663,964 | 128,090 | | 792,054 | 792,054 |
| Military Construction, Defense-wide | 699,437 | 709,337 | 9,500 | | 708,937 | 718,837 |
| Military Construction, Chemical Demil Construction, Defense | 81,886 | 81,886 | | | 81,886 | 81,886 |
| NATO Security Investment Program | 165,800 | 165,800 | | | 165,800 | 165,800 |
| Base Realignment and Closure IV | 246,116 | 246,116 | | | 246,116 | 246,116 |
| Military Construction, Army National Guard | 295,657 | 295,657 | 97,568 | | 393,225 | 393,225 |
| Military Construction, Air National Guard | 127,368 | 127,368 | 57,252 | | 184,620 | 184,620 |
| Military Construction, Army Reserve | 87,070 | 87,070 | 29,885 | | 116,955 | 116,955 |
| Military Construction, Naval Reserve | 25,285 | 25,285 | 5,670 | | 30,955 | 30,955 |
| Military Construction, Air Force Reserve | 84,556 | 84,556 | 29,534 | | 114,090 | 114,090 |
| Military Construction, Foreign Currency Fluctuations | | | | 63,000 | | 63,000 |
| **Subtotal Military Construction** | **5,308,879** | **5,318,779** | **469,830** | **63,000** | **5,778,709** | **5,851,609** |

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2005**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | FY 2005 Budget Authority Request | Committee Authorization Change | Committee Budget Authority Change | Committee Authorization Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **FAMILY HOUSING** | | | | | | |
| Family Housing Construction, Army | 636,099 | 636,099 | | | 636,099 | 636,099 |
| Family Housing Support, Army | 928,907 | 928,907 | (2,400) | | 926,507 | 926,507 |
| Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps | 139,107 | 139,107 | | | 139,107 | 139,107 |
| Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps | 704,504 | 704,504 | (8,200) | | 696,304 | 696,304 |
| Family Housing Construction, Air Force | 846,959 | 846,959 | | | 846,959 | 846,959 |
| Family Housing Support, Air Force | 863,896 | 863,896 | (9,230) | | 854,666 | 854,666 |
| Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide | 49 | 49 | | | 49 | 49 |
| Family Housing Support, Defense-wide | 49,575 | 49,575 | | | 49,575 | 49,575 |
| DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund | 2,500 | 2,500 | | | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| **Subtotal Family Housing** | **4,171,596** | **4,171,596** | **(19,830)** | | **4,151,766** | **4,151,766** |
| **Total Military Construction and Family Housing** | **9,480,475** | **9,490,375** | **450,000** | **63,000** | **9,930,475** | **10,003,375** |
| **OTHER DoD MILITARY** | | | | | | |
| National Security Education Trust Fund | | 8,000 | | | | 8,000 |
| National Science Center, Army | | 5 | | | | 5 |
| DoD Facility Recovery | | 1,300 | | | | 1,300 |
| Allowances - Travel Cards | | | | 44,000 | | 44,000 |
| Disposal of DoD Real Property | | 16,000 | | | | 16,000 |
| Lease of DoD Real Property | | 14,770 | | (6,000) | | 8,770 |
| **Total Other DoD Military** | | **40,075** | | **38,000** | | **78,075** |
| **Subtotal Department of Defense - Discretionary** | **401,718,205** | **401,716,000** | **96,000** | **118,000** | **401,814,205** | **401,930,000** |

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2005**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | FY 2005 Budget Authority Request | Committee Authorization Change | Committee Budget Authority Change | Committee Authorization Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **DoD MANDATORY PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| Sale of Certain Material in National Defense Stockpile | | (115,000) | (15,000) | 15,000 | (15,000) | (115,000) |
| Concurrent Receipt Accrual Payment | | 1,534,200 | | (160,000) | | 1,374,200 |
| Restoration of Rocky Mountain Arsenal | | 10,010 | | (4,000) | | 6,010 |
| Allied Contributions and Cooperation Account | | 600,000 | | (50,000) | | 550,000 |
| Trust Funds, Revolving Funds and Other DoD Programs | | 273,000 | | (147,000) | | 126,000 |
| Offsetting Receipts | | (1,386,000) | | 148,000 | | (1,238,000) |
| Sec 503 - Increase in retirement age limit for military officers | | | 250 | | 250 | 250 |
| Sec. 504 - Flexibility for voluntary retirement for military officers | | | 250 | | 250 | 250 |
| Sec. 512 - Mandatory retention of active duty to qualify for retired pay | | | 500 | | 500 | 500 |
| Sec. 555 - Disabilities sustained during accession training | | | 33 | | 33 | 33 |
| Sec. 642 - Survivor Benefits Plan | | | (1,000) | | (1,000) | (1,000) |
| Sec. 1004 - Microclaim Waiver Authority | | | 100 | | 100 | 100 |
| **Subtotal Department of Defense - Mandatory** | | **916,210** | **(14,867)** | **(198,000)** | **(14,867)** | **703,343** |
| **TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY (051)** | **401,718,205** | **402,632,210** | **81,133** | **(80,000)** | **401,799,338** | **402,633,343** |
| **ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)** | | | | | | |
| **National Nuclear Security Administration** | | | | | | |
| Energy Supply | | | | | | |
| Weapons Activities | 6,568,453 | 6,568,453 | 9,500 | | 6,577,953 | 6,577,953 |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 1,348,647 | 1,348,647 | (10,500) | | 1,338,147 | 1,338,147 |
| Naval Reactors | 797,900 | 797,900 | | | 797,900 | 797,900 |
| Office of the Administrator | 333,700 | 333,700 | | | 333,700 | 333,700 |
| **Subtotal National Nuclear Security Administration** | **9,048,700** | **9,048,700** | **(1,000)** | | **9,047,700** | **9,047,700** |
| **Environmental and Other Defense Activities** | | | | | | |

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2005**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | FY 2005 Budget Authority Request | Committee Authorization Change | Committee Budget Authority Change | Committee Authorization Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Defense Site Acceleration Completion | 5,970,837 | 5,970,837 | (94,000) | | 5,876,837 | 5,876,837 |
| Defense Environmental Services | 982,470 | 982,470 | 4,000 | | 986,470 | 986,470 |
| Other Defense Activities | 664,618 | 664,618 | (6,000) | | 658,618 | 658,618 |
| Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal | 131,000 | 131,000 | | | 131,000 | 131,000 |
| **Subtotal Environmental and Other Defense Activities** | **7,748,925** | **7,748,925** | **(96,000)** | | **7,652,925** | **7,652,925** |
| **Subtotal Atomic Energy Defense Activates** | **16,797,625** | **16,797,625** | **(97,000)** | | **16,700,625** | **16,700,625** |
| **OTHER ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action - Corps of Engineers | | 140,000 | | | | 140,000 |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 20,268 | 20,268 | 1,000 | | 21,268 | 21,268 |
| **Subtotal Other Atomic Energy Defense Programs** | **20,268** | **160,268** | **1,000** | | **21,268** | **161,268** |
| **Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities - Discretionary** | **16,817,893** | **16,957,893** | **(96,000)** | | **16,721,893** | **16,861,893** |
| **ATOMIC ENERGY MANDATORY PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| Energy Employees Illness Compensation Fund | | 221,000 | | 79,000 | | 300,000 |
| Energy Employees Compensation - Administration | | 41,000 | | | | 41,000 |
| **Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities - Mandatory** | | **262,000** | | **79,000** | | **341,000** |
| **TOTAL ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)** | **16,817,893** | **17,219,893** | **(96,000)** | **79,000** | **16,721,893** | **17,202,893** |
| **DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)** | | | | | | |
| Department of Homeland Security | | 1,929,000 | | | | 1,929,000 |
| Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund | | 72,000 | | | | 72,000 |
| **Total Defense Related Activities - Discretionary** | | **2,001,000** | | | | **2,001,000** |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2005

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | FY 2005 Budget Authority Request | Committee Authorization Change | Committee Budget Authority Change | Committee Authorization Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES MANDATORY PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| CIA Retirement & Disability | | 239,000 | | | | 239,000 |
| Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund | | 65,000 | | | | 65,000 |
| Proposed Legislation (outside DoD's Jurisdiction) | | 940,000 | | (940,000) | | |
| **Total Defense Related Activities - Mandatory** | | **1,244,000** | | **(940,000)** | | **304,000** |
| **TOTAL DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)** | | **3,245,000** | | **(940,000)** | | **2,305,000** |
| Subtotal National Defense Function (050) - Discretionary | 418,536,098 | 420,674,893 | | 118,000 | 418,536,098 | 420,792,893 |
| Subtotal National Defense Function (050) - Mandatory | | 2,422,210 | (14,867) | (1,059,000) | (14,867) | 1,348,343 |
| **TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)** | **418,536,098** | **423,097,103** | **(14,867)** | **(941,000)** | **418,521,231** | **422,141,236** |
| **Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION** | | | | | | |
| **PROCUREMENT** | | | | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | | | 498,300 | | 498,300 | 498,300 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | | | 42,800 | | 42,800 | 42,800 |
| Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | | | 201,900 | | 201,900 | 201,900 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | | | 78,750 | | 78,750 | 78,750 |
| Other Procurement, Army | | | 1,567,410 | | 1,567,410 | 1,567,410 |
| National Guard and Reserve Equipment, Army | | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps | | | 38,402 | | 38,402 | 38,402 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | | | 98,190 | | 98,190 | 98,190 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | | | 99,000 | | 99,000 | 99,000 |
| Procurement, Defense-wide | | | 720,000 | | 720,000 | 720,000 |
| **Total Procurement** | | | **3,394,752** | | **3,394,752** | **3,394,752** |

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2005**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | FY 2005 Budget Authority Request | Committee Authorization Change | Committee Budget Authority Change | Committee Authorization Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE & OTHER PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| **Operation and Maintenance** | | | | | | |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army | | | 9,607,113 | | 9,607,113 | 9,607,113 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy | | | 256,500 | | 256,500 | 256,500 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps | | | 2,398,735 | | 2,398,735 | 2,398,735 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force | | | 1,635,000 | | 1,635,000 | 1,635,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide | | | 2,327,900 | | 2,327,900 | 2,327,900 |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance** | | | **16,225,248** | | **16,225,248** | **16,225,248** |
| **Other Programs** | | | | | | |
| Defense Health Program | | | 75,000 | | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| **Total Other Programs** | | | **75,000** | | **75,000** | **75,000** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance & Other Programs** | | | **16,300,248** | | **16,300,248** | **16,300,248** |
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL** | | | | | | |
| **Total Military Personnel** | | | **5,305,000** | | **5,305,000** | **5,305,000** |
| **TOTAL EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION** | | | **25,000,000** | | **25,000,000** | **25,000,000** |

## RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, comes with our nation at war on multiple fronts. The ongoing Iraq mission, Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, and the broader Global War on Terrorism demand an appropriate level of resources and capabilities that Congress can and should provide. Additional security challenges elsewhere require planning and perseverance, including a continued commitment to the evolution of the U.S. armed forces. H.R. 4200 attempts to do all this given limited resources in the "Year of the Soldier".

The largest mobilization in decades, Operation Iraqi Freedom will remain the focus of our armed forces for some time. The mission to rebuild and rehabilitate Iraq after decades of tyranny, though, is not static; the 2004 force rotation plan, completed earlier this year, represents the largest troop transfer undertaken by U.S. forces since World War II. In the Army alone, elements from eight of ten divisions were on the move during the first four months of 2004—a force of 250,000 soldiers, nearly half of them reservists.

The challenges associated with the 2004 Operation Iraqi Freedom rotation of forces has confirmed pervasive concerns over end-strength shortfalls that strain armed forces personnel and undermine their ability to perform critical missions. Sustaining troop levels for Operation Iraqi Freedom and the broader Global War on Terrorism has in fact already exceeded the Army's immediate capabilities. As a result, the U.S. Marine Corps deployed 25,000 active and reserve component personnel to Iraq for two successive seven-month rotations, beginning in March 2004, while the Army was left extending the tours of more than 20,000 soldiers there. The Air Force and Navy, moreover, have deployed assets to Iraq to substitute for capabilities a stressed Army Total Force cannot provide.

Even these forces may not relieve the Army's overall burden. Over the last year, the committee has examined a range of issues related to the armed forces' inability to meet military commitments and, perhaps, potential emergencies worldwide. The committee, for instance, found that the Army cannot meet its stated goal of resetting the force within 120 days of returning from Iraq so that it is available for contingencies elsewhere. At the same time, it discovered that service force structure and manning decisions over the years have yielded insufficient numbers of high demand and low density assets, including special operations forces, intelligence and law enforcement units—elements critical to the Global War on Terrorism.

Recent operations reinforced similar conclusions on the adequacy of the reserve component end-strength. Since the end of the 1991 Gulf War, reliance on the overall reserve component for peacetime support has increased twelve-fold. In fact, for the last seven years the reserve component has provided annual peacetime support equaling roughly 33,000 active duty personnel, in course adopting missions previously the exclusive domain of full-time forces. Wartime reliance on reserve component personnel has also increased. For example, average mobilization tours for reservists were substantially lengthened, from 156 days during Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield to 319 for Operations Iraqi Freedom, En-

during Freedom and Noble Eagle, the continuing homeland security mission.

These trends suggest the committee cannot expect reserve component relief anytime soon; the Department of Defense itself assumes there will be no substantial reduction in the length of the average mobilization tour. By the end of January 2003—immediately prior to mobilizations in support of the war with Iraq and just fifteen months after the start of the Global War on Terrorism—more than 56,000 reserve component personnel remained on active duty worldwide. In comparison, at the peak of the Iraq mobilization, 225,000 reservists found themselves on active duty. Presently, the Department of Defense reports that sustaining troop levels in Iraq will require the mobilization of at least 100,000 to 150,000 reservists annually for the next several years. Reserve component personnel will ultimately comprise nearly 40 percent of all forces committed to Iraq and Kuwait during this rotation.

The demand for additional manpower to sustain mission requirements and fulfill required capabilities is finally reflected in the actual active component strengths each service needed during the past two fiscal years—all services executed actual end-strength levels well above the minimum authorized amount. In general, these additional active component personnel were funded as part of emergency supplemental appropriations. Finding this approach to managing what is clearly an end-strength shortfall self-defeating and ultimately unsustainable, the committee recommends the first significant increase in military end strength in decades.

Further, H.R. 4200 directly addresses the numerous and growing force protection requirements that have emerged from the threats and realities found on the Iraqi battlefield. This legislation provides critical force protection resources, including additional body armor, countermeasures for improvised explosive devices, armored "Humvees" and armor add-on kits for "thin-skinned" vehicles. These tangible improvements in force protection accompany equally important combat capability enhancements. H.R. 4200 will provide the American warfighter with much needed supplies and ammunition to continue a "hot" war against global terrorism and the anti-democratic insurgents in Iraq.

Today's adversaries are adaptable; they sabotage Iraq's developing infrastructure, ambush noncombatants and coalition forces alike and have found a powerfully simple capability to neutralize American conventional military might through the use of remote improvised explosive devices, or IEDs, to terrorize the country and inflict a steady number of casualties on coalition forces. U.S. servicemen and women must have every possible advantage to beat them soundly and safely. Believing that the armed forces cannot allow more unforeseen dangers—a new "IED problem"—to surprise our troops and threaten their missions, H.R. 4200 makes available funds for advanced research and development to counter emerging threats to the American Soldier.

While the American Soldier is at work in Iraq, Afghanistan, and terrorist locations worldwide, other potential threats to the United States loom. The committee believes that the standoffs on the Korean Peninsula and in the Taiwan Strait can be resolved peacefully if all parties act in good faith, but the U.S. must remain capable of responding to aggression alongside its regional partners when-

ever threats to peace and democracy surface. By supporting initiatives to strengthen our force posture and, thus, that of our allies and friends in the region, H.R. 4200 ensures that U.S. forces will not fight wars unnecessarily and from a disadvantaged starting point.

Over the long term, the committee understands that the outcome of future engagements, including terrorist attacks, may be decided during today's battles against proliferation. H.R. 4200 supports current programs designed to stop potential aggressors from obtaining advanced conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction, including their long-range and stealth delivery systems. H.R. 4200 also takes additional steps to help the United States maintain its technological advantage by strengthening domestic and multilateral controls on arms as well as militarily-sensitive goods and technologies. Coupled with measures designed to strengthen the U.S. industrial base also contained in H.R. 4200, smarter export controls will help prevent a situation in which our troops and homeland are threatened with American-made or designed technology without sacrificing American economic productivity.

In summary, this legislation is designed to strike a proper balance. H.R. 4200 provides such balance between the exigencies of ensuring full and total support for the needs of our men and women presently engaged in the difficult fight against global terrorism, while also advancing the necessary mix of policy and investments to ensure America's defense capabilities remain overwhelmingly superior to any known and future adversary, adaptable to the fast changing nature of the threat, and able to decisively defend our national interests now and in the future.

## HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 results from hearings that began on February 4, 2004 and that were completed on April 1, 2004.

The full committee conducted seven sessions. In addition, a total of 29 sessions 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 2005 contained $76,034.3 million for procurement. This represents a $1,830.8 million increase from the amount authorized for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends authorization of $76,215.7 million, an increase of $190.4 million from the fiscal year 2005 request after the transfer of $1,372.0 million and $9.0 million respectfully, for chemical agent and munitions destruction, Army, and the Defense Production Act, which have been transferred to other titles.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | 2,658,241 | | 147,700 | | 147,700 | | - | | 2,805,941 |
| | MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | 1,398,321 | | 16,000 | | 16,000 | | - | | 1,414,321 |
| | PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY | | 1,639,695 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | - | | 1,739,695 |
| | PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY | | 1,556,902 | | 172,500 | | 172,500 | | - | | 1,729,402 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | 4,240,896 | | 72,744 | | 75,600 | | (2,856) | | 4,313,640 |
| | CHEMICAL AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY | | 1,371,990 | | (1,371,990) | | | | (1,371,990) | | - |
| | **TOTAL ARMY** | | 12,866,045 | | (863,046) | | 511,800 | | (1,374,846) | | 12,002,999 |
| | AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | 8,767,867 | | 144,800 | | 197,235 | | (52,435) | | 8,912,667 |
| | WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | 2,101,529 | | 151,925 | | 160,700 | | (8,775) | | 2,253,454 |
| | AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS | | 858,640 | | 12,200 | | 12,200 | | - | | 870,840 |
| | SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY | | 9,962,027 | | 158,000 | | 258,000 | | (100,000) | | 10,120,027 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | 4,834,278 | | 42,447 | | 113,200 | | (70,753) | | 4,876,725 |
| | PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS | | 1,190,103 | | 125,000 | | 125,000 | | - | | 1,315,103 |
| | **TOTAL NAVY** | | 27,714,444 | | 634,372 | | 866,335 | | (231,963) | | 28,348,816 |
| | AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | 13,163,174 | | 486,000 | | 522,700 | | (36,700) | | 13,649,174 |
| | PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE | | 1,396,457 | | - | | - | | - | | 1,396,457 |
| | MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | 4,718,313 | | (80,000) | | 35,000 | | (115,000) | | 4,638,313 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | 13,283,557 | | (54,300) | | 40,800 | | (95,100) | | 13,229,257 |
| | **TOTAL AIR FORCE** | | 32,561,501 | | 351,700 | | 598,500 | | (246,800) | | 32,913,201 |
| | PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE | | 2,883,302 | | 67,400 | | 115,300 | | (47,900) | | 2,950,702 |
| | PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT | | [9,015] | | - | | - | | - | | [9,015] |
| | **TOTAL DEFENSE-WIDE** | | 2,883,302 | | 67,400 | | 115,300 | | (47,900) | | 2,950,702 |
| | **GRAND TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE** | | **76,025,292** | | **190,426** | | **2,091,935** | | **(1,901,509)** | | **76,215,718** |

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $2,658.2 million for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $2,805.9 million, an increase of $147.7 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **FIXED WING** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT | 1 | 11,967 | | | | | | | 1 | 11,967 |
| | **ROTARY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | HELICOPTER, OBSERVATION | - | 24,000 | | | | | | | | 24,000 |
| 3 | HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY | 10 | 45,000 | | | | | | | | 45,000 |
| 4 | COMANCHE | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| 5 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | 27 | 279,737 | 8 | 117,600 | | | | | 35 | 397,337 |
| | HH-60M | | | | | 8 | 117,600 | | | | |
| 6 | Advanced Procurement (CY) | - | 34,723 | | | | | | | - | 34,723 |
| 7 | HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING (TH-67 CREEK) | 7 | 13,100 | | | | | | | | 13,100 |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT** | | **408,527** | | **117,600** | | **117,600** | | **-** | | **526,127** |
| | **MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA) | - | 2,195 | | | | | | | - | 2,195 |
| 9 | ARL MODS (TIARA) | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | AH-64 MODS | - | 37,201 | | 17,600 | | | | | - | 54,801 |
| | Modern Signal Processing Unit | | | | | | 7,600 | | | | |
| | Combo PAK Aux Fuel System | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| 11 | CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS | - | 703,450 | | 6,500 | | | | | - | 709,950 |
| | Crashworthy Crew Seats | | | | | | 6,500 | | | | |
| 12 | Advanced Procurement | - | 23,832 | | | | | | | - | 23,832 |
| 13 | UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS | - | 10,093 | | | | | | | - | 10,093 |
| 14 | OH-58 MODS | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS | - | 754 | | | | | | | - | 754 |
| 16 | LONGBOW | - | 654,460 | | | | | | | - | 654,460 |
| 17 | Advanced Procurement (CY) | - | - | | | | | | | | - |
| 18 | UH-60 MODS | - | 142,889 | | | | | | | - | 142,889 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 19 | Advanced Procurement (CY) | - | 6,130 | | | | | | | - | 6,130 |
| | De-icing System Upgrade | | | | [2,400] | | | | | | [2,400] |
| 20 | KIOWA WARRIOR | - | 39,276 | | | | | | | - | 39,276 |
| 21 | AIRBORNE AVIONICS | - | 49,091 | | | | | | | - | 49,091 |
| 22 | GATM ROLLUP | - | 61,259 | | | | | | | - | 61,259 |
| 23 | AIRBORNE DIGITIZATION | - | - | | | | | | | | - |
| | **TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | **1,730,630** | | **24,100** | | **24,100** | | **-** | | **1,754,730** |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | SPARE PARTS (AIR) | - | 10,857 | | | | | | | - | 10,857 |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **10,857** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **10,857** |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT | - | 7,319 | | | | | | | - | 7,319 |
| 26 | ASE INFRARED CM | - | 272,166 | | | | | | | - | 272,166 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL | - | 26,603 | | | | | | | - | 26,603 |
| 28 | AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 5,140 | | | | | | | - | 5,140 |
| 29 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | - | 55,543 | | | | | | | - | 55,543 |
| 30 | AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS | - | 28,609 | | | | | | | - | 28,609 |
| 31 | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | - | 55,449 | | | | | | | - | 55,449 |
| 32 | INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 45,216 | | | | | | | - | 45,216 |
| 33 | LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET | - | 2,413 | | | | | | | - | 2,413 |
| 34 | AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS | - | 9,769 | | 6,000 | | | | | - | 15,769 |
| | AN/ARS-6 Personnel Locator | | | | | | 6,000 | | | | |
| 35 | CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | **508,227** | | **6,000** | | **6,000** | | **-** | | **514,227** |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | **2,658,241** | | **147,700** | | **147,700** | | **-** | | **2,805,941** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Airborne communications*

The budget request contained $9.8 million to procure communication equipment for Army aircraft, but included no funds to upgrade the AN/ARS–6 personnel locator system for Army special operations forces (SOF) MH–60 and MH–47 helicopters.

The committee is aware of the urgent need for modern survival radios for Army SOF aircraft to replace older, less capable equipment that these aircraft now carry. 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. Growing numbers of these military organizations are migrating to modern survival systems that are incompatible with the communications equipment currently deployed on Army SOF aircraft.

The committee recommends $15.8 million for Army airborne communications, an increase of $6.0 million for procurement of the AN/ARS–6 version 12.

*Blackhawk helicopter de-icing system upgrade*

The budget request included $6.1 million for UH–60 modifications.

The committee directs that $2.4 million be made available within the funds authorized for Army aircraft procurement for de-icing system upgrades for the Blackhawk helicopter.

*Crashworthy crew seats*

The budget request contained $703.5 million for CH–47 Cargo Helicopter Mods, of which no funds were requested for the crashworthy crew chief seats.

The crashes of CH–47s 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 will 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 $710.0 million, an increase of $6.5 million for the procurement of crashworthy crew chief seats for the CH–47 aircraft.

*Modern signal processing unit*

The budget request contained $37.2 million for AH–64 Mods, of which 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 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 $7.6 million to begin initial integration of 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.

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $1,398.3 million for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1,414.3 million, an increase of $16.0 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 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 | - | 489,253 | | | | | | | - | 489,253 |
| 2 | STINGER SYSTEM SUMMARY | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMAR | - | 2,449 | | | | | | | - | 2,449 |
| | **AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY | 1,135 | 108,475 | | | | | | | 1,135 | 108,475 |
| 4 | LESS: Advanced Procurement (PY) | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | APKWS (ADVANCED PRECISION KILL WEAPON SY | - | 755 | | | | | | | - | 755 |
| 6 | ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 6,124 | | | | | | | - | 6,124 |
| 7 | JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY | - | 125,403 | | 16,000 | | | | | - | 141,403 |
| | Additional Missiles- ARNG | | | | | | 16,000 | | | | |
| 7 | LESS: Advanced Procurement (PY) | - | (7,600) | | | | | | | - | (7,600) |
| 8 | Advanced Procurement (CY) | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | LINE OF SIGHT ANTI-TANK (LOSAT) SYSTEM SUM | - | 86,321 | | | | | | | - | 86,321 |
| 9 | LESS: Advanced Procurement (PY) | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY | - | 25,813 | | | | | | | - | 25,813 |
| 10 | LESS: Advanced Procurement (PY) | - | (12,946) | | | | | | | - | (12,946) |
| 11 | Advanced Procurement (CY) | - | 13,375 | | | | | | | - | 13,375 |
| 12 | GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) | 1,026 | 112,302 | | | | | | | 1,026 | 112,302 |
| 13 | MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RR | 822 | 6,627 | | | | | | | 822 | 6,627 |
| 14 | MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS | - | 41,200 | | | | | | | - | 41,200 |
| 15 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIM | 37 | 169,249 | | | | | | | 37 | 169,249 |
| 16 | ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM | 56 | 61,484 | | | | | | | 56 | 61,484 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER MISSILES** | | **1,228,284** | | **16,000** | | **16,000** | | **-** | | **1,244,284** |
| | **MODIFICATION OF MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MODIFICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 17 | PATRIOT MODS | - | 87,948 | | | | | | | - | 87,948 |
| 18 | STINGER MODS | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | ITAS/TOW MODS | - | 9,784 | | | | | | | - | 9,784 |
| 20 | MLRS MODS | - | 18,970 | | | | | | | - | 18,970 |
| 21 | HIMARS MODIFICATIONS: (NON AAO) | - | 474 | | | | | | | - | 474 |
| 22 | HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS | - | 9,770 | | | | | | | - | 9,770 |
| | **TOTAL MODIFICATIONS OF MISSILES** | | **126,946** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **126,946** |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 33,779 | | | | | | | - | 33,779 |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **33,779** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **33,779** |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | AIR DEFENSE TARGETS | - | 5,843 | | | | | | | - | 5,843 |
| 25 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES) | - | 10 | | | | | | | - | 10 |
| 26 | MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | - | 3,459 | | | | | | | - | 3,459 |
| 28 | CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | - | | | | | | | | |
| | **TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | **9,312** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **9,312** |
| | **TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | **1,398,321** | | **16,000** | | **16,000** | | **-** | | **1,414,321** |

## WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $1,639.7 million for Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1,739.7 million, an increase of $100.0 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 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 | - | 3,643 | | | | | | | - | 3,643 |
| 2 | BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT | - | 71,378 | | | | | | | - | 71,378 |
| 2 | LESS: Advanced Procurement (PY) | | - | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD) | - | 2,454 | | | | | | | - | 2,454 |
| 4 | ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES | - | 3,624 | | | | | | | - | 3,624 |
| 5 | STRYKER | - | 905,074 | | | | | | | - | 905,074 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | CARRIER, MOD | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | FIST VEHICLE (MOD) | - | 1 | | | | | | | - | 1 |
| 8 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, FIST VEHICLE | - | 670 | | | | | | | - | 670 |
| 9 | BFVS SERIES (MOD) | - | 55,424 | | 65,000 | | | | | - | 120,424 |
| | BFV Integrated Management | | | | | | 40,000 | | | | |
| | Reactive Armor Bradley FV | | | | | | 25,000 | | | | |
| 10 | HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD) | - | 18,350 | | | | | | | - | 18,350 |
| 11 | FAASV PIP TO FLEET | - | 7,294 | | | | | | | - | 7,294 |
| 12 | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD) | - | - | | | | | | | | - |
| 13 | ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD) | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD) | - | 116,917 | | | | | | | - | 116,917 |
| 15 | SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2 | - | 292,152 | | | | | | | - | 292,152 |
| 16 | ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | LESS: Advanced Procurement (PY) | | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV) | - | 407 | | | | | | | - | 407 |
| 18 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV) | - | 10,278 | | | | | | | - | 10,278 |
| | **TOTAL TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | **1,487,666** | | **65,000** | | **65,000** | | **-** | | **1,552,666** |
| | **WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY | | 500 | | | | | | | - | 500 |
| 20 | ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES | - | 25,249 | | | | | | | - | 25,249 |
| 21 | MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW) | - | 80 | | | | | | | - | 80 |
| 22 | GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 23 | MORTAR SYSTEMS | - | 5,258 | | | | | | | - | 5,258 |
| 24 | M16 RIFLE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 25 | XM107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE | - | 8,871 | | | | | | | - | 8,871 |
| 26 | 5.56 CARBINE M4 | - | 9,376 | | | | | | | - | 9,376 |
| 27 | HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T) | - | 37,209 | | 35,000 | | | | | - | 72,209 |
| | M777 LW 155 Howitzer- ARNG | | | | | | 35,000 | | | | |
| | **MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS | - | 4,236 | | | | | | | - | 4,236 |
| 29 | M4 CARBINE MODS | - | 13,777 | | | | | | | - | 13,777 |
| 30 | SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD) | - | 3,382 | | | | | | | - | 3,382 |
| 31 | MEDIUM MACHINE GUNS (MODS) | - | 3,409 | | | | | | | - | 3,409 |
| 32 | HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS) | - | 779 | | | | | | | - | 779 |
| 33 | M119 MODIFICATIONS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 34 | M16 RIFLE MODS | - | 2,345 | | | | | | | - | 2,345 |
| 35 | MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | - | 3,245 | | | | | | | - | 3,245 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | - | 486 | | | | | | | - | 486 |
| | SHOTGUNS | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV) | - | 6,620 | | | | | | | - | 6,620 |
| 38 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | - | 2,629 | | | | | | | - | 2,629 |
| | Rock Island Arsenal Upgrades | | | | [1,000] | | | | | | [1,000] |
| 39 | SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG) | - | 3,492 | | | | | | | - | 3,492 |
| 40 | REF SMALL ARMS | | 998 | | | | | | | - | 998 |
| | **TOTAL WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES** | | **131,941** | | **35,000** | | **35,000** | | **-** | | **166,941** |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV) | - | 20,088 | | | | | | | - | 20,088 |
| | **TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **20,088** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **20,088** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY** | | **1,639,695** | | **100,000** | | **100,000** | | **-** | | **1,739,695** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Air-droppable, lightweight armored direct fires system*

The committee notes that the operational need for a rapidly deployable, air droppable, lightweight armored direct fires system has been validated. Additionally, recent combat operations demonstrate the need for such a system. The committee is encouraged by the Department of the Army's decision to evaluate existing and developmental platforms in meeting this requirement.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to keep the congressional defense committees informed on the progress of the evaluation effort and provide a report of the Army's findings at the conclusion of the evaluation program.

*Armor and vehicle protection kits*

The budget request included $1,639.7 million for Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicle procurement.

The committee notes the importance of expedited delivery of armor and vehicle protection kits for the global war on terrorism.

Accordingly, the committee directs that $1.0 million be made available within funds authorized for Army Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicle procurement for the Rock Island Arsenal for a laser cutting machine, titanium welding cell, and wash rack to ensure the on-time delivery of armor kits and vehicle protection kits.

*Bradley fighting vehicle integrated management*

The budget request contained $55.4 million for Bradley Fighting Vehicle Series Modifications, of which no funds were requested for sustainment and modernization.

The committee is concerned that no funding exists for a sustainment and modernization program for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle. Considering the most optimistic assumptions for the fielding of the Future Combat Systems, the current force of the Abrams main battle tank and the Bradley Fighting Vehicle will constitute the majority of the total force for the next three decades.

The Abrams Integrated Management Program is the Army's long term management program for the Abrams tank which provides a rebuild capability, a modernization program, and sustainment of both the government and private industrial bases. No such program exists for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to develop and implement a Bradley Fighting Vehicle Integrated Management program to maintain the Bradley fleet readiness through planned overhaul and modernization.

The committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million for procurement of items to support the initiation of a Bradley Fighting Vehicle Integrated Management program.

*M1A2 system enhancement package*

The budget request contained $292.2 million to procure 67 M1A2 system enhancement package (SEP) tanks.

The committee understands the budget request fulfills M1A2 SEP procurement for the 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment. Consistent with previous actions, the committee continues to recognize the advantages of upgrading the Army's armored brigade combat

teams with M1A2 SEPs. The committee understands the M1A2 SEP brings advantages to the warfighter in combat and training and reduces logistical burdens. The committee commends the Army for accelerating modernization of the 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment as part of this effort to digitize the heavy counterattack corps.

Accordingly, the committee strongly recommends the Army continue the holistic M1 Abrams tank reset plan by modernizing with M1A2 SEP tanks the 3rd Infantry Division, the first armored unit to transform to the Chief of Staff's modularity construct.

*M777 lightweight 155 millimeter howitzer*

The budget request contained $37.2 million to procure 18 M777 Lightweight 155mm Howitzer (LW155) artillery systems. However, no funds were included for the Army National Guard.

The M777 LW155 is a joint competitively procured program for the U.S. Marine Corps (USMC) and U.S. Army that replaces and improves upon the currently fielded 25-year old M198 towed howitzer artillery system by utilizing networked fires at almost 50 percent of the weight of the M198. The committee recognizes the LW155 would provide enhanced mobility and lethality to the USMC, the Army's XVIII Airborne Corps and Stryker Brigade Combat Teams and to the Army National Guard.

The committee understands the Director of the Army National Guard has identified a $35.0 million fiscal year 2005 unfunded requirement for 18 LW155 systems. The committee recommends $72.2 million for the M777 LW155 artillery system, an increase of $35.0 million to procure an additional 18 systems and fulfill the Army National Guard's unfunded requirement.

## AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $1,556.9 million for Ammunition Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1,729.4 million, an increase of $172.5 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES | - | 173,550 | | | | | | | - | 173,550 |
| 2 | CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES | - | 45,062 | | | | | | | - | 45,062 |
| 3 | CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES | - | 5,078 | | | | | | | - | 5,078 |
| 4 | CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES | - | 59,810 | | | | | | | - | 59,810 |
| 5 | CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES | - | 21,600 | | | | | | | - | 21,600 |
| 6 | CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES | - | 9,726 | | 17,000 | | | | | - | 26,726 |
| | 30mm M789 HEDP | | | | | | 17,000 | | | | |
| 7 | CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES | - | 119,658 | | | | | | | - | 119,658 |
| | **MORTAR AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | - | 38,436 | | 5,000 | | | | | - | 43,436 |
| | 60mm M720A1 HE M734A1 Fuze | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| 9 | 81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | - | 4,597 | | 15,000 | | | | | - | 19,597 |
| | 81mm M821A2 HE | | | | | | 15,000 | | | | |
| 10 | CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES | - | 50,316 | | 38,100 | | | | | - | 88,416 |
| | 120mm M931A1 FR Practice | | | | | | 22,900 | | | | |
| | 120mm M933 HE | | | | | | 15,200 | | | | |
| | **TANK AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES | - | 27,419 | | | | | | | - | 27,419 |
| 12 | 120MM TANK TRAINING, ALL TYPES | - | 139,718 | | | | | | | - | 139,718 |
| 13 | CTG, TANK, 120MM TACTICAL, ALL TYPES | - | 49,845 | | | | | | | - | 49,845 |
| | **ARTILLERY AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES | - | 33,286 | | 12,000 | | | | | - | 45,286 |
| | 105mm M915 DPICM | | | | | | 12,000 | | | | |
| 16 | CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES | - | 132,668 | | | | | | | - | 132,668 |
| 17 | PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982 | | 16,960 | | | | | | | - | 16,960 |
| 18 | MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), A | - | 65,807 | | | | | | | - | 65,807 |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **ARTILLERY FUZES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES | - | 40,796 | | 6,000 | | | | | - | 46,796 |
| | Electronic Fuze M762A1/M767A1 | | | | | | 6,000 | | | | |
| | **MINES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES | - | 527 | | | | | | | - | 527 |
| 21 | MINES (CONVENTIONAL), ALL TYPES | | 4,242 | | | | | | | - | 4,242 |
| 22 | MINE AT VOLCANO,: ALL TYPES | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES | - | 1,020 | | | | | | | - | 1,020 |
| 24 | ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES | - | 15,222 | | | | | | | - | 15,222 |
| | **ROCKETS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | - | 15,414 | | 10,000 | | | | | - | 25,414 |
| | Bunker Defeat Munition-NE | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| 26 | ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES | - | 164,689 | | | | | | | - | 164,689 |
| | **OTHER AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | - | 29,193 | | 8,000 | | | | | - | 37,193 |
| | M112 Demolition Charge | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | |
| 28 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | - | 52,857 | | | | | | | - | 52,857 |
| 29 | SIGNALS, ALL TYPES | - | 26,276 | | | | | | | - | 26,276 |
| 30 | SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES | - | 20,165 | | | | | | | - | 20,165 |
| | **MISCELLANEOUS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES | - | 8,550 | | | | | | | - | 8,550 |
| 32 | NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES | - | 5,534 | | | | | | | - | 5,534 |
| 33 | CAD/PAD ALL TYPES | - | 3,884 | | | | | | | - | 3,884 |
| 34 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 11,398 | | | | | | | - | 11,398 |
| 35 | AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT | - | 4,898 | | | | | | | - | 4,898 |
| 36 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO) | - | 10,700 | | | | | | | - | 10,700 |
| 37 | CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES | - | 80 | | | | | | | - | 80 |
| | **TOTAL AMMUNITION** | | **1,408,981** | | **111,100** | | **111,100** | | **-** | | **1,520,081** |
| | **AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 40,746 | | 59,400 | | | | | - | 100,146 |
| | Lake City AAP Modernization | | | | | | 22,400 | | | | |
| | Radford AAP Modernization | | | | | | 16,000 | | | | |
| | Lone Star AAP LAP upgrades | | | | | | 6,000 | | | | |
| | Kansas AAP LAP upgrades | | | | | | 15,000 | | | | |
| 39 | LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 2,315 | | | | | | | - | 2,315 |
| 40 | MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES | - | 4,745 | | | | | | | - | 4,745 |
| 41 | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION | - | 95,372 | | 2,000 | | | | | - | 97,372 |
| | Remote Weapon Decasing and Explosive Removal Kits | | | | | | 1,500 | | | | |
| | Rotary Furnace RF9 Upgrades | | | | | | 500 | | | | |
| 42 | ARMS INITIATIVE | - | 4,743 | | | | | | | - | 4,743 |
| | **TOTAL AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT** | | **147,921** | | **61,400** | | **61,400** | | **-** | | **209,321** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY** | | **1,556,902** | | **172,500** | | **172,500** | | **-** | | **1,729,402** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Ammunition production base upgrades*

The budget request contained $147.9 million for ammunition production base support, of which $40.7 million is for the provision of industrial facilities. However, no funds were requested for flexible load, assemble, and pack (LAP) upgrades for modern munitions or small and medium caliber production line upgrades.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense has not adequately funded or addressed the requirements for production line upgrades to the Nation's ammunition production industrial base. Further, the committee understands these upgrades are required, to not only update World War II-era production lines, but are also necessary to fulfill the increased production requirements of the growing shortfalls in war reserve and training ammunition, which have occurred from increased ammunition use in the global war on terrorism, Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. These increased requirements span from small to large caliber conventional ammunition, as well as conventional bombs and other explosive materials. The increased ammunition use rate, combined with the atrophy and underfunded ammunition production industrial has resulted in a limited production capacity in the United States, as well as an increased reliance on foreign sources for ammunition for U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. The committee is concerned and disturbed about these trends.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $59.4 million for army ammunition plant (AAP) modernization and transformation to support the munitions industrial base. The increases include:

| | *In millions* |
|---|---|
| (1) Lake City AAP modernization and transformation | $22.4 |
| (2) Radford AAP modernization and transformation | 16.0 |
| (3) Lone Star AAP LAP technology upgrades | 6.0 |
| (4) Kansas AAP LAP modern munitions enterprise | 15.0 |

The committee recognizes additional resources will be required to complete these production line upgrades and strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to provide the resources necessary in future fiscal year budget requests to complete these upgrades in order to ensure that the U.S. ammunition production base can and will support the transformational and future operational munitions requirements of the 21st century.

*Conventional munitions demilitarization*

The budget request contained $95.4 million for conventional munitions demilitarization.

The committee understands the remote weapon decasing and explosive removal kits project is an ongoing project in its second year and comprises two separate systems that are used for conventional munitions demilitarization. The committee understands rotary furnace RF9 upgrades are required for a furnace pollution abatement system and the committee notes the rotary furnace is used to thermally treat fuzes, primers, igniters, and munitions up to 20mm.

The committee recommends $97.4 million for conventional munitions demilitarization, an increase of $1.5 million for remote weapon decasing and explosive removal kits and an increase of $500,000 for rotary furnace RF9 upgrades.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $4,240.9 million for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $4,313.6 million, an increase of $72.7 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 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 | - | 11,940 | | | | | | | - | 11,940 |
| 2 | SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED: | - | 9,242 | | | | | | | - | 9,242 |
| 3 | SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS | - | 667 | | | | | | | - | 667 |
| 4 | HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV) | - | 303,692 | | | | | | | - | 303,692 |
| 5 | TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE) | - | - | | | | | | | | - |
| 6 | FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) | - | 505,664 | | | | | | | - | 505,664 |
| 7 | FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIF | - | 2,198 | | | | | | | - | 2,198 |
| 8 | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) | - | 84,038 | | 15,000 | | | | | - | 99,038 |
| | Movement Tracking System | | | | | | 15,000 | | | | |
| 9 | ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV) | - | - | | | | | | | | - |
| 10 | TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916 | - | 15,314 | | | | | | | - | 15,314 |
| 11 | TOWING DEVICE, 5TH WHEEL | - | - | | | | | | | | - |
| 12 | TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S) | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SE | - | 19,204 | | | | | | | - | 19,204 |
| 14 | MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP | - | 25,848 | | | | | | | - | 25,848 |
| 15 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH) | - | 247 | | | | | | | - | 247 |
| 16 | TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL | - | 1,907 | | | | | | | - | 1,907 |
| | **NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN | - | 196 | | | | | | | - | 196 |
| 18 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | - | 197 | | | | | | | - | 197 |
| 19 | NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER | - | 196 | | | | | | | - | 196 |
| | **TOTAL TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES** | | **980,550** | | **15,000** | | **15,000** | | **-** | | **995,550** |
| | **COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 21 | JCSE EQUIPMENT | - | 4,550 | | | | | | | - | 4,550 |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM | - | 99,775 | | | | | | | - | 99,775 |
| 23 | SHF TERM | - | 30,621 | | | | | | | - | 30,621 |
| 24 | SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE) | - | 3,371 | | | | | | | - | 3,371 |
| 25 | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE) | - | 40,067 | | | | | | | - | 40,067 |
| 26 | SMART-T (SPACE) | - | 73,354 | | | | | | | - | 73,354 |
| 27 | SCAMP (SPACE) | - | 600 | | | | | | | - | 600 |
| 28 | MILSTAR COMPONENTS (SPACE) | | 25,282 | | | | | | | - | 25,282 |
| 29 | GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS | - | 12,664 | | | | | | | - | 12,664 |
| 30 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT) | - | 198 | | | | | | | - | 198 |
| | **COMM - C3 SYSTEM** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS) | - | 19,790 | | | | | | | - | 19,790 |
| | **COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO) | - | 34,435 | | | | | | | - | 34,435 |
| 33 | JTRS CLUSTER 1 | | 121,452 | | | | | | | - | 121,452 |
| 34 | RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2) | - | 3,223 | | | | | | | - | 3,223 |
| 35 | SINCGARS FAMILY | - | 48,614 | | | | | | | - | 48,614 |
| 36 | MULTI-PURPOSE INFORMATION OPERATIONS SYS | - | 7,776 | | | | | | | - | 7,776 |
| 37 | JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS | - | 843 | | 8,000 | | | | | - | 8,843 |
| | Open Architecture COTS Integration | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | |
| 38 | ACUS MOD PROGRAM | - | 81,317 | | | | | | | - | 81,317 |
| 39 | COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING | - | 8,889 | | | | | | | - | 8,889 |
| 40 | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECT | - | 25,952 | | | | | | | - | 25,952 |
| 41 | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL) | - | 28,767 | | | | | | | - | 28,767 |
| 42 | RADIO, IMPROVED HF FAMILY | - | 6,948 | | | | | | | - | 6,948 |
| 43 | MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4) | - | 4,662 | | | | | | | - | 4,662 |
| | **COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE | - | 1,279 | | | | | | | - | 1,279 |
| | **INFORMATION SECURITY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS) | - | 2,834 | | | | | | | - | 2,834 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 46 | INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSF | - | 114,124 | | | | | | | - | 114,124 |
| | **COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION | - | 23,421 | | | | | | | - | 23,421 |
| 48 | BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS | - | 40,564 | | | | | | | - | 40,564 |
| 49 | ARMY DISN ROUTER | - | 6,133 | | | | | | | - | 6,133 |
| 50 | ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP) | - | 469 | | | | | | | - | 469 |
| 51 | WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP) | - | 2,698 | | | | | | | - | 2,698 |
| | **COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS | - | 268,940 | | | | | | | - | 268,940 |
| 53 | DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS) | - | 12,296 | | | | | | | - | 12,296 |
| 54 | LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN) | - | 84,820 | | | | | | | - | 84,820 |
| 55 | PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM | - | 14,671 | | | | | | | - | 14,671 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 57 | GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 58 | ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA) | - | 15,979 | | | | | | | - | 15,979 |
| 59 | JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA) | - | 13,993 | | | | | | | - | 13,993 |
| 60 | PROPHET GROUND (TIARA) | - | 17,692 | | | | | | | - | 17,692 |
| 61 | TUAV | 8 | 100,456 | | 16,000 | | | | | 8 | 116,456 |
| | Shadow UAV Enhancements | | | | | | 16,000 | | | | |
| 62 | ARMY COMMON GROUND STATION (CGS) (TIARA) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 63 | DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA) | - | 9,138 | | | | | | | - | 9,138 |
| 64 | DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 65 | TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (TIARA) | - | 14,094 | | | | | | | - | 14,094 |
| 66 | DCGS-A UNIT OF EMPLOYMENT (JMIP) | - | 9,575 | | (1,400) | | | | (1,400) | - | 8,175 |
| 67 | TROJAN (TIARA) | - | 5,840 | | | | | | | - | 5,840 |
| 68 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA) | - | 2,594 | | | | | | | - | 2,594 |
| 69 | CI HUMINT INFO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CHIMS) | - | 2,924 | | 6,000 | | | | | - | 8,924 |
| | Digital Soldier Concept | | | | | | 6,000 | | | | |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 70 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TIARA) | - | 4,287 | | | | | | | - | 4,287 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 71 | SHORTSTOP | - | - | | 18,600 | | 18,600 | | | - | 18,600 |
| 72 | COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERME/ | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | FAAD GBS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 74 | SENTINEL MODS | - | 7,487 | | | | | | | - | 7,487 |
| 75 | NIGHT VISION DEVICES | - | 102,325 | | | | | | | - | 102,325 |
| 76 | LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE | - | 49,176 | | | | | | | - | 49,176 |
| 77 | LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 78 | NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT | - | 54,809 | | | | | | | - | 54,809 |
| 79 | ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 80 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS) | - | 461 | | | | | | | - | 461 |
| 81 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MVS) | - | 280 | | | | | | | - | 280 |
| 82 | PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SETTER | - | 1,985 | | | | | | | - | 1,985 |
| 83 | PROFILER | - | 4,963 | | | | | | | - | 4,963 |
| 84 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV) | - | 17,444 | | 4,000 | | | | | - | 21,444 |
| | AN/TPQ 36 Upgrade | | | | | | 4,000 | | | | |
| 85 | FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCI | - | 120,073 | | | | | | | - | 120,073 |
| 86 | LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDEI | - | 12,339 | | | | | | | - | 12,339 |
| 87 | MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM | - | 14,633 | | | | | | | - | 14,633 |
| 88 | INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA | - | 346 | | | | | | | - | 346 |
| 89 | ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM | - | 1,456 | | (1,456) | | | | (1,456) | - | - |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90 | TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS | - | 50,692 | | | | | | | - | 50,692 |
| 91 | ADV FA TAC DATA SYS / EFF CTRL SYS (AFATDS/E | - | 26,922 | | | | | | | - | 26,922 |
| 92 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, AFATDS | - | 3,990 | | | | | | | - | 3,990 |
| 93 | LIGHT WEIGHT TECH FIRE DIRECTION SYS | - | 2,018 | | | | | | | - | 2,018 |
| 94 | BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYS" | - | 11,909 | | | | | | | - | 11,909 |
| 95 | FAAD C2 | - | 12,873 | | | | | | | - | 12,873 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 96 | AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS | - | 6,400 | | | | | | | - | 6,400 |
| 97 | FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE / LIGHTWEIGHT FED | - | 2,045 | | | | | | | - | 2,045 |
| 98 | KNIGHT FAMILY | - | 2,236 | | | | | | | - | 2,236 |
| 99 | LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS) | - | 1,827 | | | | | | | - | 1,827 |
| 100 | LOGTECH | - | 24,416 | | | | | | | - | 24,416 |
| 101 | TC AIMS II | - | 16,376 | | | | | | | - | 16,376 |
| 102 | GUN LAYING AND POS SYS (GLPS) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 103 | ISYSCON EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 104 | JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS) | - | 12,587 | | | | | | | - | 12,587 |
| 105 | TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER | - | 11,363 | | | | | | | - | 11,363 |
| 106 | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) | - | 29,136 | | | | | | | - | 29,136 |
| 107 | STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP) | - | 54,581 | | | | | | | - | 54,581 |
| 108 | STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 109 | ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION | - | 5,377 | | | | | | | - | 5,377 |
| 110 | AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP | - | 146,184 | | | | | | | - | 146,184 |
| 111 | RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS) | - | 48,467 | | | | | | | - | 48,467 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 112 | AFRTS | - | 1,801 | | | | | | | - | 1,801 |
| 113 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V) | - | 1,624 | | | | | | | - | 1,624 |
| 114 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT) | - | 2,298 | | | | | | | - | 2,298 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT** | | - | | | | | | | | - |
| 115 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E) | - | 434 | | | | | | | - | 434 |
| | **TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | **2,315,304** | | **49,744** | | **52,600** | | **(2,856)** | | **2,365,048** |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 116 | SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITE | - | 3,863 | | | | | | | - | 3,863 |
| | **BRIDGING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 117 | TACTICAL BRIDGING | - | 34,137 | | | | | | | - | 34,137 |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 118 | TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON | - | 17,360 | | | | | | | - | 17,360 |
| | **ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 119 | DISPENSER, MINE M139 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 120 | TOWED VOLCANO DELIVERY SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 121 | HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SY | - | 6,906 | | | | | | | - | 6,906 |
| 122 | KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING | - | 3,023 | | | | | | | - | 3,023 |
| 123 | GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GST | - | 2,001 | | | | | | | - | 2,001 |
| 124 | ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS) | - | 1,038 | | | | | | | - | 1,038 |
| 125 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD E | - | 12,670 | | | | | | | - | 12,670 |
| 126 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMEN | - | 680 | | | | | | | - | 680 |
| | **COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 127 | HEATERS AND ECU'S | - | 17,554 | | | | | | | - | 17,554 |
| 128 | LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES | - | 2,020 | | | | | | | - | 2,020 |
| 129 | FLOODLIGHT SET, ELEC, TRL MTD, 3 LIGHTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 130 | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT | - | 7,275 | | | | | | | - | 7,275 |
| 131 | LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME) | - | 30 | | | | | | | - | 30 |
| 132 | LAND WARRIOR | - | 8,896 | | | | | | | - | 8,896 |
| 133 | FORCE PROVIDER | | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 134 | AUTHORIZED STOCKAGE LIST MOBILITY SYSTEM ( | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 135 | FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT | - | 20,063 | | | | | | | - | 20,063 |
| 136 | AIR DROP PROGRAM | - | 14,288 | | | | | | | - | 14,288 |
| 137 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (ENG SPT EQ) | - | 6,546 | | | | | | | - | 6,546 |
| 138 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CSS EQ) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 139 | QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 140 | DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER | - | 38,091 | | | | | | | - | 38,091 |
| 141 | INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **WATER EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 142 | WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS | - | 12,581 | | | | | | | - | 12,581 |
| | **MEDICAL EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 143 | COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL | - | 11,743 | | | | | | | - | 11,743 |
| | **MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 144 | SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYF | - | 9,427 | | | | | | | - | 9,427 |
| 145 | WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 146 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ) | - | 5,439 | | | | | | | - | 5,439 |
| | **CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT** | | - | | | | | | | | - |
| 147 | GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 148 | SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 149 | MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING | - | 5,863 | | | | | | | - | 5,863 |
| 150 | COMPACTOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 151 | LOADERS | - | 10,202 | | | | | | | - | 10,202 |
| 152 | HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 153 | DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVEF | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 154 | TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 155 | CRANES | - | 3,812 | | | | | | | - | 3,812 |
| 156 | CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 157 | PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 158 | HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) | - | 8,675 | | | | | | | - | 8,675 |
| 159 | CONST EQUIP ESP | - | 5,310 | | | | | | | - | 5,310 |
| 160 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP) | - | 7,192 | | | | | | | - | 7,192 |
| | **RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 161 | LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV) | - | - | | 3,500 | | 3,500 | | | - | 3,500 |
| 162 | THEATER SUPPORT VESSEL (TSV) | | - | | 1,000 | | | | | - | 1,000 |
| | Small Tugs | | | | | | 1,000 | | | | |
| 163 | CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 164 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL) | - | 3,465 | | | | | | | - | 3,465 |
| | **GENERATORS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 165 | GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP | - | 54,397 | | | | | | | - | 54,397 |
| | **MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 166 | ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 167 | ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM | - | 1,315 | | | | | | | - | 1,315 |
| 168 | MHE EXTENDED SERVICE PROGRAM (ESP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 169 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MHE) | - | | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TRAINING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 170 | COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS (CTC) SUPPORT | - | 86,421 | | | | | | | - | 86,421 |
| 171 | TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM | - | 241,946 | | 500 | | | | | - | 242,446 |
| | Live Fire Range Targeting Equipment | | | | | | 500 | | | | |
| 172 | CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER | - | 61,811 | | | | | | | - | 61,811 |
| 173 | AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (A | - | 40,803 | | | | | | | - | 40,803 |
| | **TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 174 | CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 175 | INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE) | - | 4,054 | | | | | | | - | 4,054 |
| 176 | TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD) | - | 5,214 | | | | | | | - | 5,214 |
| 177 | ARMY DIAGNOSTICS IMPROVEMENT PGM (ADIP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 178 | RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 13,510 | | | | | | | - | 13,510 |
| 179 | PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3) | - | 68,044 | | 3,000 | | | | | - | 71,044 |
| | Gamma Ray Inspection Equipment | | | | | | 3,000 | | | | |
| 180 | BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT | - | 7,197 | | | | | | | - | 7,197 |
| 181 | MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3) | - | 10,457 | | | | | | | - | 10,457 |
| 182 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH) | - | 2,655 | | | | | | | - | 2,655 |
| 183 | SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING | - | 9,905 | | | | | | | - | 9,905 |
| 184 | MA8975 | - | 2,447 | | - | | | | | - | 2,447 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **890,326** | | **8,000** | | **8,000** | | **-** | | **898,326** |
| | **SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **OPA2** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 185 | INITIAL SPARES - C&E | - | 44,102 | | | | | | | - | 44,102 |
| | **OPA3** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 186 | INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP | - | 1,260 | | | | | | | - | 1,260 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **45,362** | | - | | - | | - | | **45,362** |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 9,354 | | | | | | | | 9,354 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | **4,240,896** | | **72,744** | | **75,600** | | (2,856) | | **4,313,640** |
| | **CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | OPERATIONS AND MAINTANCE | - | 1,138,801 | | (1,138,801) | | | | | | - |
| | Transfer to Other DoD Programs | | | | | | | | (1,138,801) | | |
| 2 | RDT&E | - | 154,209 | | (154,209) | | | | | | - |
| | Transfer to Other DoD Programs | | | | | | | | (154,209) | | |
| 3 | PROCUREMENT | - | 78,980 | | (78,980) | | | | | | - |
| | Transfer to Other DoD Programs | | | | | | | | (78,980) | | |
| | **TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION** | | **1,371,990** | | **(1,371,990)** | | - | | **(1,371,990)** | | - |

## Items of Special Interest

*Common system open architecture*

The budget request contained $0.8 million to procure joint tactical area command systems (JTAC), but contained no funds for the integration of open architecture commercial off the shelf (COTS) technology to sustain currently fielded communications within JTACs.

The committee recognizes there is a need to upgrade the tactical communication, navigation, and personnel location equipment for the Department of Defense and the Army. The committee understands this program will directly impact affordability and sustainability of currently fielded JTAC systems by integrating current commercial products and technology in an open architecture environment.

The committee recommends $8.8 million for JTACs, an increase of $8.0 million to integrate open architecture COTS technology.

*Digital soldier*

The budget request contained $2.9 million for human intelligence information management, but contained no funds for the digital soldier concept.

The digital soldier project is a handheld extension for the Army's Information Dominance Center (IDC) at Fort Belvoir, Virginia and the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) for soldiers in the field. This highly ruggedized device supports remoted soldiers and teams in harsh combat environments. The concept leverages wireless and encrypted internet protocol (IP), voice over IP, text messaging, multi-data receive or transmit, GPS location, tracking, or fiber optic gyro for emission control conditions. The device provides eyewitness, actionable intelligence and situational reporting via networked inputs to and from IDC and DCGS with the ability to interface with other tactical radios to get information to those who critically need it.

The committee notes that this project is part of the Army senior intelligence officer's "every soldier a sensor" model for the intelligence transformation focus area of Army transformation.

Therefore the committee recommends $8.9 million, an increase of $6.0 million for the digital soldier concept.

*Distributed common ground system*

The budget request contained a total of $734.5 million for the Department of Defense's (DOD) Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) program. DCGS is a multi-service and agency program to enable existing intelligence processing, exploitation and dissemination systems to operate seamlessly across national and DOD architectures and standards.

The committee supports the recent decision of the military service acquisition executives to integrate the DCGS backbone, version 10.2, into each service DCGS architecture. The committee commends the services in coming together to work the challenges of intelligence sharing and views this as an important step towards the goal of seamless information sharing.

However, the committee is concerned that the present DCGS architecture within each of the military services is unique and may

not be able to properly network and provide critical, timely information to the tactical users in the battlespace. The committee believes the services must have an overarching architecture that is well-defined so DCGS may operate across multiple domains to include ships at sea, Army and Marine Corps battalions on the move, and fixed sites for the Air Force.

The committee also believes that the multiple systems that run the DCGS were devised by organizational tradition and not to modern standards. The committee is further concerned that while the services perform analogous operations on each DCGS system, they have not devised a coordinated strategy to merge requirements, functionalities, and applications to support a joint environment for users. The committee recommends that the Department coordinate service-centric requirements; use the best commercial practices to implement a systems architecture, maintain cost controls, leverage purchasing power, and streamline development for the program.

In addition, the committee notes that the Defense intelligence community (IC) has an interest in the DOD's Global Information Grid. Since DCGS is required to operate in both the IC and DOD domains, the committee believes there must be a common approach for managing intelligence data over both enterprise networks. Therefore, the committee encourages the IC and the Department to work together to create and implement a systems architecture that will allow users from both communities to access information in a timely and accurate manner.

Further, the committee is concerned that the DCGS is unable to receive data from either the E–8C Joint Surveillance Targeting and Radar System (J–STARS) or the RC–135 RIVET JOINT signals intelligence system and is unable to directly task the RQ–4 Global Hawk high-altitude endurance unmanned aerial vehicle for imagery. The committee is concerned that the DCGS will not be able to achieve its goals without this ability.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to provide a report to the congressional defense committees and intelligence committees detailing the Department's DCGS integration plan to include tasking and imagery downlinks for the E–8C J–STARS, RC–135 RIVET JOINT, and RQ–4 Global Hawk systems by March 1, 2005. Furthermore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networking Information and Integration to report to the congressional defense committees and intelligence committees by March 1, 2005, on the two communities' plans for future operation of a network-centric, DCGS across both the IC domain and the larger DOD information technology domain.

The committee recommends the following for the DCGS military service programs: $8.2 million for the Army, a decrease of $1.4 million; $45.2 million for the Navy, a decrease of $8.0 million; and $291.7 million for the Air Force, a decrease of $28.5 million.

*Logistics support vessel*

The budget request contained no funding for the logistics support vessel (LSV).

The committee is aware that the LSV fleet is currently used in Iraq. It also notes that the Army has major concerns with the LSVs

sea-keeping qualities. An improved bow has been developed to correct this problem.

The committee recommends $3.5 million for LSV service life extension for LSVs 1–6.

*Physical security systems*

The budget request included $68.0 million for physical security systems. The budget request included no funding for equipping new required truck and delivery inspection stations.

The committee recommends $71.0 million, an increase of $3.0 million for gamma ray inspection machines and associated items for equipping truck and inspection stations authorized in title XXI of this report.

*Movement tracking system*

The budget request contained $84.0 million to procure palletized load systems including trucks and trailers, heavy equipment transporter systems, heavy expanded mobility tactical trucks and other related equipment of which $19.0 million was included to procure 1,067 movement tracking systems (MTS).

The MTS is a satellite-based communications system providing combat support and combat service support units with secure real-time global positioning system vehicle location and tracking and two-way text messaging between stationary base locations and vehicles.

The committee understands the MTS significantly enhances the Army's ability in current operations to strategically position tactical vehicles based on battlefield requirements, monitor and track re-supply items, and provides the ground commander with total asset visibility. The committee recognizes given the current asymmetric threat matrix there is no forward or rear front to direct combat situations and the need for an affordable, interoperable logistics tracking and communications system is essential for accurate situational awareness. The committee also notes the Chief of the Army Reserve and the Chief of the National Guard have identified fiscal year 2005 high priority unfunded requirements for MTS.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million for the family of heavy tactical vehicles to accelerate the procurement of MTS.

*Shortstop electronic protection system*

The budget request contained no funds for the procurement of the Shortstop Electronic Protection System (SEPS).

SEPS is a countermeasure for proximity fuzed indirect fire munitions and other electronic attack measures. SEPS were modified in response to the emerging Improvised Explosive Device (IED) threats in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF).

The committee understands the IED threat continues to pose the greatest risk to deployed military personnel serving in OIF and recognizes the need to continue to address this threat in an aggressive manner. The committee feels SEPS is critical to providing better force protection against the IED threat in OIF.

Therefore, the committee recommends $18.6 million to procure additional SEPS.

*Small Tugs*

The budget request contained no funds for theater support vessels.

The committee understands that additional funds are required to complete the small tug under construction and for life extension upgrades to the existing Army tug fleet.

The committee recommends $1.0 million to complete the tug under construction and for tug fleet life extension upgrades.

*Tactical unmanned aerial vehicle*

The budget request contained $100.5 million for the tactical unmanned aerial vehicle (TUAV), but included no funding for the tactical common data link (TCDL).

The committee is aware that three major improvements were identified during operational testing that should be incorporated into the Shadow 200 tactical unmanned aerial vehicle. These improvements are a larger wing to increase payload and endurance, electronics system changes to reduce target location error, and use of the TCDL.

The committee supports rapid fielding of mature improved technology to our forces and recommends $116.5 million for TUAV, an increase of $16.0 million for Shadow 200 improvements.

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $8,767.9 million for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $8,912.7 million, an increase of $144.8 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 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) | - | 4,659 | | | | | | | - | 4,659 |
| 2 | Advance Procurement (CY) | - | 8,243 | | | | | | | - | 8,243 |
| 3 | F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) | 42 | 2,991,592 | | 24,000 | | | | | 42 | 3,015,592 |
| 3 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (84,136) | | | | | | | - | (84,136) |
| | SHARP | | | | | 3 | 24,000 | | | | |
| 4 | Advance Procurement (CY) | - | 78,306 | | | | | | | - | 78,306 |
| 5 | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | 8 | 885,339 | | | | | | | 8 | 885,339 |
| 5 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (38,768) | | | | | | | - | (38,768) |
| 6 | Advance Procurement (CY) | - | 71,490 | | | | | | | - | 71,490 |
| 7 | UH-1Y/AH-1Z | 9 | 241,792 | | | | | | | 9 | 241,792 |
| 8 | MH-60S (MYP) | 15 | 390,427 | | | | | | | 15 | 390,427 |
| 8 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (94,832) | | | | | | | - | (94,832) |
| 9 | Advance Procurement (CY) | - | 105,159 | | | | | | | - | 105,159 |
| 10 | MH-60R | 8 | 384,618 | | | | | | | 8 | 384,618 |
| 10 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (46,127) | | | | | | | - | (46,127) |
| 11 | Advance Procurement (CY) | - | 70,604 | | | | | | | - | 70,604 |
| 12 | E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) | 2 | 226,132 | | | | | | | 2 | 226,132 |
| 12 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (14,595) | | | | | | | - | (14,595) |
| 13 | Advance Procurement (CY) | - | 36,413 | | | | | | | - | 36,413 |
| | **TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | **5,216,316** | | **24,000** | | **24,000** | | **-** | | **5,240,316** |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | UC-35 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 15 | C-40A | 1 | 65,224 | | | | | | | 1 | 65,224 |
| 16 | C-37 | 1 | 53,331 | | | | | | | 1 | 53,331 |
| | **TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | **118,555** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **118,555** |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | T-48 (T-39 REPLACEMENT) | 1 | 52,435 | (1) | (52,435) | | | | | - | - |
| | T-48 Transfer | | | | | | | | (52,435) | | |
| 18 | T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK | 8 | 253,589 | 2 | 52,435 | | | | | 10 | 306,024 |
| | T-48 Transfer | | | | | 2 | 52,435 | | | | |
| 19 | JPATS | - | 2,534 | 6 | 35,000 | 6 | 35,000 | | | 6 | 37,534 |
| | **TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | **308,558** | | **35,000** | | **87,435** | | **(52,435)** | | **343,558** |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | KC-130J | 4 | 320,389 | | | | | | | 4 | 320,389 |
| 20 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (41,703) | | | | | | | - | (41,703) |
| 21 | ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 45,531 | | | | | | | - | 45,531 |
| 22 | F-5 | 9 | 4,487 | | | | | | | 9 | 4,487 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | **328,704** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **328,704** |
| | **MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | EA-6 SERIES | - | 165,702 | | | | | | | - | 165,702 |
| 24 | AV-8 SERIES | - | 20,808 | | | | | | | - | 20,808 |
| 25 | F-14 SERIES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 26 | ADVERSARY | - | 5,465 | | | | | | | - | 5,465 |
| 27 | F-18 SERIES | - | 412,495 | | | | | | | - | 412,495 |
| 28 | H-46 SERIES | - | 71,179 | | | | | | | - | 71,179 |
| 29 | AH-1W SERIES | - | 2,153 | | | | | | | - | 2,153 |
| 30 | H-53 SERIES | - | 9,835 | | | | | | | - | 9,835 |
| 31 | SH-60 SERIES | - | 11,655 | | | | | | | - | 11,655 |
| 32 | H-1 SERIES | - | 3,488 | | 14,000 | | | | | - | 17,488 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | Night Thermal Imaging System | | | | | | 14,000 | | | | |
| 33 | EP-3 SERIES | - | 28,339 | | | | | | | - | 28,339 |
| 34 | P-3 SERIES | - | 134,970 | | 4,000 | | | | | - | 138,970 |
| | Communications Upgrade Risk Reduction | | | | | | 4,000 | | | | |
| 35 | S-3 SERIES | - | 1,861 | | | | | | | - | 1,861 |
| 36 | E-2 SERIES | - | 15,124 | | 7,600 | | | | | - | 22,724 |
| | AN/USC-42 MIN-DAMA | | | | | | 7,600 | | | | |
| 37 | TRAINER A/C SERIES | - | 14,040 | | | | | | | - | 14,040 |
| 38 | C-2A | - | 29,564 | | | | | | | - | 29,564 |
| 39 | C-130 SERIES | - | 15,419 | | | | | | | - | 15,419 |
| 40 | FEWSG | - | 579 | | | | | | | - | 579 |
| 41 | CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES | - | 8,285 | | | | | | | - | 8,285 |
| 42 | E-6 SERIES | - | 19,721 | | | | | | | - | 19,721 |
| 43 | EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES | - | 21,800 | | | | | | | - | 21,800 |
| 44 | SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT | - | 12,415 | | | | | | | - | 12,415 |
| 45 | T-45 SERIES | - | 44,190 | | | | | | | - | 44,190 |
| 46 | POWER PLANT CHANGES | - | 24,409 | | | | | | | - | 24,409 |
| 47 | JPATS SERIES | - | 648 | | | | | | | - | 648 |
| 48 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS | - | 7,364 | | | | | | | - | 7,364 |
| 49 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | - | 43,163 | | | | | | | - | 43,163 |
| 50 | COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES | - | 167,504 | | | | | | | - | 167,504 |
| 51 | ID SYSTEMS | - | 1,575 | | | | | | | - | 1,575 |
| 52 | V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY | - | 3,448 | | | | | | | - | 3,448 |
| | **TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | **1,297,198** | | **25,600** | | **25,600** | | **-** | | **1,322,798** |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 925,803 | | 59,000 | | | | | - | 984,803 |
| | Spare Engine Procurement Transfer From Title III WCF | | | | | | 59,000 | | | | |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **925,803** | | **59,000** | | **59,000** | | **-** | | **984,803** |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | - | 474,521 | | | | | | | - | 474,521 |
| 55 | AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 16,115 | | 1,200 | | | | | - | 17,315 |
| | Metrology and Calibration Program | | | | | | 1,200 | | | | |
| 56 | WAR CONSUMABLES | - | 9,070 | | | | | | | - | 9,070 |
| 57 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | - | 9,883 | | | | | | | - | 9,883 |
| 58 | SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 61,553 | | | | | | | - | 61,553 |
| 59 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | - | 1,591 | | | | | | | - | 1,591 |
| 60 | JUDGEMENT FUND | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 61 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | **572,733** | | **1,200** | | **1,200** | | **-** | | **573,933** |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | **8,767,867** | | **144,800** | | **197,235** | | **(52,435)** | | **8,912,667** |

## Items of Special Interest

*AN/USC–42 miniaturized-demand assigned multiple access terminals*

The budget request contained $15.1 million for E–2 series modifications, but contained no funds for upgrading the AN/USC–42 miniaturized-demand assigned multiple access (Mini-DAMA) terminals with improved communications security (COMSEC) and a graphical user interface (GUI).

The committee notes that the AN/USC–42 provides significant communications improvement at less than one-tenth the size or weight of legacy communications equipment, and understands that the AN/USC–42 can be upgraded to accommodate improved COMSEC to alleviate demand on existing COMSEC systems. Additionally, the committee understands that an automated GUI upgrade would allow E–2C crews to program satellite communications channels more rapidly, and believes that both the COMSEC and GUI upgrade are necessary for future E–2C communications suites.

Therefore, the committee recommends $22.7 million for E–2 series modifications, an increase of $7.6 million for the procurement, installation, and testing of the COMSEC and GUI upgrades for the E–2C's AN/USC–42 mini-DAMA systems. The committee also expects that this increase would provide for the integration of this equipment into training facilities.

*F/A–18E/F shared reconnaissance pod*

The budget request contained $2,907.5 million for procurement of 42 F/A–18E and F/A–18F aircraft, but included no funds to procure shared reconnaissance pods (SHARPs) or their associated logistics support elements.

The SHARP is a digital reconnaissance pod capable of operating day or night, over a wide area, with the ability to use real-time data links to either land or sea-based distributed common ground systems for information exploitation. The SHARP is carried on the F/A–18F and replaces the tactical air reconnaissance pod system carried on the F–14 which is scheduled to retire in fiscal year 2006. The committee understands that current funding will only provide 21 pods, leaving the Department of the Navy short of its requirement for 30 SHARPs, and notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has included the procurement of additional SHARPs among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2005.

Consequently, the committee recommends $2,931.5 million for the F/A–18E/F, an increase of $24.0 million for three SHARPs and their associated support elements.

*H–1 series modifications*

The budget request contained $3.5 million for H–1 series modifications, all of which were five AN/AAQ–22 night thermal imaging system (NTIS) product improvement program (PIP) upgrades.

The AN/AAQ–22 NTIS provides the Marine Corps' UH–1N helicopter fleet with a capability to operate in both day and night conditions, as well as in a smoke, dust or haze environment. The PIP upgrade improves the AN/AAQ–22 NTIS by increasing resolution by greater than 20 percent, improving system stability and control, upgrading target detection and obstacle avoidance capability, and

adding a laser designator to guide precision munitions. The committee understands that the UH–1Ns equipped with the AN/AAQ–22 NTIS PIP upgrade have performed superbly in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom in their mission to identify targets of opportunity and to provide rapid alerting of threats to Allied forces. Additionally, the committee notes that both the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have included the AN/AAQ–22 NTIS PIP upgrade among their unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2005.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $17.5 million for H–1 series modifications, an increase of $14.0 million for 17 additional AN/AAQ–22 NTIS PIP upgrades.

*Joint primary air training system*

The budget request contained $2.5 million for procurement of Joint Primary Air Training System (JPATS) support equipment, 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 its 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.

Consequently, the committee recommends $37.5 million for JPATS, an increase of $35.0 million for six T–6A aircraft and associated ground-based training systems.

*Metrology and calibration program*

The budget request contained $16.1 million for aircraft industrial facilities, of which $7.7 million was included for the Navy metrology and calibration (METCAL) program.

The METCAL program provides the Navy with products and services to maintain accurate test equipment used for maintenance of weapons, aircraft, ships, submarines, and Marine Corps ground systems. The committee notes that without calibration equipment, test equipment drifts to inaccurate performance levels. This could induce errors in weapons systems or result in serviceable components being removed for unnecessary maintenance or unserviceable components remaining in a weapons or support system. The committee also notes that during the past 10 years, funding for the Navy's calibration test equipment has been substantially reduced, resulting in a corresponding decrease in the availability of calibrated test equipment.

Therefore, the committee recommends $17.3 million for aircraft industrial facilities, an increase of $1.2 million for the METCAL program.

*P–3 series modifications*

The budget request contained $135.0 million for P–3 series modifications, but included no funds for procurement of satellite commu-

nications (SATCOM) or a common information processing system (CIPS) upgrades for aircraft that are not equipped with the anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP).

The AIP upgrade improves the P–3's communications, survivability, and over-the-horizon targeting capabilities through the installation of commercial-off-the-shelf components. The committee understands that AIP-equipped P–3s are the theater commander's platform of choice for overland intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) missions, and that, as a result of extensive tasking, AIP-equipped P–3s are rapidly aging. The committee notes however, that of the Navy's 288-aircraft P–3 inventory, only 71 aircraft have been, or are planned to be, modified with the AIP upgrade. The committee understands that some of the remaining 217 non-AIP equipped aircraft could be upgraded with SATCOM and CIPS allowing those P–3 aircraft to assume lower priority ISR missions thereby conserving aircraft life on AIP equipped P–3 aircraft.

Consequently, the committee recommends $139.0 million, an increase of $4.0 million for procurement of SATCOM and CIPS upgrades for non-AIP equipped P–3 aircraft and expects that this amount will provide for procurement of two prototype systems including fleet evaluation.

*T–45TS and T–48*

The budget request contained $52.4 million for one T–48 aircraft and $253.6 million for eight T–45C aircraft and its associated training system. The T–48 would be a multi-seat replacement for the T–39 aircraft used for undergraduate military flight officer training. The T–45TS 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.

Subsequent to submission of the budget request, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition informed the committee that procurement of the T–48 is no longer required since the Department of the Navy now plans to conduct its undergraduate military flight officer training by using the T–45C, synthetic radar displays, and high-fidelity ground-based training systems.

Accordingly, the committee recommends no funds for the T–48, a decrease of $52.4 million. The committee also recommends $306.0 million for the T–45TS, a corresponding increase of $52.4 million and expects that this increase will procure at least two additional T–45C aircraft.

## WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $2,101.5 million for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $2,253.5 million, an increase of $151.9 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | TRIDENT II | 5 | 113,761 | | | | | | | 5 | 113,761 |
| 1 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | (40,694) | | | | | | | - | (40,694) |
| | **MODIFICATION OF MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 2 | TRIDENT II MODS | - | 695,555 | | | | | | | - | 695,555 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 3 | MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 1,334 | | | | | | | - | 1,334 |
| | **TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | **769,956** | | - | | - | | - | | **769,956** |
| | **OTHER MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **STRATEGIC MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | TOMAHAWK | 293 | 256,196 | 57 | 49,700 | | 49,700 | | | 350 | 305,896 |
| | AFFORDABLE WEAPON | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| 5 | ESSM | 71 | 80,313 | 24 | 22,000 | 24 | 22,000 | | | 95 | 102,313 |
| | **TACTICAL MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 6 | AMRAAM | 46 | 33,914 | | | | | | | 46 | 33,914 |
| 7 | SIDEWINDER | 157 | 35,177 | | | | | | | 157 | 35,177 |
| 8 | JSOW | 389 | 139,407 | | 13,000 | | 13,000 | | | 389 | 152,407 |
| 9 | SLAM-ER | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 10 | STANDARD MISSILE | 75 | 150,098 | | | | | | | 75 | 150,098 |
| 10a | HELLFIRE | | | 500 | 42,000 | | 42,000 | | | 500 | 42,000 |
| 11 | RAM | 90 | 47,412 | | | | | | | 90 | 47,412 |
| 12 | AERIAL TARGETS | - | 72,686 | | | | | | | - | 72,686 |
| 13 | DRONES AND DECOYS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 14 | OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT | - | 10,385 | | | | | | | - | 10,385 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 15 | SIDEWINDER MODS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | HARM MODS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 17 | STANDARD MISSILES MODS | - | 51,790 | | | | | | | - | 51,790 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 18 | WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 4,037 | | | | | | | - | 4,037 |
| | **ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 19 | ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 56,073 | | | | | | | - | 56,073 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER MISSILES** | | **937,488** | | **126,700** | | **126,700** | | **-** | | **1,064,188** |
| | **TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | ASW TARGETS | - | 23,973 | | | | | | | - | 23,973 |
| | **MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 21 | MK-46 TORPEDO MODS | - | 61,413 | | | | | | | - | 61,413 |
| 22 | MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS | - | 61,185 | | | | | | | - | 61,185 |
| 23 | QUICKSTRIKE MINE | - | 2,981 | | | | | | | - | 2,981 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 24 | TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 23,401 | | | | | | | - | 23,401 |
| 25 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT | - | 12,935 | | | | | | | - | 12,935 |
| | **DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 26 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | - | 3,123 | | | | | | | - | 3,123 |
| | **TOTAL TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT** | | **189,011** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **189,011** |
| | **OTHER WEAPONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | - | 2,195 | | | | | | | - | 2,195 |
| 28 | COAST GUARD WEAPONS | - | 5,349 | | | | | | | - | 5,349 |
| 29 | AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 30 | CIWS MODS | - | 86,128 | | 34,000 | | 34,000 | | | - | 120,128 |
| 31 | 5/54 GUN MOUNT MODS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 32 | GUN MOUNT MODS | - | 25,858 | | | | | | | - | 25,858 |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **OTHER** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 33 | PIONEER | - | 8,775 | | (8,775) | | | | (8,775) | - | - |
| 34 | CRUISER MODERNIZATON WEAPONS | - | 8,760 | | | | | | | - | 8,760 |
| 35 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL OTHER WEAPONS** | | **137,065** | | **25,225** | | **34,000** | | **(8,775)** | | **162,290** |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 68,009 | | | | | | | - | 68,009 |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **68,009** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **68,009** |
| | **TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | **2,101,529** | | **151,925** | | **160,700** | | **(8,775)** | | **2,253,454** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Close-in weapon system block 1B*

The budget request contained $86.1 million for 19 close-in weapon system (CIWS) modifications to upgrade the CIWS to the block 1B configuration.

The CIWS is a weapon system with a high rate of fire that automatically acquires, tracks and destroys anti-ship missiles that have penetrated all other surface ship defenses. The CIWS block 1B configuration is a CIWS upgrade that incorporates a thermal imager and automatic acquisition video tracker to provide additional capability to engage small, high-speed maneuvering craft, and low, slow aircraft and helicopters. The committee understands that the CIWS, upgraded to the block 1B configuration, is the most effective surface-ship weapon system used to combat terrorist surface vessels and air threats. The committee further understands that 22 CIWSs are scheduled for overhaul in fiscal year 2005 without an upgrade to the CIWS block 1B configuration.

Since the committee believes that completing the block 1B upgrade as part of an overhaul is the most cost-effective method to maximize CIWS block 1B capability for the surface ship fleet, it recommends $120.1 million for CIWS modifications, an increase of $34.0 million to upgrade 22 additional CIWSs to the block 1B configuration.

*Evolved sea sparrow missile*

The budget request contained $80.3 million for 71 evolved Sea Sparrow missiles (ESSMs).

The ESSM is an upgraded version of the existing North Atlantic Treaty Organization Sea Sparrow missile which provides improved surface-ship air defense capabilities against low altitude, high-velocity and maneuvering aircraft and against anti-ship cruise missiles. The ESSM is designed for use in a "quad pack" canister, or set of four missiles, in the MK 41 vertical launching system.

The committee notes that additional ESSMs were included among the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2005, and believes that increased procurement of ESSMs would significantly improve force protection capabilities in the surface fleet.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $102.3 million for the ESSM, an increase of $22.0 million for 24 additional ESSMs and for 6 additional "quad pack" canisters.

*Hellfire II missile*

The budget request for the Department of the Navy contained no funds for Hellfire II missiles.

The Hellfire II missile is a laser-guided, anti-armor and anti-ship weapon used by the Marine Corps on the AH–1W helicopter and by the Navy on the SH–60B helicopter as their primary precision-guided munition. The committee notes that current Hellfire II missile inventories are at 34 percent of requirements, and are projected to fall to 13 percent of the inventory requirement by fiscal year 2009 based on forecast expenditures and shelf-life expirations. As a result of this projection, the committee notes that both the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine

Corps have included procurement of Hellfire II missiles among their unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2005.

Consequently, the committee recommends $42.0 million to procure 500 Hellfire II missiles.

*Pioneer unmanned aerial vehicle*

The budget request contained $8.8 million to improve the Pioneer unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV).

The committee is aware that the Navy no longer uses Pioneer, but has loaned Pioneer to the Marine Corps for use as a tactical UAV until the Marine Corps has developed and fielded its objective high speed vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) UAV. The committee notes that a Marine Corps VTOL UAV will, at best, not be operational until the end of this decade. The committee understands that the cost to improve the Pioneer is approximately the same as to produce a new Shadow tactical UAV (TUAV). Therefore, the committee believes that it is wiser to equip the Marine Corps with new Shadow systems incorporating a standard tactical common data link, target location error reduction features and other improvements. The committee notes that this would provide an interim TUAV to the Marine Corps that could, when appropriate, be transferred to the Army.

Therefore, the committee recommends no funding for Pioneer, a reduction of $8.8 million. Elsewhere in this report funding is recommended to provide an upgraded Shadow 200 TUAV system to the Marine Corps.

*Tomahawk missile*

The budget request contained $256.2 million for 293 tactical tomahawk (TACTOM) missiles.

The TACTOM missile is a long-range, precision-strike cruise missile launched from surface ships or submarines.

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 required inventory levels, and notes that planned production of 293 TACTOM missiles is below both the fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2004 production rate of 350 missiles per year. Also, the committee notes that additional TACTOMs were included among the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2005 to restore inventory levels expended during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

To sustain TACTOM production at a rate of 350 missiles per year for fiscal year 2005 and to improve the TACTOM inventory levels, the committee recommends $305.9 million for the Tomahawk missile, an increase of $49.7 million for an additional 57 TACTOM missiles.

## AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, NAVY & MARINE CORPS

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $858.6 million for Ammunition Procurement, Navy & Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $870.8 million, an increase $12.2 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 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 | - | 181,452 | | | | | | | - | 181,452 |
| 2 | JDAM | 6,620 | 151,189 | | | | | | | 6,620 | 151,189 |
| 3 | AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | - | 34,151 | | | | | | | - | 34,151 |
| 4 | MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION | - | 25,674 | | | | | | | - | 25,674 |
| 5 | PRACTICE BOMBS | - | 53,577 | | | | | | | - | 53,577 |
| 6 | CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES | - | 26,182 | | | | | | | - | 26,182 |
| 7 | AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS | - | 10,735 | | | | | | | - | 10,735 |
| 8 | AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES | - | 48,674 | | | | | | | - | 48,674 |
| 9 | JATOS | - | 4,502 | | | | | | | - | 4,502 |
| 10 | 5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION | - | 19,749 | | | | | | | - | 19,749 |
| 11 | EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM) | - | 500 | | | | | | | - | 500 |
| 12 | 76MM GUN AMMUNITION | - | 1,153 | | | | | | | - | 1,153 |
| 13 | OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | - | 19,199 | | 10,200 | | | | | - | 29,399 |
| | 20mm PGU-28A/B | | | | | | 10,200 | | | | |
| 14 | SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO | - | 23,235 | | | | | | | - | 23,235 |
| 15 | PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | - | 10,133 | | | | | | | - | 10,133 |
| 16 | MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 17 | JUDGEMENT FUND | | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 18 | AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 3,135 | | | | | | | - | 3,135 |
| | **TOTAL PROC AMMO, NAVY** | | **613,240** | | **10,200** | | **10,200** | | **-** | | **623,440** |
| | **PROC AMMO, MC** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | 5.56 MM, ALL TYPES | - | 35,129 | | | | | | | - | 35,129 |
| 20 | 7.62 MM, ALL TYPES | - | 8,708 | | | | | | | - | 8,708 |
| 21 | LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES | - | 10,286 | | | | | | | - | 10,286 |
| 22 | .50 CALIBER | - | 1,898 | | | | | | | - | 1,898 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 23 | 40 MM, ALL TYPES | - | 23,614 | | | | | | | - | 23,614 |
| 24 | 60MM, ALL TYPES | - | 10,446 | | | | | | | - | 10,446 |
| 25 | 81MM, ALL TYPES | - | 24,319 | | | | | | | - | 24,319 |
| 26 | 120MM, ALL TYPES | - | 15,365 | | | | | | | - | 15,365 |
| 27 | CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES | - | 3,749 | | | | | | | - | 3,749 |
| 28 | 9 MM ALL TYPES | - | 7,644 | | | | | | | - | 7,644 |
| 29 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | - | 5,042 | | | | | | | - | 5,042 |
| 30 | STINGER SLEP | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 31 | ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | - | 14,050 | | 2,000 | | | | | - | 16,050 |
| | M72A7 LAW | | | | | | 2,000 | | | | |
| 32 | ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES | - | 55,599 | | | | | | | - | 55,599 |
| 33 | AAAV (EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE? | - | 2,474 | | | | | | | - | 2,474 |
| 34 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | - | 3,270 | | | | | | | - | 3,270 |
| 35 | FUZE, ALL TYPES | - | 13,816 | | | | | | | - | 13,816 |
| 36 | NON LETHALS | - | 1,145 | | | | | | | - | 1,145 |
| 37 | AMMO MODERNIZATION | - | 7,123 | | | | | | | - | 7,123 |
| 38 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 1,723 | | | | | | | - | 1,723 |
| | **TOTAL PROC. AMMO, MC** | | **245,400** | | **2,000** | | **2,000** | | **-** | | **247,400** |
| | **TOTAL AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS** | | **858,640** | | **12,200** | | **12,200** | | **-** | | **870,840** |

## SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $9,962.0 million for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $10,120.0 million, an increase of $158.0 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER WARSHIPS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER WARSHIPS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 2 | ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 626,084 | | | | | | | - | 626,084 |
| 3 | SSN-21 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | COMPLETION OF PY PROGRAMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | 1 | 2,253,513 | | | | | | | 1 | 2,253,513 |
| 4 | LESS: ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (672,370) | | | | | | | - | (672,370) |
| 5 | ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 871,864 | | | | | | | - | 871,864 |
| 6 | SSGN CONVERSION | 1 | 783,793 | | | | | | | 1 | 783,793 |
| 6 | LESS: ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (314,567) | | | | | | | - | (314,567) |
| 7 | ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 48,000 | | | | | | | - | 48,000 |
| 8 | CRUISER CONVERSION | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 8 | LESS: ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 9 | ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 333,061 | | | | | | | - | 333,061 |
| 10 | SSN ERO | - | 90,699 | | | | | | | - | 90,699 |
| 10 | LESS: ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (90,699) | | | | | | | - | (90,699) |
| 11 | ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 19,368 | | | | | | | - | 19,368 |
| 12 | SSBN ERO | 1 | 292,450 | | | | | | | 1 | 292,450 |
| 12 | LESS: ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (30,221) | | | | | | | - | (30,221) |
| 13 | ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 72,171 | | | | | | | - | 72,171 |
| 14 | DDG-51 | 3 | 3,504,970 | | 100,000 | | | | | 3 | 3,604,970 |
| 14 | LESS: ADVANCED PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (60,020) | | | | | | | - | (60,020) |
| 14 | COMPLETION OF PY PROGRAMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | DDG-51 In Service Modernization | | | | | | 100,000 | | | | |
| | **TOTAL OTHER WARSHIPS** | | **7,728,096** | | **100,000** | | **100,000** | | **-** | | **7,828,096** |
| | **AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS** | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 15 | LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP | - | 1,091,185 | | 150,000 | | | | | - | 1,241,185 |
| 15 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (855,167) | | | | | | | - | (855,167) |
| | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | | 150,000 | | | | |
| 16 | LPD-17 | 1 | 1,103,620 | | | | | | | 1 | 1,103,620 |
| 16 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (137,061) | | | | | | | - | (137,061) |
| 16 | COMPLETION OF PY PROGRAMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 17 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | LHA | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TOTAL AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS** | | **1,202,577** | | **150,000** | | **150,000** | | **-** | | **1,352,577** |
| | **AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | LCU(X) | 1 | 25,048 | | | | | | | 1 | 25,048 |
| 19 | OUTFITTING | - | 399,327 | | (100,000) | | | | (100,000) | - | 299,327 |
| 20 | SERVICE CRAFT | - | 32,099 | | 8,000 | | | | | - | 40,099 |
| | Aft Ramp Range Retriever Craft | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | |
| 21 | LCAC SLEP | 5 | 90,490 | | | | | | | 5 | 90,490 |
| 21 | COMPLETION OF PY PROGRAMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 22 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 23 | MINE HUNTER | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 24 | COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS | - | 484,390 | | | | | | | - | 484,390 |
| | SSN-774 (MEMO NON ADD) | - | {91330} | | | | | | | - | |
| | DDG (MEMO NON ADD) | - | {128279} | | | | | | | - | |
| | LPD (MEMO NON ADD) | - | {264781} | | | | | | | - | |
| | **TOTAL AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM:** | | **1,031,354** | | **(92,000)** | | **8,000** | | **(100,000)** | | **939,354** |
| | **TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY** | | **9,962,027** | | **158,000** | | **258,000** | | **(100,000)** | | **10,120,027** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Aft ramp range retriever craft*

The budget request contained $32.1 million for the procurement of service craft, but included no funding for aft ramp range retriever craft (ARC).

The committee is informed that the Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division located in Keyport, Washington, currently has two, approximately 40-years old, wooden ARCs that are at the end of their useful service life. The committee notes that the Navy has approved an Operational Requirements Document for replacement ARCs.

The committee recommends $40.1 million for the procurement of service craft, an increase of $8.0 million to design and build two aluminum ARCs and provide appropriate spare parts.

*Amphibious assault ship replacement program*

The budget request contained no funding for the amphibious assault ship replacement program (LHA (R)).

The committee understands that the LHA (R) will be based on the LHD–1 Class hull combined with the latest propulsion and electric plant technology. The committee further notes that, while the LHA (R) design is not yet finalized, commonality with LHD–1 Class will be much greater than 50 percent. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to report to the congressional defense committees how the additional funding will be used prior to obligation of those funds, since no description has been provided with the budget request.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $150.0 million in ship construction Navy for advanced procurement of components common to LHD–9 and LHA (R).

# Other Procurement, Navy

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $4,834.3 million for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $4,876.7 million, an increase of $42.4 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 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 | - | 9,009 | | | | | | | - | 9,009 |
| 2 | ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE | - | 22,271 | | | | | | | - | 22,271 |
| | **PROPELLERS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 3 | SUBMARINE PROPELLERS | - | - | | 7,000 | | | | | - | 7,000 |
| | CVN Propeller Replacement | | | | | | 7,000 | | | | |
| | **NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 4 | OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT | - | 16,180 | | | | | | | - | 16,180 |
| | **UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 5 | UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT | - | 1,530 | | | | | | | - | 1,530 |
| | **PERISCOPES** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 6 | SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP | - | 62,050 | | | | | | | - | 62,050 |
| | **OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 7 | FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT | - | 24,731 | | | | | | | - | 24,731 |
| 8 | COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD | - | 3,768 | | | | | | | - | 3,768 |
| 9 | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | - | 42,612 | | | | | | | - | 42,612 |
| 10 | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 21,181 | | | | | | | - | 21,181 |
| 11 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 56,051 | | | | | | | - | 56,051 |
| 12 | SUBMARINE BATTERIES | - | 26,077 | | | | | | | - | 26,077 |
| 13 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP | - | 55,166 | | | | | | | - | 55,166 |
| 14 | DSSP EQUIPMENT | - | 21,131 | | | | | | | - | 21,131 |
| 15 | CG-MODERNIZATION | | 114,139 | | | | | | | - | 114,139 |
| 16 | LCAC | - | 8,365 | | | | | | | - | 8,365 |
| 17 | MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT | - | 8,046 | | | | | | | - | 8,046 |
| 18 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 148,637 | | 14,100 | | | | | - | 162,737 |
| | Integrated Condition Assessment | | | | | | 11,800 | | | | |
| | Weapons Elevator Automation | | | | | | 2,300 | | | | |
| 19 | CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS | - | 4,725 | | | | | | | - | 4,725 |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 20 | SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM | - | 13,940 | | | | | | | - | 13,940 |
| | **REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 21 | REACTOR POWER UNITS | - | 356,372 | | | | | | | - | 356,372 |
| 22 | REACTOR COMPONENTS | - | 217,175 | | | | | | | - | 217,175 |
| | **OCEAN ENGINEERING** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 23 | DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT | - | 8,875 | | | | | | | - | 8,875 |
| | **SMALL BOATS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 24 | STANDARD BOATS | - | 18,328 | | | | | | | - | 18,328 |
| | **TRAINING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 25 | OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT | - | 8,848 | | | | | | | - | 8,848 |
| | **PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 26 | OPERATING FORCES IPE | - | 22,384 | | | | | | | - | 22,384 |
| | **OTHER SHIP SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 27 | NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS | - | 133,999 | | | | | | | - | 133,999 |
| | **DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 28 | DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **1,425,590** | | **21,100** | | **21,100** | | **-** | | **1,446,690** |
| | **COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SHIP RADARS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | SPQ-9B RADAR | - | 3,584 | | 6,000 | | | | | - | 9,584 |
| | Evolved Sea Sparrow: SPQ-9B | | | | | | 6,000 | | | | |
| 30 | RADAR SUPPORT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 31 | TISS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **SHIP SONARS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 32 | AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 33 | SSN ACOUSTICS | - | 225,028 | | 4,000 | | | | | - | 229,028 |
| | Complementary Acoustic System | | | | | | 4,000 | | | | |
| 34 | UUV PROGRAM | - | 61,253 | | (61,253) | | | | (61,253) | - | - |
| 35 | UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 14,116 | | | | | | | - | 14,116 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 36 | SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS | - | 13,330 | | | | | | | - | 13,330 |
| | **ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 37 | SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM | - | 20,857 | | | | | | | - | 20,857 |
| 38 | SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE (SSTD) | - | 22,273 | | | | | | | - | 22,273 |
| 39 | FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | - | 55,325 | | | | | | | - | 55,325 |
| 40 | SURTASS | - | 7,166 | | | | | | | - | 7,166 |
| 41 | TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER | | 5,100 | | | | | | | - | 5,100 |
| | **ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 42 | AN/SLQ-32 | - | 18,728 | | | | | | | - | 18,728 |
| 43 | INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS | - | 4,034 | | | | | | | - | 4,034 |
| | **RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 44 | SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT | - | 69,194 | | | | | | | - | 69,194 |
| | **SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 45 | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG | - | 78,968 | | | | | | | - | 78,968 |
| | **OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 46 | NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 47 | COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY | - | 57,531 | | 4,200 | | | | | - | 61,731 |
| | Evolved Sea Sparrow: CEC | | | | | | 4,200 | | | | |
| 48 | GCCS-M EQUIPMENT | - | 63,363 | | | | | | | - | 63,363 |
| 49 | NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (N | - | 26,208 | | | | | | | - | 26,208 |
| 50 | ADVANCED TACTICAL DATA LINK (ATDLS) | - | 2,386 | | | | | | | - | 2,386 |
| 51 | MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT | - | 77,956 | | | | | | | - | 77,956 |
| 52 | NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE) | - | 11,650 | | | | | | | - | 11,650 |
| 53 | ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV | - | 4,170 | | | | | | | - | 4,170 |
| 54 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP | - | 5,265 | | | | | | | - | 5,265 |
| | **TRAINING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 55 | OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 56 | OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT | - | 42,913 | | | | | | | - | 42,913 |
| | **AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 57 | MARINE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL (MATCALS) | - | 15,614 | | | | | | | - | 15,614 |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 58 | SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | - | 7,695 | | | | | | | - | 7,695 |
| 59 | AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM | - | 12,515 | | | | | | | - | 12,515 |
| 60 | NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM | - | 16,122 | | | | | | | - | 16,122 |
| 61 | AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 3,640 | | | | | | | - | 3,640 |
| 62 | MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM | - | 7,232 | | | | | | | - | 7,232 |
| 63 | FACSFAC | - | 3,712 | | | | | | | - | 3,712 |
| 64 | ID SYSTEMS | - | 18,296 | | | | | | | - | 18,296 |
| 65 | TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS (TAMPS) | | 9,098 | | | | | | | - | 9,098 |
| | **OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 66 | DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT | - | 32,469 | | | | | | | - | 32,469 |
| 67 | NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 68 | DIMHRS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 69 | COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS | - | 53,173 | | (8,000) | | | | (8,000) | - | 45,173 |
| 70 | RADIAC | - | 9,087 | | | | | | | - | 9,087 |
| 71 | GPETE | - | 7,010 | | | | | | | - | 7,010 |
| 72 | INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY | - | 4,662 | | | | | | | - | 4,662 |
| 73 | EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION | - | 5,872 | | | | | | | - | 5,872 |
| 74 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 12,058 | | | | | | | - | 12,058 |
| | **SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 75 | SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS / JTRS | - | 14,077 | | 2,000 | | | | | - | 16,077 |
| | Programmable Integrated Communications Terminal | | | | | | 2,000 | | | | |
| 76 | SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION | - | 159,718 | | | | | | | - | 159,718 |
| 77 | COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M | - | 11,921 | | | | | | | - | 11,921 |
| | **SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 78 | SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT | | 17,802 | | | | | | | - | 17,802 |
| 79 | SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT | - | 94,533 | | | | | | | - | 94,533 |
| | **SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 80 | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | - | 130,564 | | | | | | | - | 130,564 |
| | **SHORE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 81 | JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT | - | 3,023 | | | | | | | - | 3,023 |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 82 | ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS | - | 1,291 | | | | | | | - | 1,291 |
| 83 | NSIPS / IT | - | 289 | | | | | | | - | 289 |
| 84 | JEDMICS / IT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 85 | NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS | - | 57,066 | | | | | | | - | 57,066 |
| | **CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 86 | INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) | - | 88,418 | | | | | | | - | 88,418 |
| | **CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 87 | CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP | - | 26,111 | | | | | | | - | 26,111 |
| | **OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 88 | COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT | - | 7,638 | | | | | | | - | 7,638 |
| | **DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 89 | OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | **1,721,104** | | **(53,053)** | | **16,200** | | **(69,253)** | | **1,668,051** |
| | **AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SONOBUOYS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90 | SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES | - | 50,081 | | | | | | | - | 50,081 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 91 | WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 44,643 | | | | | | | - | 44,643 |
| 92 | EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS | - | 7,527 | | | | | | | - | 7,527 |
| 93 | AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT | - | 11,667 | | | | | | | - | 11,667 |
| 94 | AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT | - | 21,275 | | | | | | | - | 21,275 |
| 95 | METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT | - | 20,134 | | | | | | | - | 20,134 |
| 96 | OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | - | 1,438 | | | | | | | - | 1,438 |
| 97 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT | - | 19,040 | | 8,000 | | | | | - | 27,040 |
| | Multi Climate Protection Clothing System | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | |
| 98 | AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES | - | 73,081 | | | | | | | - | 73,081 |
| 99 | LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT | - | 16,433 | | | | | | | - | 16,433 |
| 100 | OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 6,157 | | | | | | | - | 6,157 |
| | **TOTAL AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **271,476** | | **8,000** | | **8,000** | | **-** | | **279,476** |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 101 | GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 102 | NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM | - | 7,610 | | | | | | | - | 7,610 |
| 103 | GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT | - | 11,481 | | | | | | | - | 11,481 |
| | **SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 104 | NATO SEASPARROW | - | 25,453 | | 8,700 | | | | | - | 34,153 |
| | Evolved Sea Sparrow: RNSSMS | | | | | | 8,700 | | | | |
| 105 | RAM GMLS | - | 22,968 | | | | | | | - | 22,968 |
| 106 | SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM | - | 42,130 | | | | | | | - | 42,130 |
| 107 | AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 57,517 | | 19,000 | | | | | - | 76,517 |
| | Integrated Bridge System | | | | | | 19,000 | | | | |
| 108 | SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 69,732 | | | | | | | - | 69,732 |
| 109 | SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP | - | 5,469 | | | | | | | - | 5,469 |
| 110 | VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS | - | 9,829 | | | | | | | - | 9,829 |
| | **FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 111 | STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP | - | 102,073 | | | | | | | - | 102,073 |
| | **ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 112 | SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS | - | 147,481 | | | | | | | - | 147,481 |
| 113 | SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 4,849 | | | | | | | - | 4,849 |
| 114 | SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 4,539 | | | | | | | - | 4,539 |
| 115 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 7,175 | | | | | | | - | 7,175 |
| | **OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 116 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP | - | 25,058 | | 10,400 | | | | | - | 35,458 |
| | EOD Capability Requirement | | | | | | 10,400 | | | | - |
| 117 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 4,037 | | | | | | | - | 4,037 |
| | **OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 118 | ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM | - | 46,553 | | | | | | | - | 46,553 |
| 119 | SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS | - | 6,347 | | | | | | | - | 6,347 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 120 | SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS | - | 39,405 | | | | | | | - | 39,405 |
| | **TOTAL ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **639,706** | | **38,100** | | **38,100** | | **-** | | **677,806** |
| | **CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 121 | ARMORED SEDANS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 122 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | - | 1,507 | | | | | | | - | 1,507 |
| 123 | GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS | - | 2,321 | | | | | | | - | 2,321 |
| 124 | CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP | - | 19,197 | | | | | | | - | 19,197 |
| 125 | FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | - | 12,345 | | | | | | | - | 12,345 |
| 126 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | - | 30,926 | | | | | | | - | 30,926 |
| 127 | AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT | - | 11,607 | | | | | | | - | 11,607 |
| 128 | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | - | 11,396 | | | | | | | - | 11,396 |
| 129 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION | - | 13,686 | | | | | | | - | 13,686 |
| 130 | PHYSICAL SECURITY VECHICLES | - | 1,125 | | | | | | | - | 1,125 |
| | **TOTAL CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **104,110** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **104,110** |
| | **SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 131 | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | - | 12,754 | | | | | | | - | 12,754 |
| 132 | OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 11,523 | | 8,000 | | | | | - | 19,523 |
| | Serial Number Tracking System | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | |
| 133 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | - | 5,578 | | | | | | | - | 5,578 |
| 134 | SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS | - | 82,158 | | | | | | | - | 82,158 |
| | **TOTAL SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **112,013** | | **8,000** | | **8,000** | | **-** | | **120,013** |
| | **PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TRAINING DEVICES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 135 | TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 18,756 | | 5,000 | | | | | - | 23,756 |
| | Laser Marksmanship Training System- Navy Reserve | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| 136 | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 20,658 | | 10,900 | | | | | - | 31,558 |
| | Man Overboard ID Program | | | | | | 12,400 | | | | |
| | Enterprise Resource Planning | | | | | | | | (1,500) | | |
| 137 | EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 5,507 | | | | | | | - | 5,507 |
| 138 | MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 8,459 | | | | | | | - | 8,459 |
| 139 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 140 | OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 7,826 | | | | | | | - | 7,826 |
| 141 | C4ISR EQUIPMENT | | 27,582 | | | | | | | - | 27,582 |
| 142 | ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 13,155 | | | | | | | - | 13,155 |
| 143 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | - | 194,214 | | | | | | | - | 194,214 |
| 144 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | - | | | | | | | | - | |
| 145 | SPECIAL PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 146 | JUDGEMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **OTHER** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 147 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMEN** | | **296,157** | | **15,900** | | **17,400** | | **(1,500)** | | **312,057** |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 148 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 245,476 | | 4,400 | | | | | - | 249,876 |
| | Envelop Protective Covers | | | | | | 4,400 | | | | |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **245,476** | | **4,400** | | **4,400** | | **-** | | **249,876** |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 18,646 | | | | | | | | 18,646 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | **4,834,278** | | **42,447** | | **113,200** | | **(70,753)** | | **4,876,725** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Chemical biological defense for aviation and explosive ordnance disposal*

The budget request included $25.1 million for explosive ordnance disposal equipment and $131.9 million for chemical and biological defense individual protection equipment.

The committee notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has identified a critical requirement for chemical and biological individual protection equipment and explosive ordnance disposal equipment for which funding was not requested in fiscal year 2005.

The committee notes increasing Navy requirements for improvement of the mission readiness of explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) units for incidents involving improvised explosive devices and weapons of mass destruction. The committee notes that commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) robotic and explosive detection systems are available that would significantly enhance the ability of EOD units to conduct remote reconnaissance and disruption operations against a range of military and commercial explosive devices.

The committee also notes significant shortfalls in chemical and biological defense individual protection systems for Navy aircrews. The procurement of replacement aircrew chemical biological defense respirators is essential for Navy and Marine aircrews to be capable of operating in a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear threat environment until the joint service aircrew mask is fielded in fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.4 million for procurement of COTS robotic and explosive detection systems for EOD units. The committee also recommends an increase of $11.0 million for procurement of aircrew chemical and biological defense respirators.

*Complementary acoustic system improvements*

The budget request contained $225.0 million for the procurement of SSN acoustics, but contained no funding for complementary acoustic system improvements.

The committee understands that it is necessary to coordinate complementary acoustic improvements in order that maximum overall system performance is realized. The committee also realizes that cost savings can be realized by such an approach.

Therefore, the committee recommends $229.0 million for procurement of SSN acoustics, an increase of $4.0 million for complementary acoustic system improvements.

*CVN replacement propeller program*

The budget request contained no funds for advanced aircraft carrier propellers.

The committee is aware that the Navy has designed a new Generation III propeller for new and in service aircraft carriers. It further notes that it costs $2.0 million per ship set to refurbish old propellers which last for only a few years. The committee believes the Generation III propeller offers a more cost-effective alternative.

The committee recommends $7.0 million to procure two ship sets of Generation III propellers for in-service aircraft carriers.

*Envelop protective covers*

The budget request contained $245.5 million for the procurement of spares and repair parts, but contained no funding for envelop protective covers.

The committee is aware that envelop protective covers significantly reduce corrosion on Navy surface combatant weapons systems. The committee notes that a 2003 General Accounting Office study estimated annual cost of corrosion control for military infrastructure at $20,000 million. The committee further notes that envelop covers, developed under Navy-sponsored research use modern technology to draw moisture from beneath the cover, keeping metal surfaces dry. The committee understands that Navy test results show that envelop covers reduce corrosion by 95 percent, compared to current covers.

The committee recommends $249.9 million for the procurement of spares and repair parts, an increase of $4.4 million to procure covers for weapons systems on Navy surface combatants.

*Integrated bridge system*

The budget request contained $57.5 million for the procurement of Aegis support equipment, but contained no funding for an integrated bridge system (IBS).

The committee notes that an integrated bridge system has been developed that automates underway planning, reduces bridge manning, and reduces risk of collision and grounding. The committee also notes that significant cost savings per ship result from installation of IBS.

The committee recommends $76.5 million for Aegis support equipment, an increase of $19.0 million for IBS.

*Integrated condition assessment system*

The budget request contained $148.6 million for the procurement of items less than $5.0 million, but included no funding for an integrated condition assessment systems (ICAS).

The committee is aware that ICAS links the key elements of the maintenance decision process, continually monitoring and recording critical machinery operating data. The committee notes that ICAS facilitates more timely and accurate maintenance with the potential to improve systems reliability while lowering operating costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $11.8 million for ICAS.

*Man overboard identification program*

The budget request contained $20.7 million in other procurement Navy, but included no funding for man overboard identification program (MOBI).

The committee is aware that each year more than 50 service members fall overboard from U.S. Navy ships. The MOBI system provides an active means by which a Navy ship can immediately be alerted to a man-overboard incident and also be provided precision location of the individual in the water, thereby reducing death and injury from such incidents. The committee notes that the Navy has begun installing MOBI on all Navy ships.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.4 million in other procurement Navy to expedite MOBI installation on all Navy ships.

*Multi-climate protection clothing system*

The budget request contained $19.0 million for the procurement of aviation life support equipment, but contained no funding for a multi-climate protection clothing system.

The committee is aware that the Chief of Naval Operations has given high priority to procurement of improved clothing for aircrews. The committee notes that a new multi-climate clothing system has been introduced that meets present requirements.

The committee recommends $27.0 million aviation life support equipment, an increase of $8.0 million for the multi-climate clothing protection system.

*Programmable integrated communications terminal*

The budget request contained $14.1 million for shipboard tactical communications, but included no funding for a programmable integrated communications terminal (PICT).

The committee is aware that many of the secure voice terminals aboard ship are out-dated and require expensive and time-consuming maintenance. The committee notes that a single commercial technology PICT can be used to replace several legacy terminals for interior and radio communications.

The committee recommends $16.1 million, an increase of $2.0 million for procurement and installation of PICTs aboard Marine Corps amphibious ships.

*Serial number tracking system*

The budget request contained $11.5 million for the procurement of other supply support equipment, but contained no funding for a serial number tracking system (SNTS).

The committee notes that the SNTS provides web-based, "cradle-to-grave" total asset visibility of individual components throughout the supply, maintenance and transportation processes. This leads to increased readiness and reduced maintenance costs.

The committee recommends $19.5 million for other supply support equipment, an increase of $8.0 million to continue implementation of SNTS in the areas of shipboard automated configuration management and calibrated equipment areas.

*Weapons elevator automation*

The budget request contained $148.6 million for the procurement of items less than $5.0 million, but included no funding for weapons elevator automation.

The committee is aware that weapons elevators on aircraft carriers are critical to the success of strike missions. The committee is also aware that a successful demonstration of an automated weapons elevator has been conducted and that it was also proven during recent combat deployments.

The committee supports this improved capability and recommends an increase of $2.3 million for weapons elevator automation.

## PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $1,190.1 million for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1,315.1 million, an increase of $125.0 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 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 | - | 58,596 | | 46,400 | | | | | - | 104,996 |
| | AAV RAM/RS Upgrade | | | | | | 46,400 | | | | - |
| 2 | EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE | - | 67,701 | | | | | | | - | 67,701 |
| 3 | LAV PIP | - | 41,588 | | | | | | | - | 41,588 |
| 4 | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV) | - | - | | 8,500 | | 8,500 | | | - | 8,500 |
| 5 | MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH) | - | 11,844 | | | | | | | - | 11,844 |
| 6 | M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS | - | 36,873 | | | | | | | - | 36,873 |
| | **ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 7 | HIMARS | - | 16,340 | | | | | | | - | 16,340 |
| 8 | 155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER | - | 175,445 | | | | | | | - | 175,445 |
| 9 | MOD KITS (ARTILLERY) | - | 3,248 | | | | | | | - | 3,248 |
| 10 | MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM | - | 4,024 | | | | | | | - | 4,024 |
| 11 | WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MIL | - | 4,888 | | | | | | | - | 4,888 |
| | **WEAPONS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 12 | MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM | - | 10,051 | | | | | | | - | 10,051 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 13 | OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR | - | 1,509 | | | | | | | - | 1,509 |
| | **TOTAL WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES** | | **432,107** | | **54,900** | | **54,900** | | **-** | | **487,007** |
| | **GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **GUIDED MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | EADS MOD | - | 10,314 | | | | | | | - | 10,314 |
| 15 | JAVELIN | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP) | - | 10,004 | | | | | | | - | 10,004 |
| 17 | HIMARS ROCKETS | - | 1,325 | | | | | | | - | 1,325 |
| 18 | PREDATOR (SRAW) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | - |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 19 | MODIFICATION KITS | - | 595 | | | | | | | - | 595 |
| | **TOTAL GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT** | | **22,238** | | - | | - | | - | | **22,238** |
| | **COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **VEHICLE MOUNTED RADIOS AND EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | SMALL UNIT REMOTE SCOUTING SYSTEM | - | 8,866 | | | | | | | - | 8,866 |
| | **COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 21 | UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER | - | 35,933 | | | | | | | - | 35,933 |
| 22 | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | - | 21,664 | | | | | | | - | 21,664 |
| 23 | MULTIPLE ROLE RADAR SYSTEM | - | 2,283 | | | | | | | - | 2,283 |
| 24 | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS | - | 26,009 | | 14,200 | | | | | - | 40,209 |
| | AN/PRC 150C | | | | | | 14,200 | | | | |
| 25 | TRANSITION SWITCH MODULE | - | 9,245 | | | | | | | - | 9,245 |
| 26 | COMPLEMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPON | - | 4,412 | | | | | | | - | 4,412 |
| | **REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 27 | AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS | - | 15,823 | | | | | | | - | 15,823 |
| 28 | GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP. | - | 14,495 | | | | | | | - | 14,495 |
| 29 | CALIBRATION FACILITIES | - | 2,305 | | | | | | | - | 2,305 |
| | **RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 30 | RADAR SET AN/TPS-59 | - | 24,466 | | | | | | | - | 24,466 |
| | **INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 31 | TACTICAL REMOTE SENSOR SYSTEM | - | 10,622 | | | | | | | - | 10,622 |
| 32 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 15,842 | | | | | | | - | 15,842 |
| 33 | MOD KITS (INTEL) | - | 9,551 | | 4,500 | | | | | - | 14,051 |
| | GCCS-13 | | | | | | 4,500 | | | | |
| 34 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (INTELL) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 35 | GENERAL PURPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE | - | 1,790 | | | | | | | - | 1,790 |
| | **OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 36 | NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT | - | 26,100 | | 22,900 | | | | | - | 49,000 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | AN/PVS 17 | | | | | | 4,100 | | | | |
| | AN/PVS 14 | | | | | | 5,800 | | | | |
| | AN/PEQ-2A | | | | | | 13,000 | | | | |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 37 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) | - | 461 | | | | | | | - | 461 |
| 38 | COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES | - | 61,989 | | | | | | | - | 61,989 |
| 39 | COMMAND POST SYSTEMS | - | 8,144 | | | | | | | - | 8,144 |
| 40 | RADIO SYSTEMS | - | 14,476 | | 13,200 | | | | | - | 27,676 |
| | Lightweight Multiband Satellite Terminal | | | | | | 12,000 | | | | |
| | AN/TRC-170 | | | | | | 1,200 | | | | |
| 41 | COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS | - | 26,145 | | | | | | | - | 26,145 |
| 42 | COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT | - | 24,778 | | | | | | | - | 24,778 |
| 43 | MOD KITS MAGTF C41 | - | 984 | | | | | | | - | 984 |
| 44 | AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS | - | 10,290 | | | | | | | - | 10,290 |
| 45 | INTELLIGENCE C2 SYSTEMS | - | 1,211 | | | | | | | - | 1,211 |
| 46 | FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | - | 10,215 | | | | | | | - | 10,215 |
| | **TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | **388,099** | | **54,800** | | **54,800** | | **-** | | **442,899** |
| | **SUPPORT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES | - | 1,096 | | | | | | | - | 1,096 |
| 48 | COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES | - | 11,563 | | | | | | | - | 11,563 |
| | **TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 49 | 5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP) | - | 131,276 | | | | | | | - | 131,276 |
| 50 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 51 | LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP | - | 3,343 | | | | | | | - | 3,343 |
| 52 | FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS | - | 942 | | | | | | | - | 942 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 53 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 3,598 | | | | | | | - | 3,598 |
| | **TOTAL SUPPORT VEHICLES** | | **151,818** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **151,818** |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT | - | 2,869 | | | | | | | - | 2,869 |
| 55 | COMBAT BREACHER VEHICLE | - | 4,621 | | 12,000 | | 12,000 | | | - | 16,621 |
| 56 | BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT | - | 11,524 | | | | | | | - | 11,524 |
| 57 | TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS | - | 5,219 | | 3,300 | | | | | - | 8,519 |
| | Nitrile Rubber Collapsible Storage Units | | | | | | 3,300 | | | | |
| 58 | DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS | - | 3,422 | | | | | | | - | 3,422 |
| 59 | POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED | - | 10,657 | | | | | | | - | 10,657 |
| 60 | SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE (SECM) | | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 61 | FAMILY OF EOD EQUIPMENT | - | 4,724 | | | | | | | - | 4,724 |
| 62 | BRIDGE BOATS | - | 5,307 | | | | | | | - | 5,307 |
| | **MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 63 | AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT | - | 15,771 | | | | | | | - | 15,771 |
| 64 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | - | 4,979 | | | | | | | - | 4,979 |
| 65 | GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP | - | 10,927 | | | | | | | - | 10,927 |
| 66 | MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP | - | 21,190 | | | | | | | - | 21,190 |
| 67 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | - | 5,715 | | | | | | | - | 5,715 |
| | **GENERAL PROPERTY** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 68 | FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT | - | 6,027 | | | | | | | - | 6,027 |
| 69 | TRAINING DEVICES | - | 24,214 | | | | | | | - | 24,214 |
| 70 | CONTAINER FAMILY | - | 5,244 | | | | | | | - | 5,244 |
| 71 | FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | - | 15,067 | | | | | | | - | 15,067 |
| 72 | RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 73 | FAMILY OF INCIDENT RESPONSE | - | 2,804 | | | | | | | - | 2,804 |
| 74 | MODIFICATION KITS | - | 2,901 | | | | | | | - | 2,901 |
| 75 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 5,713 | | | | | | | - | 5,713 |
| 76 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **TOTAL ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT** | | **168,895** | | **15,300** | | **15,300** | | **-** | | **184,195** |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 26,946 | | | | | | | - | 26,946 |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **26,946** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **26,946** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS** | | **1,190,103** | | **125,000** | | **125,000** | | **-** | | **1,315,103** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Assault breacher vehicle*

The budget request contained $4.6 million for the assault breacher vehicle (ABV).

The ABV is a tracked, armored combat engineer vehicle designed to breach mine fields, complex obstacles and provide in-stride breaching capability to Marine Corps ground forces operating on the battlefield. The committee understands the ABV enters into low-rate initial production in fiscal year 2005 and recognizes the ABV would provide additional crew protection, vehicle survivability and improve the mobility of the Marine Air-Ground Task Force. The committee also notes the Commandant of the Marine Corps identified a $12.0 million fiscal year 2005 unfunded requirement for the ABV.

The committee recommends $16.6 million for the ABV, an increase of $12.0 million to accelerate ABV fielding by one year and fulfill the Commandant of the Marine Corps fiscal year 2005 unfunded requirement.

*Improved recovery vehicle*

The budget request contained no funds for procurement of the M88A2 Hercules Improved Recovery Vehicle (IRV).

The committee understands the M88A2 IRV is a joint Marine Corps and Army product improvement program that reuses the fielded M88A1 recovery vehicle hull and installs a new upgraded engine and provides better suspension to increase towing, hoisting, and winching capability. The committee notes the M88A2 IRV also provides improved armored crew protection and is the prime recovery vehicle for the M1 Abrams tank and other heavy vehicles.

The committee recommends $8.5 million to procure three M88A2 Hercules Improved Recovery Vehicles and fulfill the Commandant of the Marine Corps's fiscal year 2005 unfunded requirement.

*Marines global command and control systems and integrated imagery and intelligence analysis system*

The budget request included $9.6 million for modification kits for intelligence.

The committee notes the Commandant of the Marine Corps's number one unfunded requirement for fiscal year 2005 is the acceleration of the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) integrated backbone (DIB). The DCGS DIB integration supports the capstone requirements document (CRD) and ongoing multi-service collaboration efforts for the Marine Corps. Additional funding would provide the Marine Corps with needed licenses, software, and servers for intelligence analysis systems necessary to support the Marine Corps intelligence infrastructure.

The committee recommends $14.1 million, an increase of $4.5 million for Global Command and Control Systems, Integrated Imagery and Intelligence (GCCS–I3) for the Marine Corps.

*Nitrile rubber collapsible storage units*

The budget request contained $5.2 million for tactical fuel systems, but included no funding for nitrile rubber collapsible storage tanks.

The committee understands that the Marine Corps has identified an immediate need to procure nitrile rubber collapsible storage tanks for its Tactical Fuel System (TFS). The committee notes that TFS played a critical role in receiving, storage, transfer and dispensing fuel and bulk liquid in support of Marine Corps operations in Iraq.

The committee recommends $8.5 million, an increase of $3.3 million for nitrile rubber collapsible storage tanks.

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $13,163.2 million for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $13,649.2 million, an increase of $486.0 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL FORCES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | F/A-22 RAPTOR | 24 | 4,128,356 | | | | | | | 24 | 4,128,356 |
| 1 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (494,587) | | | | | | | - | (494,587) |
| 2 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 523,187 | | | | | | | - | 523,187 |
| | **TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | **4,156,956** | | - | | - | | - | | **4,156,956** |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL AIRLIFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | C-17A (MYP) | 14 | 2,941,532 | | 35,000 | | | | | 14 | 2,976,532 |
| 3 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (429,053) | | | | | | | - | (429,053) |
| | Maintenance Training System | | | | | | 35,000 | | | | |
| 4 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 381,800 | | | | | | | - | 381,800 |
| 5 | C-17 ICS | - | 945,560 | | | | | | | - | 945,560 |
| | **OTHER AIRLIFT** | | | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | C-130H | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 7 | C-130J | 11 | 902,421 | | 36,700 | | 36,700 | | | 11 | 939,121 |
| 7 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (169,916) | | | | | | | - | (169,916) |
| 8 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 186,666 | | (36,700) | | | | (36,700) | - | 149,966 |
| | **TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | **4,759,010** | | **35,000** | | **71,700** | | **(36,700)** | | **4,794,010** |
| | **TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **UPT TRAINERS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **OPERATIONAL TRAINERS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | JPATS | 53 | 307,072 | | | | | | | 53 | 307,072 |
| | **TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | **307,072** | | - | | - | | - | | **307,072** |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **HELICOPTERS** | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 10 | V-22 OSPREY | 3 | 320,619 | | | | | | | 3 | 320,619 |
| 10 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (15,038) | | | | | | | - | (15,038) |
| 11 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 11,035 | | | | | | | - | 11,035 |
| | **MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C | 27 | 2,271 | | | | | | | 27 | 2,271 |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | TARGET DRONES | - | 74,143 | | | | | | | - | 74,143 |
| 14 | C-40 ANG | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 15 | EC-130J | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | E-8C | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | E-8C | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 17 | HAEUAV | 4 | 342,360 | | | | | | | 4 | 342,360 |
| 17 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (54,592) | | | | | | | - | (54,592) |
| 18 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 71,863 | | | | | | | - | 71,863 |
| 19 | PREDATOR UAV | 9 | 146,609 | | 176,000 | | | | | 9 | 322,609 |
| | Predator A | | | | | | 132,000 | | | | |
| | Predator B | | | | | | 44,000 | | | | |
| 20 | SMALL UAV'S | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 20a | KC-767 | | | | 15,000 | | 15,000 | | | | 15,000 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | **899,270** | | **191,000** | | **191,000** | | **-** | | **1,090,270** |
| | **MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | B-2A | - | 96,002 | | | | | | | - | 96,002 |
| 22 | B-1B | - | 8,825 | | 95,800 | | 95,800 | | | - | 104,625 |
| 23 | B-52 | - | 92,216 | | | | | | | - | 92,216 |
| 24 | F-117 | - | 13,223 | | | | | | | - | 13,223 |
| | **TACTICAL AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | A-10 | - | 53,362 | | | | | | | - | 53,362 |
| 26 | F-15 | - | 181,602 | | 17,000 | | | | | - | 198,602 |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | ALQ 135 | | | | | | 17,000 | | | | |
| 27 | F-16 | - | 336,289 | | 22,000 | | | | | - | 358,289 |
| | Advanced IFF Interrogator | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| | TARS P3I | | | | | | 12,000 | | | | |
| 28 | F-22 | - | 70,087 | | | | | | | - | 70,087 |
| 29 | T/AT-37 | - | 78 | | | | | | | - | 78 |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | C-5 | - | 99,601 | | 21,000 | | | | | - | 120,601 |
| | AMP | | | | | | 21,000 | | | | |
| 31 | C-9 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 32 | C-17A | - | 89,144 | | | | | | | - | 89,144 |
| 33 | C-21 | - | 1,409 | | | | | | | - | 1,409 |
| 34 | C-32A | - | 187 | | | | | | | - | 187 |
| 35 | C-37A | - | 351 | | | | | | | - | 351 |
| 36 | C-141 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | T-6 | - | 3,850 | | | | | | | - | 3,850 |
| 38 | T-38 | - | 153,677 | | 20,000 | | | | | - | 173,677 |
| | Escape System | | | | | | 20,000 | | | | |
| 39 | T-41 AIRCRAFT | - | 89 | | | | | | | - | 89 |
| 40 | T-43 | - | 599 | | | | | | | - | 599 |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | KC-10A (ATCA) | - | 37,314 | | | | | | | - | 37,314 |
| 42 | C-12 | - | 19,373 | | | | | | | - | 19,373 |
| 43 | C-18 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 44 | C-20 MODS | - | 449 | | | | | | | - | 449 |
| 45 | VC-25A MOD | - | 28,031 | | | | | | | - | 28,031 |
| 46 | C-40 | - | 187 | | | | | | | - | 187 |
| 47 | C-130 | - | 110,375 | | 9,200 | | | | | - | 119,575 |
| | C-130E Engine Upgrades | | | | | | 7,200 | | | | |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | Senior Scout | | | | | | 2,000 | | | | |
| 48 | C-130J MODS | - | 36,921 | | | | | | | - | 36,921 |
| 49 | C-135 | - | 51,905 | | | | | | | - | 51,905 |
| 50 | C-29A MODS | - | 15,953 | | | | | | | - | 15,953 |
| 51 | DARP | - | 101,233 | | | | | | | - | 101,233 |
| 52 | E-3 | - | 36,025 | | | | | | | - | 36,025 |
| 53 | E-4 | - | 101,818 | | | | | | | - | 101,818 |
| 54 | E-8 | - | 45,302 | | 10,000 | | | | | - | 55,302 |
| | Blue Force Combat ID | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| 55 | H-1 | - | 6,575 | | | | | | | - | 6,575 |
| 56 | H-60 | - | 95,068 | | | | | | | - | 95,068 |
| 57 | OTHER AIRCRAFT | - | 76,701 | | | | | | | - | 76,701 |
| 58 | PREDATOR MODS | - | 31,872 | | | | | | | - | 31,872 |
| 59 | CV-22 MODS | - | 275 | | | | | | | - | 275 |
| | **OTHER MODIFICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 60 | CLASSIFIED PROJECTS | - | 20,880 | | | | | | | - | 20,880 |
| | **TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT** | | **2,016,848** | | **195,000** | | **195,000** | | **-** | | **2,211,848** |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | - | 234,103 | | | | | | | - | 234,103 |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **234,103** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **234,103** |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 223,600 | | | | | | | - | 223,600 |
| | **POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 63 | B-1 | - | 11,733 | | | | | | | - | 11,733 |
| 64 | B-2A | - | 6,801 | | | | | | | - | 6,801 |
| 65 | B-2A | - | 30,683 | | | | | | | - | 30,683 |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 66 | B-52 | - | 19,405 | | | | | | | - | 19,405 |
| 67 | C-130 | - | 1,229 | | | | | | | - | 1,229 |
| 68 | F-15 | - | 13,407 | | | | | | | - | 13,407 |
| 69 | F-16 | - | 11,531 | | | | | | | - | 11,531 |
| | **INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS | - | 21,082 | | | | | | | - | 21,082 |
| | **WAR CONSUMABLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 71 | WAR CONSUMABLES | - | 41,314 | | | | | | | - | 41,314 |
| | **OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 72 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | - | 309,725 | | 65,000 | | | | | - | 374,725 |
| | Sniper XR Advanced Targeting Pod | | | | | | 65,000 | | | | |
| 73 | DEPOT MODERNIZATION | - | 34,464 | | | | | | | - | 34,464 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 74 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **DARP** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | DARP | - | 64,941 | | | | | | | - | 64,941 |
| | **CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | SUPPLY DEPOTS/OPERATIONS (NON-IF) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | **789,915** | | **65,000** | | **65,000** | | **-** | | **854,915** |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | **13,163,174** | | **486,000** | | **522,700** | | **(36,700)** | | **13,649,174** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Advanced targeting pod*

The budget request contained $309.7 million for other production charges, of which $52.3 million was for procurement of advanced targeting pods (ATP).

The ATP will supplement and replace existing targeting pods while providing improved infra-red technology, improved laser capability, a laser spot tracker, and enhanced combat identification. The committee notes that the budget request would only provide forty-four percent of the fiscal year 2005 inventory requirement for targeting pods, and understands that current budget plans would leave the Department of the Air Force 300 ATPs short of its inventory requirement. Additionally, the committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included accelerated ATP procurement as his second highest unfunded priority for fiscal year 2005.

Therefore, the committee recommends $374.7 million for other production charges, an increase of $65.0 million to accelerate the procurement of ATPs.

*B–1B modifications*

The budget request contained $8.8 million for B–1B procurement modifications, but included no funds for modifications or operations and maintenance required to regenerate 17 additional aircraft.

The committee notes that the Air Force had planned to retire 32 of its 92–aircraft B–1B aircraft fleet by the end of fiscal year 2004. However, in its report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) the committee noted the B–1B's long-range capability to deliver conventional precision-guided munitions against strategic and tactical targets during the recent Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, and the B–1B's crucial contribution to the success of both operations. Moreover, the committee continues to believe that possible future conflicts could require an increased number of long-range bomber aircraft to deliver precision-guided munitions since basing for shorter range aircraft may not be assured.

To address the need for additional long-range bomber aircraft in fiscal year 2004, the committee recommended an increase of $20.3 million for B–1B modifications to begin the regeneration of 23 of the 32 aircraft planned for retirement, because, only 23 were available for regeneration at that time. The committee notes that $17.0 million was appropriated in fiscal year 2004 for this purpose. For fiscal year 2005, the committee understands that only 17, rather than 23, of the 32 B–1Bs scheduled for retirement can now be reasonably regenerated to an operational condition, and that the Department of the Air Force plans to regenerate 7 of those 17 aircraft. The Department, however, has not included the additional $7.5 million to operate and maintain these aircraft in its fiscal year 2005 budget request. To address this shortfall, the committee recommends a $7.5 million increase for this purpose elsewhere in this report.

Since the committee continues to believe that all 17 of those aircraft should be regenerated, it recommends $104.6 million for B–1B procurement modifications, an increase of $95.8 million for the necessary upgrades for 10 additional B–1B aircraft. Elsewhere in

this report, the committee recommends an increase of $149.9 million to operate and maintain these aircraft for fiscal year 2005.

In making this recommendation, the committee understands that an additional $732.5 million will need to be budgeted in various appropriations for fiscal years 2006 through 2011 to provide for these aircraft, and strongly encourages the Department to take this action.

*C–5 modifications*

The budget request contained $99.6 million for C–5 modifications, of which $89.7 million was included for 18 C–5 avionics modernization program (AMP) kits.

The C–5 AMP replaces unreliable and unsupportable engine flight instruments and flight system components. The committee understands that increased C–5 AMP funding is critical to sustain the operational utility and viability of the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard C–5A fleet.

Consequently, the committee recommends $120.6 million for C–5 modifications, an increase of $21.0 million for 6 C–5 additional AMP kits.

*C–17*

The C–17 is a strategic cargo aircraft, capable of rapid delivery to main operating bases or 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 that delivers 15 aircraft per year with the last deliveries under the existing contract scheduled for fiscal year 2008. The Department of the Air Force currently plans for an inventory of 180 C–17 aircraft.

The committee notes that the January 2001 Mobility Requirements Study 2005 (MRS–05) concluded that the airlift capacity to transport 54.5 million ton miles per day (MTM/D) is needed to execute the national military strategy with a moderate degree of risk, but that currently airlift capacity is approximately 44.7 MTM/D, a shortage of 9.8 MTM/D. In testimony before the committee's Projection Forces Subcommittee on March 17, 2004, the Commander of the U.S. Transportation Command noted that a new Mobility Capabilities Study (MCS) is underway and stated that, "we need to make sure that we meet at least the requirements of MRS–05 plus whatever MCS lays on the table." This would require an inventory of at least 222 C–17s, 42 more than now planned to meet mobility requirements.

Accordingly, the committee strongly urges the Department of the Air Force to budget for continued C–17 procurement through a multiyear program to procure at least 42 additional C–17 aircraft.

*C–17 maintenance training system*

The budget request contained $2,512.5 million to procure 14 C–17 aircraft and associated support equipment, of which $45.0 million was included for a C–17 maintenance training system (MTS) at Travis Air Force Base, California, but included no funds for an MTS at Hickam AFB, Hawaii.

The C–17 MTS consists of three maintenance training devices designed to qualify personnel, and to sustain proficiency, in the main-

tenance of the C–17's engines, aircraft systems, and avionics. The committee understands that eight C–17 aircraft are planned for delivery to Hickam AFB in December 2005, and that without an MTS at this location, maintenance personnel would be required to travel to McChord AFB, Washington, for this training resulting in increased travel costs and maintenance manpower loss at Hickam AFB.

Therefore, the committee recommends $2,547.5 million for the C–17, an increase of $35.0 million for an additional MTS.

*C–130E engine upgrades*

The budget request contained $110.4 million for C–130 modifications but included no funds to upgrade the C–130E's T56–A–7 engines to the T–56–A–15 configuration.

Due to engine power limitations, the committee understands that C–130E aircraft are restricted to less demanding missions. The committee also understands that upgrading the C–130E's T56–A–7 engines to the T–56–A–15 configuration would provide a 32 percent increase in engine power, reduce time between engine overhaul by 15 percent, and provide the same engine configuration as the C–130E/H fleet.

Consequently, the committee recommends $117.6 million for C–130 modifications, an increase of $7.2 million to upgrade 20 C–130E T56–A–7 engines to the T–56–A–15 configuration.

*F–15 modifications*

The budget request contained $181.6 million for F–15 modifications, of which $3.0 million was included for ALQ–135 band 1.5 countermeasures system support equipment, but included no funds for the procurement of ALQ–135 band 1.5 countermeasures system modification kits.

The ALQ–135 band 1.5 countermeasures system modification provides a self-protection jamming capability against modern surface-to-air enemy missiles and is integrated with the F–15E's existing internal countermeasure set and its ALR–56C radar warning receiver to provide full threat coverage. The committee understands that over half of the F–15E fleet is now equipped with the ALQ–135 band 1.5 countermeasures system, and believes that all combat-coded F–15E aircraft should be so equipped until the F/A–22 and F–35 aircraft enter the Air Force inventory in significant numbers.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $198.6 million for F–15 modifications, an increase of $17.0 million for ALQ–135 band 1.5 countermeasures system modification kits, and encourages the Department of the Air Force to complete ALQ–135 band 1.5 production and installation on all combat-coded F–15E aircraft as soon as possible with a minimum production rate of two shipsets per month.

*F–16 Air National Guard Force Structure*

The committee notes that the 177th Fighter Wing (FW) in Atlantic City, New Jersey, is designated as one of several full-time Combat Air Patrol (CAP) alert sites by the United States Northern Command. The 177th FW currently possesses a primary assigned aircraft (PAA) strength of only 15 Block 25 F–16 aircraft, but the

committee believes that an increase to 24 PAA would enable the 177th FW to better meet its essential CAP mission protecting the citizens and property located on the East Coast of the United States. The committee strongly encourages the Air Force to adopt 24 PAA at the 177th FW as part of its force structure plan as soon as aircraft become available from elsewhere in active or air reserve component units, aircraft reassignments resulting from domestic or overseas base realignment and closure, or from future acquisition of F–16 aircraft.

*F–16 modifications*

The budget request contained $336.3 million for F–16 modifications, but included no funds for the AN/APX–113 Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF) for F–16 block 25, 30, and 32 aircraft, or for the Air National Guard's (ANG) Theater Airborne Reconnaissance System (TARS) pods.

The AN/APX–113 AIFF provides F–16 block 25, 30, and 32 aircraft with a capability to identify both U.S. and allied aircraft at well beyond visual ranges. The committee notes that the APX–113 AIFF is included among the ANG's significant equipment shortages in the "National Guard and Reserve Equipment Report for Fiscal Year 2005," and believes that this system is critical for F–16 block 25, 30, and 32 aircraft that perform a homeland defense combat air patrol mission. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the AN/APX–113 AIFF for the ANG's F–16 block 25, 30, and 32 aircraft.

The two ANG F–16 units equipped with TARS pods provide a responsive reconnaissance capability to support intelligence and targeting requirements of military users. The committee understands that upgraded TARS pods are available that meet Department of the Air Force operational requirements for day and night, through-the-weather reconnaissance and near real-time data link of imagery to support time-critical targeting. The committee also understands that the Air Force component commander of the U.S. Central command has requested that this capability be deployed to the Iraq theater. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million to provide one of the two ANG F–16 TARS-equipped units with two TARS pods and associated spares and support equipment.

In total, the committee recommends $358.3 million for F–16 modifications, an increase of $22.0 million.

*KC–767 aerial refueling tanker aircraft*

The budget request contained no funds for a KC–767 aerial refueling tanker aircraft. The Secretary of the Air Force has designated the KC–767 to be the replacement for the 43-year old KC–135 aerial refueling tanker aircraft.

In its report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rpt. 108–106) for fiscal year 2004, the committee noted the advancing age of the KC–135 fleet, which comprises most of the Air Force's aerial refueling capability, and expressed concern that a substantial portion of the Air Force's air refueling tanker fleet will reach simultaneous maturity, and will require substantial investment to operate, maintain, and eventually replace this fleet. To address this concern, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136)

included a provision (section 135) that authorized the Secretary of the Air Force to lease not more that 20 tanker aircraft and to procure up to 80 additional tanker aircraft through a ten-year multiyear procurement program.

On December 1, 2003, the Deputy Secretary of Defense requested the Department of Defense (DOD) Inspector General (IG) determine if there is any compelling reason why the Secretary of the Air Force should not proceed with its tanker lease program. The committee notes the DOD IG concluded that there was no compelling reason why the Air Force could not execute the proposal as planned, but that the DOD IG was critical of the Air Force's procurement strategy, acquisition procedures, and adherence to statutory requirements.

Additionally, the committee notes that the Secretary of Defense has directed other reviews of the tanker lease program including a Defense Science Board evaluation of the tanker recapitalization program, a DOD General Counsel review and update of ethics policy and training for senior DOD officials, and a National Defense University study to analyze the decisionmaking process to develop lessons learned that would improve the acquisition and procurement processes. Other on-going studies include an analysis of alternatives to meet the Air Force's aerial refueling requirements and a study of the long-term tanker aircraft maintenance and training requirements directed by sections 134 and 135 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). As a result of these studies, analyses, and investigations, the committee further notes that the Secretary of Defense has directed the Secretary of the Air Force to suspend all further negotiations on the tanker lease program.

While the committee supports the DOD and Congressionally-directed studies and analysis regarding the Air Force's tanker aircraft, it remains concerned that as the KC–135 aircraft fleet ages, the Air Force confronts a risk that the entire KC–135 fleet may be grounded pending the resolution of stress, material, or corrosion problems. The prospect of grounding the KC–135 fleet puts the Nation's long range strike and re-supply capabilities at risk when U.S. forces are globally deployed in support of the global war on terrorism. Accordingly, the committee believes that the Secretary of the Air Force should begin the KC–767 program in fiscal year 2005 in accordance with section 135 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) and section 116 and 117 of this act. The committee further understands that projected annual procurement of KC–767 tanker aircraft would result in a procurement program likely to span over twenty-five years to replace the entire 544-aircraft KC–135 fleet, and further understands that the last of the retiring KC–135 aircraft may be approximately 70 years old when they are removed from the Air Force's tanker aircraft inventory.

Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in procurement for the advance procurement of KC–767 aerial refueling tankers, and an increase of $80.0 million in PE 64XXXF for KC–767 development. Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in operations and maintenance to sustain the KC–767 system program office and for KC–767 training.

*Predator unmanned aerial vehicle*

The budget request contained $146.6 million for Predator unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV).

The committee is aware that Predator B is the next generation of the proven Predator UAV. The committee strongly supports additional acquisition of propjet Predator B UAVs. The committee also realizes that Predator A has significant capability to support operations in Iraq.

The committee recommends $322.6 million, an increase of $44.0 million for additional propjet Predator B UAVs and an increase of $132.0 million for four Predator A systems.

*Senior scout permanent carrier*

The budget request contained $110.4 million for the C–130 program, but contained no funding for the establishment of a dedicated C–130 unit for the SENIOR SCOUT mission.

The SENIOR SCOUT mission package and assigned personnel are temporarily located at the Air National Guard's 169th intelligence squadron (169th IS) in Salt Lake City, Utah. The SENIOR SCOUT mission package is a self-contained, roll-on/roll-off shelter that can be accommodated on any appropriately modified C–130 aircraft. The Joint Chiefs of Staff has mobilized this mission since October 2001 and considers this a high demand, low density asset capable of meeting current counternarcotics and global war on terrorism intelligence tasking.

The Air National Guard (ANG) supports the SENIOR SCOUT mission lift requirements. The Idaho ANG at Gowen Field has indicated that it wishes to host the SENIOR SCOUT mission personnel and is presently coordinating with the National Guard Bureau (NGB) in establishing this permanent affiliation. The committee commends both the NGB and their units for their initiative and looks forward to the 169th IS–Idaho ANG affiliation to increase mission effectiveness and availability to both the counternarcotics and the global war of terrorism.

Therefore, the committee recommends $112.4 million in C–130 procurement, an increase of $2.0 million for the establishment of a dedicated ANG unit for the SENIOR SCOUT mission.

*T–38 modifications*

The budget request contained $153.7 million for T–38 modifications, but included no funds for the T–38 ejection system upgrade program (ESUP).

The T–38 ESUP will replace the T–38's original ejection seats, add an inter-seat sequencing system, and improve escape path clearance. The committee understands that the T–38 ESUP will also result in improved accommodation for smaller and larger crewmembers not considered when the aircraft was originally fielded in the early 1960s, and notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included the T–38 ESUP among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2005.

Therefore, the committee recommends $173.7 million for T–38 modifications, an increase of $20.0 million for the T–38 ESUP.

## AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $1,396.5 million for Ammunition Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends the budget request for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **ROCKETS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | ROCKETS | - | 34,557 | | | | | | | - | 34,557 |
| | **CARTRIDGES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | CARTRIDGES | - | 149,100 | | | | | | | - | 149,100 |
| | **BOMBS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | PRACTICE BOMBS | - | 46,918 | | | | | | | - | 46,918 |
| 4 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | - | 266,489 | | | | | | | - | 266,489 |
| 5 | SENSOR FUZED WEAPON | 315 | 117,023 | | | | | | | 315 | 117,023 |
| 6 | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION | 23,137 | 521,782 | | | | | | | 23,137 | 521,782 |
| 7 | WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISP | 2,507 | 58,670 | | | | | | | 2,507 | 58,670 |
| | **FLARE, IR MJU-7B** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | CAD/PAD | - | 20,379 | | | | | | | - | 20,379 |
| 9 | EXPLOSIVE DISPOSAL | - | 2,889 | | | | | | | - | 2,889 |
| 10 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 179 | | | | | | | - | 179 |
| 11 | REPLENISHMENT SPARES | - | 4,185 | | | | | | | - | 4,185 |
| 12 | MODIFICATIONS <5M | - | 202 | | | | | | | - | 202 |
| 13 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 2,798 | | | | | | | - | 2,798 |
| | **FUZES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | FLARES | - | 123,830 | | | | | | | - | 123,830 |
| 15 | FUZES | - | 36,507 | | | | | | | - | 36,507 |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE** | | **1,385,508** | | - | | - | | - | | **1,385,508** |
| | **WEAPONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SMALL ARMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | SMALL ARMS | | 10,949 | | | | | | | - | 10,949 |
| | **TOTAL WEAPONS** | | **10,949** | | - | | - | | - | | **10,949** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE** | | **1,396,457** | | - | | - | | - | | **1,396,457** |

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $4,718.3 million for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $4,638.3 million, a decrease of $80.0 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | LGM-30F/G MINUTEMAN II/III | - | 30,143 | | | | | | | - | 30,143 |
| 2 | PEACEKEEPER (M-X) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | **30,143** | | - | | - | | - | | **30,143** |
| | **OTHER MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | JASSM | 360 | 148,161 | | | | | | | 360 | 148,161 |
| 4 | JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 5 | SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X) | 248 | 52,595 | | | | | | | 248 | 52,595 |
| 6 | AMRAAM | 202 | 107,354 | | | | | | | 202 | 107,354 |
| 7 | PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE | 235 | 20,017 | | | | | | | 235 | 20,017 |
| 8 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB | 158 | 29,257 | | | | | | | 158 | 29,257 |
| | **INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS/POL PREVENTION | - | 2,084 | | | | | | | - | 2,084 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER MISSILES** | | **359,468** | | - | | - | | - | | **359,468** |
| | **MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **CLASS IV** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE | - | 4,094 | | | | | | | - | 4,094 |
| 11 | LGM-30F/G MINUTEMAN II/III | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | MM III MODIFICATIONS | - | 640,760 | | | | | | | - | 640,760 |
| 13 | AGM-65D MAVERICK | - | 222 | | | | | | | - | 222 |
| 14 | AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE | - | 21,154 | | | | | | | - | 21,154 |
| 15 | PEACEKEEPER (M-X) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES** | | **666,230** | | - | | - | | - | | **666,230** |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE | - | 8,020 | | | | | | | - | 8,020 |
| 17 | AIM-7E SPARROW | - | 1,898 | | | | | | | - | 1,898 |
| 18 | AIM-9 SIDEWINDER | - | 6,273 | | | | | | | - | 6,273 |
| 19 | SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X) | - | 1,759 | | | | | | | - | 1,759 |
| 20 | AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15 | - | 368 | | | | | | | - | 368 |
| 21 | LGM-30F/G MINUTEMAN II/III | - | 10,016 | | | | | | | - | 10,016 |
| 22 | MM III MODIFICATIONS | - | 12,866 | | | | | | | - | 12,866 |
| 23 | AGM-65D MAVERICK | - | 1,423 | | | | | | | - | 1,423 |
| 24 | AGM-88A HARM | - | 2,868 | | | | | | | - | 2,868 |
| 25 | AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE | - | 4,609 | | | | | | | - | 4,609 |
| 26 | AMRAAM | - | 341 | | | | | | | - | 341 |
| 27 | PEACEKEEPER (M-X) | - | 11,669 | | | | | | | - | 11,669 |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **62,110** | | - | | - | | - | | **62,110** |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SPACE PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | ADVANCED EHF - ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 98,590 | | 35,000 | | | | | - | 133,590 |
| | Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellite | | | | | | 35,000 | | | | |
| 29 | WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES | - | 40,307 | | | | | | | - | 40,307 |
| 29 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 30 | SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC) | - | 9,250 | | | | | | | - | 9,250 |
| 31 | GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) | 3 | 332,763 | | | | | | | 3 | 332,763 |
| 31 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (31,991) | | | | | | | - | (31,991) |
| 32 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT | - | 29,758 | | | | | | | - | 29,758 |
| 33 | DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(S | - | 74,201 | | | | | | | - | 74,201 |
| 34 | DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE | - | 116,468 | | (15,000) | | | | (15,000) | - | 101,468 |
| 35 | DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM | - | 6,613 | | | | | | | - | 6,613 |
| 36 | TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE) | - | 74,290 | | | | | | | - | 74,290 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 37 | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH | 3 | 610,997 | | (100,000) | | | | (100,000) | 3 | 510,997 |
| 38 | MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE) | - | 102,872 | | | | | | | - | 102,872 |
| | **SPECIAL PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 40 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM | - | 332,388 | | | | | | | - | 332,388 |
| 41 | SPECIAL PROGRAMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 42 | SPECIAL ACTIVITIES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 43 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | - | 1,673,047 | | | | | | | - | 1,673,047 |
| 44 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS | - | 130,809 | | | | | | | - | 130,809 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT** | | **3,600,362** | | **(80,000)** | | **35,000** | | **(115,000)** | | **3,520,362** |
| | **TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | **4,718,313** | | **(80,000)** | | **35,000** | | **(115,000)** | | **4,638,313** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Advanced extremely high frequency satellite*

The budget request contained $98.6 million for the advanced extremely high frequency (EHF) program, but contained no funds for long lead procurement associated with advanced EHF IV.

Advanced EHF will replenish the existing EHF system and improve the capability to provide survivable, anti-jam, worldwide, secure communications for strategic and tactical warfighters. The current national space architecture plans for three advanced EHF satellites with follow-on capability provided by the Transformational Satellite (TSAT) Communications program. The committee is aware of the risk associated with the TSAT schedule and its ability to satisfy follow-on requirements which may require an additional advanced EHF satellite.

The committee recommends $133.6 million, an increase of $35.0 million for long-lead procurement for a fourth advanced EHF satellite. This additional funding may not be obligated until 30 days after a formal Air Force decision to procure an additional advanced EHF satellite.

*Evolved expendable launch vehicle*

The budget request included $611.0 million to acquire space launch services in the evolved expendable launch vehicle (EELV) program.

EELV services are procured two years in advance of an operational requirement to provide the EELV contractors time to prepare for future launches. The fiscal year 2005, EELV budget request included launch services for a spaced-based infrared system satellite launch in fiscal year 2007. The committee notes that this launch will be delayed at least a year because of technical difficulties in satellite development and therefore funding for this launch is not required.

Consequently, the committee recommends $511.0 million, a reduction of $100.0 million for the EELV program.

## Other Procurement, Air Force

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $13,283.6 million for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $13,229.3 million, a decrease of $54.3 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 2 | STATION WAGON, 4X2 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | BUSES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | AMBULANCES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 5 | LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | ARMORED VEHICLE | 1 | 250 | | | | | | | 1 | 250 |
| 7 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLE | 284 | 11,873 | | | | | | | 284 | 11,873 |
| | **CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | TRUCK, STAKE/PLATFORM | - | 8,342 | | | | | | | - | 8,342 |
| 9 | TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4 | - | 13,415 | | | | | | | - | 13,415 |
| 10 | TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4 | - | 7,855 | | | | | | | - | 7,855 |
| 11 | TRUCK MAINT/UTILITY/DELIVERY | - | 9,062 | | | | | | | - | 9,062 |
| 12 | TRUCK CARRYALL | - | 4,166 | | | | | | | - | 4,166 |
| 13 | FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE | - | 15,332 | | | | | | | - | 15,332 |
| 14 | HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP) | - | 7,555 | | | | | | | - | 7,555 |
| 15 | TRUCK TRACTOR, OVER 5T | - | 14,086 | | | | | | | - | 14,086 |
| 16 | CAP VEHICLES | - | 802 | | | | | | | - | 802 |
| 17 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 24,734 | | | | | | | - | 24,734 |
| | **SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | TRUCK TANK, 1200 GAL | - | 5,775 | | | | | | | - | 5,775 |
| 19 | TRUCK TANK FUEL R-11 | - | 14,642 | | | | | | | - | 14,642 |
| 20 | HMMWV, ARMORED | - | 2,301 | | | | | | | - | 2,301 |
| 21 | TRUCK REFUSE | - | 549 | | | | | | | - | 549 |
| 22 | HMWWV, UP-ARMORED | - | 6,953 | | | | | | | - | 6,953 |
| 23 | TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-2 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 24 | TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-4 | - | 11,127 | | | | | | | - | 11,127 |
| 25 | TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE | - | 6,820 | | | | | | | - | 6,820 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 26 | TRUCK HYDRANT FUEL | - | 45 | | | | | | | - | 45 |
| 27 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 38,839 | | | | | | | - | 38,839 |
| | **FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | TRUCK CRASH P-19 | - | 16,158 | | | | | | | - | 16,158 |
| 29 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 8,372 | | | | | | | - | 8,372 |
| | **MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | TRUCK, F/L 6,000 LB | - | 7,408 | | | | | | | - | 7,408 |
| 31 | TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB | - | 18,588 | | | | | | | - | 18,588 |
| 32 | TUNNER LOADER | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 33 | HALVERSEN LOADER | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 34 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 18,184 | | | | | | | - | 18,184 |
| | **BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | LOADER, SCOOP | - | 9,414 | | | | | | | - | 9,414 |
| 36 | LOADER, SCOOP, W/BACKHOE | - | 4,202 | | | | | | | - | 4,202 |
| 37 | TRUCK, DUMP | - | 10,609 | | | | | | | - | 10,609 |
| 38 | RUNWAY SNOW REMOVAL & CLEANING | - | 22,589 | | | | | | | - | 22,589 |
| 39 | CRANE, 7-50 TON | - | 5,827 | | | | | | | - | 5,827 |
| 40 | MODIFICATIONS | - | 4,474 | | | | | | | - | 4,474 |
| 41 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 34,013 | | | | | | | - | 34,013 |
| | **CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTM** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 43 | JUDGEMENT FUND | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT** | | **364,361** | | - | | - | | - | | **364,361** |
| | **ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | COMSEC EQUIPMENT | - | 46,867 | | | | | | | - | 46,867 |
| 45 | MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC) | - | 462 | | | | | | | - | 462 |
| | **INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT | - | 2,902 | | | | | | | - | 2,902 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 47 | INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP | - | 1,695 | | | | | | | - | 1,695 |
| | **ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (AT | - | 2,949 | | | | | | | - | 2,949 |
| 49 | NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM | - | 44,354 | | | | | | | - | 44,354 |
| 50 | THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPRO | - | 67,471 | | | | | | | - | 67,471 |
| 51 | WEATHER OBSERVE/FORECAST | - | 32,366 | | | | | | | - | 32,366 |
| 52 | STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL | - | 49,300 | | | | | | | - | 49,300 |
| 53 | CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX | - | 17,672 | | | | | | | - | 17,672 |
| 54 | TAC SIGINT SUPPORT | - | 386 | | | | | | | - | 386 |
| 55 | DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM | - | 404 | | | | | | | - | 404 |
| | **SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | - | 99,862 | | 15,000 | | | | | - | 114,862 |
| | Science and Engineering Lab Data Integration | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | - |
| | Eagle Scout | | | | | | 7,000 | | | | - |
| 57 | AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL | - | 17,324 | | | | | | | - | 17,324 |
| 58 | MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL | - | 8,982 | | | | | | | - | 8,982 |
| 59 | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY | - | 93,750 | | | | | | | - | 93,750 |
| 60 | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES | - | 38,142 | | 5,000 | | | | | - | 43,142 |
| | Joint Threat Emitter | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| 61 | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 62 | C3 COUNTERMEASURES | - | 11,812 | | | | | | | - | 11,812 |
| 63 | GCSS-AF FOS | - | 18,614 | | | | | | | - | 18,614 |
| 64 | THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS | - | 44,669 | | | | | | | - | 44,669 |
| 65 | AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) | - | 43,269 | | | | | | | - | 43,269 |
| | **AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE | - | 423,972 | | (66,600) | | | | | - | 357,372 |
| | Combat Information Transport System | | | | | | | | (60,000) | | |
| | Joint Network Management System | | | | | | | | (6,600) | | |
| 67 | USCENTCOM | - | 30,430 | | | | | | | - | 30,430 |
| 68 | DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS) | - | 8,297 | | | | | | | - | 8,297 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **DISA PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 69 | SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PROG SP | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 70 | NAVSTAR GPS SPACE | - | 10,272 | | | | | | | - | 10,272 |
| 71 | NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPA | - | 7,554 | | | | | | | - | 7,554 |
| 72 | AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK | - | 43,882 | | | | | | | - | 43,882 |
| 73 | SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE | - | 101,458 | | | | | | | - | 101,458 |
| 74 | MILSATCOM SPACE | - | 19,176 | | | | | | | - | 19,176 |
| 75 | SPACE MODS SPACE | - | 16,346 | | | | | | | - | 16,346 |
| | **ORGANIZATION AND BASE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT | - | 141,883 | | | | | | | - | 141,883 |
| 77 | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATE | - | 13,936 | | | | | | | - | 13,936 |
| 78 | RADIO EQUIPMENT | - | 8,777 | | | | | | | - | 8,777 |
| 79 | TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV) | - | 5,112 | | | | | | | - | 5,112 |
| 80 | CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT | - | 3,271 | | | | | | | - | 3,271 |
| 81 | BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE | - | 118,935 | | | | | | | - | 118,935 |
| 82 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 5,948 | | | | | | | - | 5,948 |
| | **MODIFICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 83 | COMM ELECT MODS | - | 23,400 | | | | | | | - | 23,400 |
| | **TOTAL ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP** | | **1,625,901** | | **(46,600)** | | **20,000** | | **(66,600)** | | **1,579,301** |
| | **OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TEST EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 84 | BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE | - | 15,306 | | | | | | | - | 15,306 |
| 85 | PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY | - | 1,107 | | | | | | | - | 1,107 |
| 86 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 7,607 | | | | | | | - | 7,607 |
| | **PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 87 | NIGHT VISION GOGGLES | - | 17,349 | | | | | | | - | 17,349 |
| 88 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 12,997 | | 4,800 | | | | | - | 17,797 |
| | Fixed Aircrew Standardized Seats | | | | | | 4,800 | | | | |
| | **DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 89 | MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING | - | 16,155 | | 16,000 | | | | | - | 32,155 |
| | Point of Maintenance and Combat Ammunition System Initiative | | | | | | 16,000 | | | | |
| 90 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 6,503 | | | | | | | - | 6,503 |
| | **ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 91 | FLOODLIGHTS | - | 5,882 | | | | | | | - | 5,882 |
| 92 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 9,876 | | | | | | | - | 9,876 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 93 | BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT | - | 8,401 | | | | | | | - | 8,401 |
| 94 | MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT | - | 14,019 | | | | | | | - | 14,019 |
| 95 | ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 96 | AIR BASE OPERABILITY | - | 5,432 | | | | | | | - | 5,432 |
| 97 | PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | - | 1,424 | | | | | | | - | 1,424 |
| 98 | PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCING CAPITAL EQUIIPMENT | - | 5,475 | | | | | | | - | 5,475 |
| 99 | MOBILITY EQUIPMENT | - | 320,116 | | | | | | | - | 320,116 |
| 100 | AIR CONDITIONERS | - | 1,452 | | | | | | | - | 1,452 |
| 101 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 18,811 | | | | | | | - | 18,811 |
| | **SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 102 | PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 103 | TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ | - | 4,034 | | | | | | | - | 4,034 |
| 104 | DARP RC-135 | - | 18,726 | | | | | | | - | 18,726 |
| 105 | DARP, MRIGS | - | 320,218 | | (28,500) | | | | (28,500) | - | 291,718 |
| 106 | SELECTED ACTIVITIES | - | 10,195,797 | | | | | | | - | 10,195,797 |
| 107 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM | - | 224,988 | | | | | | | - | 224,988 |
| 108 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE | - | 14,264 | | | | | | | - | 14,264 |
| 109 | MODIFICATIONS | - | 195 | | | | | | | - | 195 |
| 110 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | - | 5,767 | | | | | | | - | 5,767 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP** | | **11,251,901** | | **(7,700)** | | **20,800** | | **(28,500)** | | **11,244,201** |
| | **SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 111 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 41,097 | | | | | | | - | 41,097 |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 112 | REPLENSHIMENT SPARES | - | 297 | | | | | | | - | 297 |
| | **TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **41,394** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **41,394** |
| | **TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | **13,283,557** | | **(54,300)** | | **40,800** | | **(95,100)** | | **13,229,257** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Combat training ranges*

The budget request contained $38.1 million for combat training ranges, of which $9.2 million was included for 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 understands that the Air Force's Air Combat Command fielding plan for the JTE includes additional JTEs in fiscal year 2006, and believes that this schedule should be accelerated.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $43.1 million for combat training ranges, an increase of $5.0 million for the fielding of one additional JTE.

*Advanced compression of tactical sensor information*

The budget request included $99.7 million for general information technology, but no funding for commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) technology that would improve intelligence analysis through the use of high-quality automatic target recognition from compressed video information.

The committee is aware of COTS technology like Eagle Scout that would dramatically enhance the capability of advanced digital data and image compression technology that would automatically detect changes and objects within compressed digital video thereby improving target recognition and analysis.

Therefore the committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million for procurement and integration of COTS advanced compression, change detection, and target recognition software.

*Fixed aircrew standardized seats*

The budget request contained $13.0 million for personal safety and rescue equipment items under $5.0 million, but included no funds for fixed aircrew standardized seats (FASS).

FASS would provide crewmembers and passengers on C–130, C–135, C–5, E–3, and E–8 aircraft protection against aircraft crash loads up to 16 times the force of gravity. In prior years, the committee has supported the development of the FASS, and understands that development will be completed in the early months of fiscal year 2005. The committee continues to believe that FASS procurement would not only increase safety, but would also reduce supply and maintenance costs through the commonality and interchangeability of their parts.

Therefore, the committee recommends $17.8 million, an increase of $4.8 million for personal safety and rescue equipment items under $5.0 million for FASS.

*General information technology*

The budget request contained $99.9 million for general information technologies, but included no funds for the science and engineering lab data integration (SELDI) program.

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. The committee has recommended increases for the SELDI program in prior years, and continues to believe its implementation would improve operational aircraft readiness, increase flight safety and reduce support costs.

Therefore, the committee recommends $107.9 million, an increase of $8.0 million for the SELDI program.

*Point of maintenance and combat ammunition system initiative*

The budget request contained $16.2 million for mechanized material handling equipment, but included no funds for the point of maintenance and combat ammunition system initiative (POMX/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 the POMX/CAS in prior years.

Since the committee continues to believe that the POMX/CAS would increase the timeliness and accuracy of maintenance data collection while reducing the administrative burden on maintenance technicians, it recommends $32.2 million for mechanized material handling equipment, an increase of $16.0 million for the POMX/CAS.

## PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $2,883.3 million for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authorization of $2,950.7 million, an increase of $67.4 million, for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 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 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | WHS MOTOR VEHICLES | 1 | 40 | | | | | | | 1 | 40 |
| 2 | PROCUREMENT DEFENSE WIDE | - | 125,320 | | (30,300) | | | | | - | 95,020 |
| | Strategic Planning and Budget Domain Architecture Support | | | | | | | | (30,300) | | - |
| 3 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS | - | 23,324 | | (8,600) | | | | | - | 14,724 |
| | Horizontal Fusion | | | | | | | | (2,000) | | |
| | OSD IT Programs | | | | | | | | (6,600) | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 5 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | - | 10,487 | | | | | | | - | 10,487 |
| 6 | DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 7 | DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE COUNTERDRUG PROGR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | ANTI DRUG NETWORK | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 9 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY | - | 44,827 | | | | | | | - | 44,827 |
| 10 | CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 11 | DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM | - | 4,261 | | | | | | | - | 4,261 |
| 12 | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS | - | 5,187 | | | | | | | - | 5,187 |
| 13 | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | - | 2,639 | | | | | | | - | 2,639 |
| 14 | TELEPORTS | - | 42,710 | | | | | | | - | 42,710 |
| 15 | GLOBAL INFORMATION GRID | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M | - | 38,217 | | | | | | | - | 38,217 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 18 | INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIE: | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 19 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO OSD COUNTER-NAR( | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 20 | MOBILE SURVEY GROUP | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 21 | DEFENSE HUMINT INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) PROG | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | MICROELECTRONICS EQUIP | - | 7,874 | | | | | | | - | 7,874 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M | - | 1,496 | | | | | | | - | 1,496 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS | - | 47,633 | | | | | | | - | 47,633 |
| | **MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | PATRIOT PAC-3 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION | - | 7,187 | | | | | | | - | 7,187 |
| | **NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NGA | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | VEHICLES | | 80 | | | | | | | - | 80 |
| 29 | OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT | | 23,772 | | | | | | | - | 23,772 |
| | **DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS | - | 6,977 | | | | | | | - | 6,977 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTI | - | 2,965 | | | | | | | - | 2,965 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | - | 18,945 | | (9,000) | | | | | - | 9,945 |
| | Standard Procurement System | | | | | | | | (9,000) | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DTSA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | - | 628 | | | | | | | - | 628 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, CIFA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | TSCM EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NDU** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY | - | 348 | | | | | | | - | 348 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **TOTAL MAJOR EQUIPMENT** | | **414,917** | | **(47,900)** | | **-** | | **(47,900)** | | **367,017** |
| | **SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AVIATION PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMEN | - | 447,272 | | 7,000 | | | | | - | 454,272 |
| | IR Exhaust Suppressor | | | | | | 7,000 | | | | |
| 38 | SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS | - | 49,192 | | | | | | | - | 49,192 |
| 39 | MC-130H COMBAT TALON II | - | 82,079 | | | | | | | - | 82,079 |
| 40 | CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION | 3 | 126,083 | | | | | | | 3 | 126,083 |
| 41 | AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION | - | 10,243 | | | | | | | - | 10,243 |
| 42 | C-130 MODIFICATIONS | - | 110,666 | | | | | | | - | 110,666 |
| 43 | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT | - | 387 | | | | | | | - | 387 |
| | **SHIPBUILDING** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS | - | 29,262 | | | | | | | - | 29,262 |
| 44 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | - | (23,398) | | | | | | | - | (23,398) |
| 45 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | - | 34,921 | | | | | | | - | 34,921 |
| 46 | MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEH | - | 1,768 | | | | | | | - | 1,768 |
| | **AMMUNITION PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT | - | 34,380 | | | | | | | - | 34,380 |
| 48 | SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION | - | 12,166 | | | | | | | - | 12,166 |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS | - | 38,434 | | | | | | | - | 38,434 |
| 50 | SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS | - | 16,946 | | 14,500 | | | | | - | 31,446 |
| | Joint Threat Workstation, GSK | | | | | | 14,500 | | | | |
| 51 | SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS | - | 8,221 | | 12,000 | | | | | - | 20,221 |
| | AN/PVS 15 Goggles | | | | | | 12,000 | | | | |
| 52 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 53 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAM GDIP | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 54 | MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS | - | 1,796 | | | | | | | - | 1,796 |
| 55 | SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES | - | 16,184 | | | | | | | - | 16,184 |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 56 | SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS | - | 7,297 | | | | | | | - | 7,297 |
| 57 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 8,369 | | | | | | | - | 8,369 |
| 58 | SPECIAL PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 59 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | - | 493 | | | | | | | - | 493 |
| 60 | SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT | - | 3,449 | | | | | | | - | 3,449 |
| 61 | DRUG INTERDICTION | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 62 | MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | - | 16,830 | | | | | | | - | 16,830 |
| 63 | SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM | - | 192 | | | | | | | - | 192 |
| 64 | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | - | 233,632 | | | | | | | - | 233,632 |
| 65 | PSYOP EQUIPMENT | - | 18,388 | | | | | | | - | 18,388 |
| | **TOTAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND** | | **1,285,252** | | **33,500** | | **33,500** | | **-** | | **1,318,752** |
| | **CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **CBDP** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION | - | 104,935 | | | | | | | - | 104,935 |
| 67 | INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION | - | 131,926 | | 21,500 | | | | | - | 153,426 |
| | M40 Protective Mask (Rebuild) | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| | M45 Protective Mask (Rebuild) | | | | | | 500 | | | | |
| | M40 Protective Mask | | | | | | 2,000 | | | | |
| | M45 Protective Mask | | | | | | 3,000 | | | | |
| | Aircrew CBD Respirator | | | | | | 11,000 | | | | - |
| 68 | DECONTAMINATION | - | 11,284 | | 11,000 | | | | | - | 22,284 |
| | M12A1 Decontamination Apparatus (Rework) | | | | | | 3,000 | | | | |
| | M49 Fixed Installation Filters | | | | | | 1,000 | | | | |
| | M100 Sorbent Decontamination Kit | | | | | | 2,000 | | | | |
| | M291 Skin Protection Kit | | | | | | 3,000 | | | | |
| | M295 Equipment Decontamination Kit | | | | | | 2,000 | | | | |
| 69 | JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | - | 101,097 | | | | | | | - | 101,097 |
| 70 | COLLECTIVE PROTECTION | - | 18,394 | | 19,000 | | | | | - | 37,394 |
| | Protective Shelters | | | | | | 19,000 | | | | |

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

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2005 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 71 | CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE | - | 270,105 | | 20,000 | | | | | - | 290,105 |
| | M22 ACADA - ARNG | | | | | | 20,000 | | | | |
| | **TOTAL CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE** | | **637,741** | | **71,500** | | **71,500** | | **-** | | **709,241** |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | - | 545,392 | | 10,300 | | | | | - | 555,692 |
| | Program Increase | | | | | | 10,300 | | | | |
| | **TOTAL CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | **545,392** | | **10,300** | | **10,300** | | **-** | | **555,692** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | **2,883,302** | | **67,400** | | **115,300** | | **(47,900)** | | **2,950,702** |
| | **DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES | - | [9,015] | | | | | | | - | [9,015] |
| | **TOTAL DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Chemical agents and munitions destruction*

The budget request contained $1,372.0 million for chemical agents and munitions destruction, including $1,138.8 million for operations and maintenance, $154.2 million for research, development, test and evaluation, and $79.0 million for procurement. The budget request also contained $81.9 million in military construction for the chemical agents and munitions destruction program.

The committee notes that to date more than 8,600 tons of lethal chemical agents and munitions, over 27 percent of the total U.S. stockpile, has been safely destroyed in 4 operational chemical demilitarization facilities. The committee notes, however, that the budget request represents a decrease of $166.2 million from the fiscal year 2004 budget request, despite the increased level of activity planned for the program in fiscal year 2005:

(1) Destruction of chemical agents and munitions at six sites: Tooele, Utah; Anniston, Alabama; Umatilla, Oregon; Pine Bluff, Arkansas; Aberdeen, Maryland; and Newport, Indiana;

(2) Design, permitting, and construction activities for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternative pilot plants at Pueblo, Colorado, and Blue Grass, Kentucky;

(3) Sustainment of emergency preparedness activities and capability improvements; and

(4) Non-stockpile chemical material cleanup and disposal efforts.

The committee also notes that the fiscal year 2005 budget request reduced the fiscal year 2005 estimate for the chemical demilitarization program for completion, equipping, and systemization of the Pueblo Army Depot pilot plant from $151.7 million to $4.9 million. The committee is informed that an analysis of alternatives for potential redesign of that plant is underway. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2004 the results of the analysis of alternatives, the recommended course of action for proceeding with the construction of the Pueblo facility and destruction of the stockpile, and fiscal year 2005 funding requirements necessary to carry out that course of action.

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. 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. At the same time we must 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 proceed expeditiously in providing for a prompt, objective and deliberate independent review of the process for destroying the VX nerve agent stockpile at Newport and not proceed with that process until such a review is completed, the findings are made available for public scrutiny, and all concerned understand precisely the risks involved.

Section 1412(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986 (Public Law 99–145) requires that funds for carrying out the destruction of the U.S. stockpile shall be set forth in the budget of the Department of Defense for any fiscal year as a separate account and shall not be included in the budget accounts for any military department. In committee hearings on the fiscal year 2005 budget request, Department of Defense witnesses testified that, while the Army was executive agent for the demilitarization program, the budget for the program is funded in a defense-wide account and any increases to program funding that might be required would come from the defense-wide account and not from the Department of the Army's budget. The committee agrees that this interpretation corresponds to the intent of Congress in establishing the program.

Elsewhere in this report the committee recommends a provision that would transfer oversight of the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternative program from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to the Secretary of the Army. The committee believes that the establishment of a new management structure, which brings together all elements of the program under a single activity, as recommended by the General Accounting Office, would ensure more efficient management of the total program, and would also address the equities and concerns of those sites using assembled chemical weapons alternatives for destruction of stockpiles.

The committee recommends $154.2 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction research, development, test and evaluation, $79.0 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction procurement, and $1,138.8 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction operations and maintenance. Elsewhere in this report the committee recommends $81.9 million for military construction for the chemical agents and munitions destruction program.

*Chemical and biological defense procurement program*

The budget request contained $637.7 million for chemical and biological defense (CBD) procurement, including $104.9 million for procurement of installation force protection equipment, $131.9 million for individual protection equipment, $11.3 million for decontamination equipment, $101.1 million for the joint biological defense program, $18.4 million for collective protection equipment, and $270.1 million for contamination avoidance equipment.

The committee recommends the following increases for procurement of CBD individual protection and decontamination equipment:

| | *In millions* |
|---|---|
| M40 protective mask (rebuild) | $5.0 |
| M45 protective mask (rebuild) | 0.5 |
| M40 protective mask | 2.0 |
| M45 protective mask | 3.0 |
| M12A1 decontamination apparatus (rework) | 3.0 |
| M49 fixed installation filters | 1.0 |
| M100 sorbent decontamination kit | 2.0 |
| M291 skin protection kit | 3.0 |
| M295 equipment decontamination kit | 2.0 |

The committee also recommends an increase of $19.0 million for procurement of retrofit kits for improvement of the currently fielded chemical biological protective shelters and $20.0 million for procurement of M22 automatic chemical agent alarms for the Army National Guard.

*Countering improvised explosive devices*

The committee finds that the well-being of the members of the Armed Forces deployed in defense of the Nation is of paramount importance. Therefore, the Department of Defense should do its utmost to see that deployed military personnel have the best force protection equipment the Nation can make available.

Toward that end, the committee recommends that the Department of Defense and the military departments should, using all means at their disposal, increase the ability of currently unarmored vehicles that are deployed forward for operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom to resist improvised explosive devices, including nontraditional production sources and technologies, field-installable kits, and reprogramming of funds. Further, the committee urges the Department of Defense to immediately release all funds that have been authorized and appropriated and that have not previously been released, to the military departments for the purposes of defeating improvised explosive devices and mitigating their effect on vehicles.

In order to facilitate future such acquisitions, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2005, discussing the lessons learned from the fiscal year 2004 effort to rapidly acquire force protection equipment and possible improvements in the acquisition system reflecting these lessons.

*Guard and Reserve equipment*

The committee believes that the Chiefs of the Reserve and National Guard should exercise control of modernization funds provided for Reserve and National Guard programs and directs that the Chiefs of the Reserve and National Guard provide a separate submission for fiscal year 2006 of a detailed assessment of their modernization requirements and priorities to the congressional defense committees.

*Indexing of class A mishaps*

The committee understands that the Department of Defense seeks to index certain contract thresholds to inflation, on the grounds that over time, unintended consequences result from not adjusting values to reflect actual economic conditions. The committee also notes that the value criterion for determining a Class A mishap has remained at $1.0 million for many years, while the value of parts for, and repair of, military systems have increased considerably.

Therefore, the committee requests the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2005, his recommendation as to whether the dollar values used to classify military mishaps should be indexed, and if so to recommend a generally accepted index to be used.

*Joint threat work station, ground signals intelligence kits*

The budget request contained $16.9 million for the Special Operations Command (SOCOM) joint threat work station (JTWS), ground signals intelligence (SIGINT) kits (GSK).

The committee notes that the JTWS is presently being integrated into the SOCOM mobile force platforms. The GSK is a variant of the JTWS that provides threat warning, force protection and SIGINT capabilities packaged for ground mobile special operation forces (SOF). Its utility in the global war on terrorism operations is significant. Additional funding would permit procurement of an additional 45 GSKs for use in the field by operational forces.

The committee recommends $31.4 million, an increase of $14.5 million for SOF intelligence systems for the procurement of 45 GSKs.

*Military specifications for radomes*

The committee notes that the military specification for radomes, also known as MIL–R–7705B, was written in 1975, and believes that this specification is outdated since it does not account for technological advancements that improve signal efficiency, reduce cost, and promote easier radome installation.

The committee understands that, according to MIL–R–7705B, radomes are constructed according to four styles. One of these styles is a sandwich construction where the wall of the radome is constructed of three layers, two skins and a core material, and the dielectric constant of the skin materials is higher than the dielectric constant of the core material. The committee believes that greater efficiencies could be achieved through the use of interchangeable panels and overlapping flanges where the panels are joined so that signal loss could be diminished and installation time is reduced, resulting in lower cost.

Therefore, the committee recommends that the Department of Defense consider updating its MIL–R–7705B military specification for radomes, by adding language to the sandwich construction section of this military specification to permit panels to be arranged in horizontal rows of identical interchangeable panels. The total panel arrangement would be such that the vertically joined edges would be staggered by locating them at the center of the panels in the rows immediately above and below the joint and that the joints of the panels would be overlapping sandwich flanges having appropriate dielectric constants and dimensions to produce minimum loss at the principal frequency of the system.

*Special Operations Forces binocular goggle system*

The budget request contained $8.2 million for Special Operations Forces (SOF) small arms and weapons, but included no funding to procure the AN/PVS–15 binocular goggle system for SOF operators. The committee understands that this new binocular system will substantially improve the ability of SOF operators to conduct night operations by providing a wider field of view and better depth perception than the system currently in use. The committee notes that this item is on the unfunded priority list of the Commander, Special Operations Command.

The committee recommends $20.2 million, an increase of $12.0 million for the procurement of AN/PVS–15 goggles for SOF small arms and weapons.

*Special Operations Forces MH–47 infrared engine exhaust suppressor*

The budget request contained $447.3 million for Special Operations Forces (SOF) rotary wing upgrades and sustainment, but included only $2.9 million to procure 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 $454.3 million, an increase of $7.0 million for SOF rotary wing upgrades and sustainment for procurement of additional MH–47 infrared engine exhaust suppressors.

*Use of capability-based acquisition*

The committee endorses the Department's continuing move to capability-based planning and acquisition, a system that develops requirements based on the expected capabilities of potential adversaries rather than any specific employment scenario.

Capability-based planning can be useful in allowing for unforeseen situations. Ideally, tailoring American forces to exceed other nations' known and projected capabilities should yield an advantage regardless of the situation in which they are employed.

However, the committee notes a growing difficulty emerging from capability-based acquisition. Requiring all new hardware to exceed the posited capabilities of all possible enemies in all possible scenarios, while ignoring the likelihood of engagement against a particular adversary, leads ineluctably to more sophisticated and expensive systems. Given a defense budget top-line relatively fixed in real terms, that focus on possible future conflicts impinges on the Department's ability to meet requirements for current and known threats. The combat systems of the future fight for dollars against current logistics and operations and maintenance requirements, often to the detriment of both.

Further, designing systems to meet the most stringent adversary capabilities does not always increase the capability to address lesser or unconventional threats. Traditional force structures included a "high-low" mix, offering an optimum combination of cost and capability. If all combat aircraft, for example, are tailored to operate in the most stressing environment that can be conceived, there can by definition be no "low" side.

The Department asserts that the point of spiral acquisition is to be able to increase system capabilities as threats increase. But even the basic systems, prior to any spirals, are far more complex than will be needed in many post-Cold War conflicts.

Before capabilities-based acquisition became the standard, the Office of Net Assessment provided input to the Defense Planning Guidance indicating which threats were likely to be most significant in the future; indeed, that was the reason Net Assessment

was created in the first place. Force structures and acquisitions were designed to be relevant to what was likely to happen during the foreseeable future, recognizing that the likelihood of, for example, going to war against longtime allies was at best remote. The resulting forces can hardly be called technologically inadequate.

As the military continues to operate at an unprecedented tempo around the globe against largely unsophisticated threats, the committee is concerned that use of capabilities-based acquisition, unleavened by common sense input as to the probability of a particular capability threat being used, will increase the pressure placed on the budgeting necessary to fight and win the wars in which we are currently engaged.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

#### Sections 101–104—Authorization of Appropriations

These sections would authorize the recommended fiscal year 2005 funding levels for all procurement accounts.

### SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM MATTERS

#### Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for the M777 Lightweight 155mm Howitzer Program

This section would permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Army to enter into a joint-service multiyear contract for procurement of the Lightweight 155mm Howitzer.

#### Section 112—DDG–51 Modernization Program

This section would direct the Secretary of the Navy to accelerate modernization of in-service guided missile destroyers (DDG–51) and expansion of the DDG–51 modernization program to include additional emphasis to reduce crew size to about 200.

The budget request contained $3,445.0 million for procurement of three guided missile destroyers (DDG–51), but included no funding for in-service DDG–51 modernization.

The committee notes that the Navy is scheduled to commence a DDG–51 modernization plan in fiscal year 2005 with new construction and subsequently extend modernization to in-service destroyers. The committee is aware that the foundations for DDG–51 modernization are: increased warfighting capability, leverage of the DDG–51 shipbuilding program, reduction of total ship ownership costs, and use of open architecture. In addition to those factors, the committee believes that reduction in crew size from the present approximately 300 to an objective of 200 personnel should also be part of the foundation of an even more aggressive modernization program.

According to the Navy, a DDG–51 class ship costs $25.0 million per year to operate, including $13.0 million for the crew. The Navy estimate is that its present modernization plan could reduce the crew cost per ship by $2.7 million per year. A larger reduction in crew size would clearly appear to result in significant savings over the estimated 18 years of remaining normal service life, especially

noting that per capita personnel costs may be expected to increase during that period.

The committee understands that the present DDG–51 retirement schedule would retire some ships significantly before their expected life. The recent report to Congress, "DDG–51 Class Guided Missile Destroyers Modernization Plan" indicates that modernization, beginning with the oldest DDGs first, "will keep the DDG–51 portion of the Aegis equipped fleet an integral part of the Navy's Sea Power 21 Plan through year 2047."

The committee believes that acceleration of the in-service DDG–51 modernization would have the benefit of providing significant additional work to sustain the shipbuilding industrial base, which would allow deliberate maturation of the next generation destroyer's (DD (X)) critical technologies prior to initiating production. The committee notes the recent testimony of the General Accounting Office and Congressional Research Service indicating that the majority of the DD (X) critical technologies are well below the acceptable level for initiating system design and development.

The committee also notes that efforts are reportedly being made to accelerate the Coast Guard Deepwater Cutter program and that the Army is preparing to award a contract to construct several high speed vessels. Both programs, if coordinated with Navy ship construction, have potential to eliminate significant fluctuation in shipyard manning and to help to stabilize the industry.

The committee understands that to increase shipyard work load, one solution would be to simply authorize one or several additional existing class new construction ships or to accelerate commencement of acquisition of some other class of ship. However, the committee believes it would be much wiser in the long run not to procure additional ships for which there is no established requirement. Likewise, to accelerate development of a class whose critical technologies are not mature has proven to significantly increase costs and cause delays that exacerbate industrial base problems.

In fiscal year 2003, Congress approved and funded, above the President's request, a $300.0 million proposal that included a swap of DDG–51 and amphibious transport dock (LPD) shipbuilding workload between two shipyards handling the construction of these ships. At the time, the Navy indicated that such a workload "swap" was in the best interests of the government, providing workload stability and generally protecting a vital industrial base for the construction of surface combatants.

This swap, implemented by Congress as a way of stabilizing the workload at these yards, has been undermined by the Navy's changing construction profile. Starting in 2004 and continuing into 2005, the Navy has reduced the number of DDG–51s and LPDs in its shipyard construction plan. Each time this happens, it creates instability within the surface combatant shipyards that see workload shares decrease in both the short- and long-term. In both 2004 and 2005, the Navy's ship construction plan changed from the proposal presented in 2003, negatively impacting the construction of surface combatants and thereby the same shipyards that Congress, with approval of the Navy, attempted to stabilize in 2003.

The committee recommends $3,545.0 million for DDG–51s, an increase of $100.0 million to accelerate in-service DDG–51 modernization.

Section 113—Repeal of Authority for Pilot Program for Flexible Funding of Cruiser Conversions and Overhauls

This section would repeal Section 126 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136).

Section 114—Force Protection for Asymmetric Threat Environment

This section would require that all manned ground systems, war-fighter survivability systems, and certain manned airborne systems be assessed for adequacy in survivability and suitability against asymmetrical threats. Force protection or survivability enhancements would be developed for these existing systems through the combination of in-service modifications and tactics, techniques, and procedures. Further, developmental military system designs must account for survivability and suitability against asymmetrical threats.

The global war on terrorism has revealed a new sophisticated enemy. This foe is rapid to adapt, unbounded by civilized rules, and successfully using simple mechanisms to fight our advanced technology. Our military forces were developed to survive on the battlefield by detecting and destroying the enemy before he could see and engage our forces. Therefore, our existing manned ground and airborne systems were designed to survive in an environment that did not include the types of threats that now prevail in the global war on terrorism. Our military systems must now adapt to counter the close proximity, asymmetrical threat. Along with conventional threats, asymmetrical threats must be included as significant factors in the design and development of our war-fighter systems.

The committee recommends that military departments adapt their current war gaming and simulation systems used to test advanced concepts to include asymmetrical threat capability.

Section 115—Allocation of Equipment Authorized by This Title To Be Made on Basis of Units Deployed or Preparing To Deploy

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide that, in allocation to operational units of equipment acquired using funds authorized to be appropriated by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, priority shall be given to units that are deployed to, or preparing to deploy to, Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, regardless of the status of those units as active, Guard, or reserve component units.

Section 116—KC–767 Tanker Multiyear Procurement

This section would clarify and reaffirm that the intent of Congress behind the multiyear aircraft tanker pilot program authority established by section 135 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) is to accomplish a lease of no more than 20 aircraft and conventional purchase of no more than 80 aircraft. The provision would repeal the multiyear portion of section 135 of Public Law 108–136 and reestablish it as an authorization for the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into a multiyear contract for 80 KC–767 tanker aircraft under section 2306b of title 10, United States Code. The multi-year procurement authority provided in this section may not be executed under sec-

tion 135 Public Law 108–136 or under section 8159 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (Public Law 107–117).

### Section 117—Other Matters Relating to KC–767 Tanker Acquisition Program

This section would express the Sense of Congress that: (1) aerial refueling capability is a critical combat force multiplier, (2) the nation must expeditiously proceed with a program to replace the existing aging fleet of aerial refueling tankers, (3) in pursuing such a program, the Department of Defense should take full advantage of the United States' commercial aircraft production base, and (4) anyone currently or previously associated with this program that is found to have engaged in illegal activities should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. The provision would also direct the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with one or more new contracts to execute the program authorized by subsection (a) in section 135 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), section 8159 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (Public Law 107–117), and section 116(a) of this Act. Finally, the provision would require the creation of an advisory panel of experts to review and assess the terms of the new contract and advise the Department of Defense and Congress on whether it provides the best value for the funds expended.

The committee is deeply concerned that the ongoing multiple investigations into allegations of wrongdoing associated with this program, while necessary and proper, are needlessly delaying the pressing requirement to proceed with the acquisition of a replacement aircraft for our aging fleet of KC–135 tankers. The committee believes that a "fresh start" approach is warranted on the question of the contract proposed for the execution of the so-called 20–80 plan authorized by section 135 of Public Law 108–136. By negotiating a new contract and submitting the outcome of such negotiations to review by an independent panel of experts, the committee believes the Department can proceed with this important program without jeopardizing or undermining the various investigations presently under way at the direction of the Secretary of Defense. In turn, this approach would also help ensure that the Air Force can take full advantage of the existing availability of a "warm" domestic commercial aircraft production line ideal for the aerial tanker role. The committee is concerned that the increased costs associated with starting the production line, should production cease in the immediate future, would be significant and wholly unnecessary.

The committee notes that there is no legal or other impediment presently precluding the Department from immediately pursuing this strategy and strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to pursue this approach in advance of the enactment of the fiscal year 2005 defense authorization bill.

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

### OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $67,772.3 million for research, development, test, & evaluation (RDT&E). The committee rec-

ommends $68,128.4 million, an increase of $356.1 million to the budget request.

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH | 317,506 | 13,000 | 13,000 | | 330,506 |
| | | TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH | 651,192 | 208,300 | 208,300 | | 859,492 |
| | | TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 814,615 | 83,500 | 83,500 | | 898,115 |
| | | TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 737,373 | 26,500 | 26,500 | | 763,873 |
| | | TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 4,919,649 | (151,397) | 811,657 | (963,054) | 4,768,252 |
| | | TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 859,798 | 2,500 | 2,500 | | 862,298 |
| | | TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 966,125 | 29,503 | 30,500 | (997) | 995,628 |
| | | **TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY** | **9,266,258** | **211,906** | **1,175,957** | **(964,051)** | **9,478,164** |
| | | TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH | 476,984 | 3,000 | 3,000 | | 479,984 |
| | | TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH | 564,067 | 58,200 | 58,200 | | 622,267 |
| | | TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 677,172 | (27,152) | 140,500 | (167,652) | 650,020 |
| | | TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 2,803,667 | (8,598) | 126,100 | (134,698) | 2,795,069 |
| | | TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 8,008,517 | (360,700) | 163,400 | (524,100) | 7,647,817 |
| | | TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 653,996 | | | | 653,996 |
| | | TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 3,161,988 | 36,700 | 36,700 | | 3,198,688 |
| | | **TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY** | **16,346,391** | **(298,550)** | **527,900** | **(826,450)** | **16,047,841** |
| | | TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH | 345,500 | 2,000 | 2,000 | | 347,500 |
| | | TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH | 786,180 | 41,000 | 41,000 | | 827,180 |
| | | TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 786,994 | 71,000 | 71,000 | | 857,994 |
| | | TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 2,384,536 | 50,000 | 150,000 | (100,000) | 2,434,536 |
| | | TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 4,708,025 | 223,000 | 223,000 | | 4,931,025 |
| | | TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 747,114 | | | | 747,114 |
| | | TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 11,356,318 | 26,300 | 61,700 | (35,400) | 11,382,618 |
| | | **TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE** | **21,114,667** | **413,300** | **548,700** | **(135,400)** | **21,527,967** |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH | 190,088 | 20,000 | 20,000 | | 210,088 |
| | | TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH | 1,876,306 | (11,000) | 58,000 | (69,000) | 1,865,306 |
| | | TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 3,047,451 | 55,500 | 200,500 | (145,000) | 3,102,951 |
| | | TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 9,429,174 | 27,102 | 298,102 | (271,000) | 9,456,276 |
| | | TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 424,870 | (50,135) | 13,000 | (63,135) | 374,735 |
| | | TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 711,326 | 30,950 | 47,950 | (17,000) | 742,276 |
| | | TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 5,060,622 | (43,000) | 30,200 | (73,200) | 5,017,622 |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E, DEFENSE WIDE** | **20,739,837** | **29,417** | **667,752** | **(638,335)** | **20,769,254** |
| | | TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE | 305,135 | | | | 305,135 |
| | | **TOTAL, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT** | **67,772,288** | **356,073** | **2,920,309** | **(2,564,236)** | **68,128,361** |

## ARMY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION

### OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $9,266.3 million for Army research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $9,478.2 million, an increase of $211.9 million to the budget request.

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY** | | | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0601101A | 1 | In-House Laboratory Independent Research | 23,971 | | | | 23,971 |
| 0601102A | 2 | Defense Research Sciences | 131,206 | 6,000 | | | 137,206 |
| 0601102A | | Carbon Nano Technology | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0601103A | 3 | University Research Initiatives | 75,133 | 4,000 | | | 79,133 |
| 0601103A | | Smart Responsive Nanocomposites | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0601104A | 4 | University and Industry Research Centers | 77,658 | 3,000 | | | 80,658 |
| 0601104A | | Centers of Excellence | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0601105A | 5 | Force Health Protection | 9,538 | | | | 9,538 |
| | | **TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH** | **317,506** | **13,000** | **13,000** | | **330,506** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0602105A | 6 | Materials Technology | 15,385 | 8,300 | | | 23,685 |
| 0602105A | | Titanium Alloy Powder | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0602105A | | Ultrasonic Consolidation Matrix for Metal Composites | | | 2,300 | | |
| 0602105A | | Ballistic Shields Technology | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0602120A | 7 | Sensors and Electronic Survivability | 25,629 | | | | 25,629 |
| 0602122A | 8 | TRACTOR HIP | 6,627 | | | | 6,627 |
| 0602211A | 9 | Aviation Technology | 41,629 | 17,000 | | | 58,629 |
| 0602211A | | National Full Scale Aerodynamic Complex | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602211A | | Center for Rotorcraft Innovation | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0602211A | | Xenon Light Source for Non Lethal Deterrence from Small UAVs | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602270A | 10 | EW Technology | 18,034 | | | | 18,034 |
| 0602303A | 11 | Missile Technology | 51,993 | 10,000 | | | 61,993 |
| 0602303A | | Unmanned Systems Initiative | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602307A | 12 | Advanced Weapons Technology/HEL | 16,641 | 30,000 | | | 46,641 |
| 0602307A | | Solid State Lasers | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602307A | | Applied Weapons Technology | | | 20,000 | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0602308A | 13 | Advanced Concepts and Simulation | 15,041 | 7,000 | | | 22,041 |
| 0602308A | | Institute for Creative Technologies | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0602601A | 14 | Combat Vehicle and Automotive Technology | 69,638 | 15,000 | | | 84,638 |
| 0602601A | | Hydrogen Proton Exchange Membrane | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602601A | | Light Utility Vehicle | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0602618A | 15 | Ballistics Technology/FCS | 51,301 | | | | 51,301 |
| 0602622A | 16 | Chemical, Smoke and Equipment Defeating Technology | 3,476 | | | | 3,476 |
| 0602623A | 17 | Joint Service Small Arms Program | 5,739 | | | | 5,739 |
| 0602624A | 18 | Weapons and Munitions Technology | 44,666 | 20,000 | | | 64,666 |
| 0602624A | | Strategic Materials Strategic Manufacturing Initiative | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0602624A | | TEMPER | | | 12,000 | | |
| 0602624A | | Active Coating Technology | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602705A | 19 | Electronics and Electronic Devices | 41,236 | 39,000 | | | 80,236 |
| 0602705A | | Advanced Battery Technology Initiative | | | 20,000 | | |
| 0602705A | | Flexible Display Initiative | | | 13,500 | | |
| 0602705A | | JP-8 Soldier Fuel Cell | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602705A | | Silicon Based Alternative Substrates for IR Images | | | 3,500 | | |
| 0602709A | 20 | Night Vision Technology | 22,617 | 5,000 | | | 27,617 |
| 0602709A | | UAV Miniature Hyperspectral Coherent Imaging | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0602712A | 21 | Countermine Systems | 20,547 | 1,500 | | | 22,047 |
| 0602712A | | Stoichemetric Explosive Detection Systems | | | 1,500 | | |
| 0602716A | 22 | Human Factors Engineering Technology | 16,899 | 5,500 | | | 22,399 |
| 0602716A | | Manpower and Personnel Integration (MANPRINT) | | | 5,500 | | |
| 0602720A | 23 | Environmental Quality Technology | 17,026 | | | | 17,026 |
| 0602782A | 24 | Command, Control, Communications Technology | 18,604 | | | | 18,604 |
| 0602783A | 25 | Computer and Software Technology | 3,982 | | | | 3,982 |
| 0602784A | 26 | Military Engineering Technology | 47,152 | 5,000 | | | 52,152 |
| 0602784A | | Modeling and Anaylsis of Response of Structures | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0602785A | 27 | Manpower/Personnel/Training Technology | 15,322 | | | | 15,322 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0602786A | 28 | Logistics Technology | 21,131 | 10,000 | | | 31,131 |
| 0602786A | | M5 High Performance Fibers | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602787A | 29 | Medical Technology | 60,877 | 35,000 | | | 95,877 |
| 0602787A | | Amputee R&D | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602787A | | Applied Research Initiative | | | 25,000 | | |
| | | **TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH** | **651,192** | **208,300** | **208,300** | | **859,492** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603001A | 30 | Warfighter Advanced Technology | 68,034 | | | | 68,034 |
| 0603002A | 31 | Medical Advanced Technology | 38,404 | 8,000 | | | 46,404 |
| 0603002A | | Patient Monitor with Defibrillator | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603002A | | Rugged Textile Electronic Garments | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603003A | 32 | Aviation Advanced Technology | 69,549 | 2,000 | | | 71,549 |
| 0603003A | | VTDP Compound Helicopter Program | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603004A | 33 | Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology | 67,622 | 16,000 | | | 83,622 |
| 0603004A | | Silicon Power Light Sandwich Technology | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0603004A | | ALACV Air Burst Munition | | | 15,000 | | |
| 0603005A | 34 | Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology / FCS | 203,126 | 22,000 | | | 225,126 |
| 0603005A | | Lightweight Structures Initiative | | | 9,000 | | |
| 0603005A | | UAV Weaponization | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0603005A | | Advanced Composite Bridge | | | 9,000 | | |
| 0603006A | 35 | Command, Control, Communications Advanced Technology | 9,946 | | | | 9,946 |
| 0603007A | 36 | Manpower, Personnel and Training Advanced Technology | 7,288 | | | | 7,288 |
| 0603008A | 37 | Electronic Warfare Advanced Technology / FCS | 41,760 | 17,000 | | | 58,760 |
| 0603008A | | Portable and Emergency Broadband System | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0603008A | | Applied Communications and Information Networking | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603008A | | GalaxyVue Compression Technology | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603008A | | Advanced Antenna Technologies | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0603009A | 38 | TRACTOR HIKE | 8,035 | | | | 8,035 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603015A | 39 | Next Generation Training & Simulation Systems / FCS | 18,072 | | | | 18,072 |
| 0603020A | 40 | TRACTOR ROSE | 4,736 | | | | 4,736 |
| 0603103A | 41 | Explosives Demilitarization Technology | 9,706 | | | | 9,706 |
| 0603105A | 42 | Military HIV Research | 6,641 | | | | 6,641 |
| 0603125A | 43 | Combating Terrorism, Technology Development | 3,383 | | | | 3,383 |
| 0603238A | 44 | Global Surveillance/Air Defense/Precision Strike Technology Demonstration | 10,721 | | | | 10,721 |
| 0603270A | 45 | EW Technology / FCS | 9,382 | | | | 9,382 |
| 0603313A | 46 | Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology / FCS | 92,800 | | | | 92,800 |
| 0603322A | 47 | TRACTOR CAGE | 13,312 | | | | 13,312 |
| 0603606A | 48 | Landmine Warfare and Barrier Advanced Technology | 25,577 | | | | 25,577 |
| 0603607A | 49 | Joint Service Small Arms Program | 5,968 | | | | 5,968 |
| 0603654A | 50 | Line-Of-Sight Technology Demonstration | | | | | |
| 0603710A | 51 | Night Vision Advanced Technology | 50,071 | 11,500 | | | 61,571 |
| 0603710A | | Night Vision Fusion Technology | | | 9,500 | | |
| 0603710A | | Integrated Autonomous Situation Awareness Sensor | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603728A | 52 | Environmental Quality Technology Demonstrations | 14,666 | | | | 14,666 |
| 0603734A | 53 | Military Engineering Advanced Technology | 3,865 | | | | 3,865 |
| 0603772A | 54 | Advanced Tactical Computer Science and Sensor Technology | 31,951 | 7,000 | | | 38,951 |
| 0603772A | | Digital Army Radar Technology Development | | | 7,000 | | |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | **814,615** | **83,500** | **83,500** | | **898,115** |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | | | |
| 0603305A | 55 | Army Missile Defense Systems Integration (Non Space)/MTHEL | 53,509 | 10,000 | | | 63,509 |
| 0603305A | | Joint and Combined Communications Test Tool | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603308A | 56 | Army Missile Defense Systems Integration (Space) | 4,871 | | | | 4,871 |
| 0603327A | 57 | Air and Missile Defense Systems Engineering | 91,713 | 14,000 | | | 105,713 |
| 0603327A | | Space and Missile Defense Architecture Analysis Program | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0603327A | | Geospatial Information Decision Support | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0603619A | 58 | Landmine Warfare and Barrier - Adv Dev | 11,634 | | | | 11,634 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603627A | 59 | Smoke, Obscurant and Target Defeating Sys-Adv Dev | 6,249 | | | | 6,249 |
| 0603639A | 60 | Tank and Medium Caliber Ammunition | 39,697 | | | | 39,697 |
| 0603645A | 61 | Armored System Modernization - Adv Dev | | | | | |
| 0603653A | 62 | Advanced Tank Armament System (ATAS) / STRYKER | 51,892 | | | | 51,892 |
| 0603747A | 63 | Soldier Support and Survivability | 13,810 | | | | 13,810 |
| 0603766A | 64 | Tactical Electronic Surveillance System - Adv Dev | 15,441 | | | | 15,441 |
| 0603774A | 65 | Night Vision Systems Advanced Development | 14,047 | | | | 14,047 |
| 0603779A | 66 | Environmental Quality Technology | 9,356 | 2,500 | | | 11,856 |
| 0603779A | | Aberdeen Proving Ground Asbestos Conversion Facility | | | 2,500 | | |
| 0603782A | 67 | Warfighter Information Network-Tactical | 99,645 | | | | 99,645 |
| 0603790A | 68 | NATO Research and Development | 4,801 | | | | 4,801 |
| 0603801A | 69 | Aviation - Adv Dev | 12,113 | | | | 12,113 |
| 0603802A | 70 | Small Arms Improvement | 2,382 | | | | 2,382 |
| 0603804A | 71 | Logistics and Engineer Equipment - Adv Dev | 10,485 | | | | 10,485 |
| 0603805A | 72 | Combat Service Support Control System Evaluation and Analysis | 6,366 | | | | 6,366 |
| 0603807A | 73 | Medical Systems - Adv Dev | 10,258 | | | | 10,258 |
| 0603850A | 74 | Integrated Broadcast Service (JMIP/DISTP) | 4,356 | | | | 4,356 |
| 0603854A | 75 | Artillery Systems | | | | | |
| 0603856A | 76 | SCAMP Block II | 10,221 | | | | 10,221 |
| 0603869A | 77 | Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) Concepts | 264,527 | | | | 264,527 |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | **737,373** | **26,500** | **26,500** | | **763,873** |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | | | |
| 0604201A | 78 | Aircraft Avionics | 68,857 | | | | 68,857 |
| 0604220A | 79 | Armed, Deployable OH-58D | 20,000 | | | | 20,000 |
| 0604223A | 80 | Comanche | | | | | |
| 0604270A | 81 | EW Development | 16,879 | | | | 16,879 |
| 0604280A | 82 | Joint Tactical Radio | 121,400 | | | | 121,400 |
| 0604321A | 83 | All Source Analysis System | 5,346 | | | | 5,346 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0604328A | 84 | TRACTOR CAGE | 14,149 | | | | 14,149 |
| 0604329A | 85 | JT Common Missile | 152,381 | | | | 152,381 |
| 0604601A | 86 | Infantry Support Weapons | 28,187 | 2,500 | | | 30,687 |
| 0604601A | | Low Cost Course Correction M135 AT4 | | | 2,500 | | |
| 0604604A | 87 | Medium Tactical Vehicles/FMTV | 2,854 | 9,700 | | | 12,554 |
| 0604604A | | FMTV A2 | | | 9,700 | | |
| 0604609A | 88 | Smoke, Obscurant and Target Defeating Sys-SDD | 3,798 | | | | 3,798 |
| 0604611A | 89 | JAVELIN | 944 | | | | 944 |
| 0604622A | 90 | Family of Heavy Tactical Vehicles | 2,479 | | | | 2,479 |
| 0604633A | 91 | Air Traffic Control | 2,088 | | | | 2,088 |
| 0604641A | 92 | Tactical Unmanned Ground Vehicle (TUGV) | | | | | |
| 0604642A | 93 | Light Tactical Wheeled Vehicles | | | | | |
| 0604645A | 94 | FCS -SDD | 2,700,455 | (963,054) | | (963,054) | 1,737,401 |
| 646XAA | 94a | Reconnaissance and Sensors | | 35,300 | 35,300 | | 35,300 |
| 646XBA | 94b | Unmanned Ground Vehicles | | 57,600 | 57,600 | | 57,600 |
| 646XCA | 94c | MGVs | | 186,900 | 186,900 | | 186,900 |
| 646XDA | 94d | UGS | | 15,700 | 15,700 | | 15,700 |
| 646XEA | 94e | NLOS-LS | | 76,400 | 76,400 | | 76,400 |
| 0604647A | 95 | Non-Line of Sight Cannon | 497,643 | 345,857 | 345,857 | | 843,500 |
| 0604649A | 96 | Engineer Mobility Equipment Development | | | | | |
| 0604710A | 97 | Night Vision Systems - SDD | 24,693 | | | | 24,693 |
| 0604713A | 98 | Combat Feeding, Clothing, and Equipment | 115,093 | 4,200 | | | 119,293 |
| 0604713A | | Mounted Warrior Nomad C2 HUD | | | 4,200 | | |
| 0604715A | 99 | Non-System Training Devices - SDD | 51,694 | | | | 51,694 |
| 0604716A | 100 | Terrain Information - SDD | 3,199 | | | | 3,199 |
| 0604726A | 101 | Integrated Meteorological Support System | 2,485 | | | | 2,485 |
| 0604738A | 102 | JSIMS Core Program | | | | | |
| 0604741A | 103 | Air Defense Command, Control and Intelligence - SDD | 27,376 | | | | 27,376 |
| 0604742A | 104 | Constructive Simulation Systems Development | 42,869 | | | | 42,869 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0604746A | 105 | Automatic Test Equipment Development | 4,713 | | | | 4,713 |
| 0604760A | 106 | Distributive Interactive Simulations (DIS) - SDD | 26,985 | | | | 26,985 |
| 0604766A | 107 | Tactical Surveillance Systems - SDD | 21,821 | | | | 21,821 |
| 0604768A | 108 | Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS) | 21 | | | | 21 |
| 0604770A | 109 | Joint Surveillance/Target Attack Radar System | | | | | |
| 0604778A | 110 | Positioning Systems Development (SPACE) | 2,048 | | | | 2,048 |
| 0604780A | 111 | Combined Arms Tactical Trainer (CATT) Core | 23,849 | | | | 23,849 |
| 0604783A | 112 | Joint Network Management System | 10,726 | | | | 10,726 |
| 0604801A | 113 | Aviation - SDD | 2,378 | | | | 2,378 |
| 0604802A | 114 | Weapons and Munitions - SDD / APKWS / GAMRAAM | 125,885 | 70,000 | | | 195,885 |
| 0604802A | | Common Remotely Operated Weapon System | | | 70,000 | | |
| 0604804A | 115 | Logistics and Engineer Equipment - SDD | 89,151 | | | | 89,151 |
| 0604805A | 116 | Command, Control, Communications Systems - SDD | 219,790 | | | | 219,790 |
| 0604807A | 117 | Medical Materiel/Medical Biological Defense Equipment - SDD | 11,727 | 2,500 | | | 14,227 |
| 0604807A | | LSTAT | | | 2,500 | | |
| 0604808A | 118 | Landmine Warfare/Barrier - SDD | 51,045 | | | | 51,045 |
| 0604814A | 119 | Artillery Munitions | 133,297 | 5,000 | | | 138,297 |
| 0604814A | | BONUS Compliance Program | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0604817A | 120 | Combat Identification | 6,994 | | | | 6,994 |
| 0604818A | 121 | Army Tactical Command & Control Hardware & Software | 60,115 | | | | 60,115 |
| 0604818A | 121a | Airborne C2 | 7,995 | | | | 7,995 |
| 0604819A | 122 | LOSAT | 22,628 | | | | 22,628 |
| 0604820A | 123 | Radar Development / Sentinel | 6,107 | | | | 6,107 |
| 0604823A | 124 | Firefinder | 18,516 | | | | 18,516 |
| 0604854A | 125 | Artillery Systems | 9,550 | | | | 9,550 |
| 0604865A | 126 | Patriot PAC-3 Theater Missile Defense Acquisition | 64,178 | | | | 64,178 |
| 0605013A | 127 | Information Technology Development | 95,261 | | | | 95,261 |
| | | **TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | **4,919,649** | **(151,397)** | **811,657** | **(963,054)** | **4,768,252** |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | | | |
| 0604256A | 128 | Threat Simulator Development | 22,101 | | | | 22,101 |
| 0604258A | 129 | Target Systems Development | 11,017 | | | | 11,017 |
| 0604759A | 130 | Major T&E Investment | 57,987 | | | | 57,987 |
| 0605103A | 131 | Rand Arroyo Center | 20,012 | | | | 20,012 |
| 0605301A | 132 | Army Kwajalein Atoll | 143,921 | | | | 143,921 |
| 0605326A | 133 | Concepts Experimentation Program | 22,727 | | | | 22,727 |
| 0605502A | 134 | Small Business Innovative Research | | | | | |
| 0605601A | 135 | Army Test Ranges and Facilities | 181,114 | | | | 181,114 |
| 0605602A | 136 | Army Technical Test Instrumentation and Targets | 52,433 | | | | 52,433 |
| 0605604A | 137 | Survivability/Lethality Analysis | 44,648 | | | | 44,648 |
| 0605605A | 138 | DOD High Energy Laser Test Facility | 15,725 | | | | 15,725 |
| 0605606A | 139 | Aircraft Certification | 3,485 | | | | 3,485 |
| 0605702A | 140 | Meteorological Support to RDT&E Activities | 8,711 | | | | 8,711 |
| 0605706A | 141 | Materiel Systems Analysis | 18,000 | | | | 18,000 |
| 0605709A | 142 | Exploitation of Foreign Items | 4,740 | | | | 4,740 |
| 0605712A | 143 | Support of Operational Testing | 71,239 | | | | 71,239 |
| 0605716A | 144 | Army Evaluation Center | 62,209 | | | | 62,209 |
| 0605718A | 145 | Simulation & Modeling for Acq, Rqts, & Tng (SMART) | 1,935 | | | | 1,935 |
| 0605801A | 146 | Programwide Activities | 59,368 | | | | 59,368 |
| 0605803A | 147 | Technical Information Activities | 27,713 | | | | 27,713 |
| 0605805A | 148 | Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness and Safety | 14,611 | 2,500 | | | 17,111 |
| 0605805A | | MEMS/IMU Technology | | | 2,500 | | |
| 0605857A | 149 | Environmental Quality Technology Mgmt Support | 4,527 | | | | 4,527 |
| 0605898A | 150 | Management Headquarters (Research and Development) | 11,575 | | | | 11,575 |
| 0909999A | 151 | Financing for Cancelled Account Adjustments | | | | | |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | **859,798** | **2,500** | **2,500** | | **862,298** |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603778A | 152 | MLRS Product Improvement Program | 97,422 | | | | 97,422 |
| 0102419A | 153 | JT Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense | 81,514 | 3,000 | | | 84,514 |
| 0102419A | | Aerostat Joint Program Office | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0203610A | 154 | Domestic Preparedness Against Weapons of Mass Destruction | | | | | |
| 0203726A | 155 | Adv Field Artillery Tactical Data System | 17,994 | | | | 17,994 |
| 0203735A | 156 | Combat Vehicle Improvement Programs | 15,952 | 5,000 | | | 20,952 |
| 0203735A | | Combat Vehicle Electronics | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0203740A | 157 | Maneuver Control System - Tactical C2 | 24,753 | | | | 24,753 |
| 0203744A | 158 | Aircraft Modifications/Product Improvement Programs / Guardrail | 242,853 | | | | 242,853 |
| 0203752A | 159 | Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program | 2,427 | 3,500 | | | 5,927 |
| 0203752A | | Electronic Flight Planning | | | 3,500 | | |
| 0203758A | 160 | Digitization | 24,506 | | | | 24,506 |
| 0203759A | 161 | Force XXI Battle Command, Brigade and Below (FBCB2) | 23,510 | | | | 23,510 |
| 0203801A | 162 | Patriot Product Improvement | 31,690 | | | | 31,690 |
| 0203802A | 163 | Other Missile Product Improvement Programs | 4,863 | | | | 4,863 |
| 0203806A | 164 | TRACTOR RUT | 3,321 | | | | 3,321 |
| 0203808A | 165 | TRACTOR CARD | 9,023 | | | | 9,023 |
| 0208010A | 166 | Joint Tactical Communications Program (TRI-TAC) | 18,177 | | | | 18,177 |
| 0208053A | 167 | Joint Tactical Ground System | 9,967 | | | | 9,967 |
| 0301359A | 168 | Special Army Program | | | | | |
| 0301555A | 169 | Classified Programs | | | | | |
| 0301556A | 170 | Special Program | | | | | |
| 0303028A | 171 | Security and Intelligence Activities | | 4,000 | | | 4,000 |
| 0303028A | | Information Dominance Center | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0303140A | 172 | Information Systems Security Program | 24,725 | | | | 24,725 |
| 0303141A | 173 | Global Combat Support System | 94,215 | | | | 94,215 |
| 0303142A | 174 | SATCOM Ground Environment (SPACE) | 70,459 | | | | 70,459 |
| 0303142A | 175 | WWMCCS/Global Command and Control System | 19,204 | | | | 19,204 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0305114A | 176 | Traffic Control, Approach and Landing System/JPALS | | | | | |
| 0305204A | 177 | Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles | 27,127 | 3,500 | | | 30,627 |
| 0305204A | | Shadow UAV Improvements | | | 3,500 | | |
| 0305206A | 178 | Airborne Reconnaissance Systems | 5,128 | 3,500 | | | 8,628 |
| 0305206A | | HyLITE | | | 3,500 | | |
| 0305208A | 179 | Distributed Common Ground Systems | 43,254 | | | | 43,254 |
| 0702239A | 180 | Avionics Component Improvement Program | 997 | (997) | | (997) | |
| 0708045A | 181 | End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities | 67,236 | 3,000 | | | 70,236 |
| 0708045A | | LEAN Munitions | | | 3,000 | | |
| 1001018A | 182 | NATO Joint STARS | 595 | | | | 595 |
| | 183 | Defense Language Institute Foreign Learning Center | | 5,000 | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| XXXXXXX | 999 | Classified Programs | 5,213 | | | | 5,213 |
| | | **TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | **966,125** | **29,503** | **30,500** | (997) | **995,628** |
| | | **TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY** | **9,266,258** | **211,906** | **1,175,957** | (964,051) | **9,478,164** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Advanced amputee treatment research and development*

The budget request contained $60.9 million in PE 62787A for applied research in medical technology.

The committee notes that in Afghanistan and Iraq approximately 60 to 80 percent of all survivable combat injuries are to the extremities with 20 percent resulting in traumatic amputation. In order to provide the best care for these patients, the Surgeon General established the Walter Reed Amputee Care Center and the Army Amputee Patient Care Program at Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC). The program provides state-of-the-art treatment and is the center of a multi-site, coordinated complex of facilities involving 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.

Highlights of the program include innovative prosthetic technology; computer-assisted design and manufacturing of prosthetic devices; laboratory and training facilities, amputee education and peer visitation; clinical developments; and collaborative research in treatment, prosthetic design, and rehabilitation.

The committee strongly endorses the Army's initiative in establishing the Amputee Patient Care Program. The committee notes that one element of the program is an infrastructure improvement plan for the center, which proposes construction of an advanced amputee training center at WRAMC at a cost of $10.9 million and is addressed elsewhere in this report.

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

*Advanced battery technology initiative*

The budget request contained $41.2 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 but not limited to alkaline cylindrical cells, cylindrical zinc air batteries, high capacity nickel/zinc rechargeable cells, lithium oxyhalide and lithium ion thin-film technology, lithium copper oxide, lithium carbon monoflouride cells, and proton exchange membrane fuel cells. The committee recommends that these 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 the particular technology to meet service needs.

The committee requests the Secretary of Defense provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the next generation of lithium battery technologies for military applications. New lithium

batteries for advanced portable electronic applications should be able to significantly increase energy and power, increase safety, lower cost, and/or weigh less. The Secretary should report on all phases of research, development and production for new systems and recommend actions necessary for commercial production in a one-to-three year time frame.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 62705A for the battery/portable power technology initiative.

*Advanced carbon nano technology*

The budget request contained $131.2 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 to open the door to the creation of new sensors and other devices.

The committee recommends $137.2 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 weapons technology*

The budget request contained $16.6 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, PAC–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 is also aware of the Army's need for additional funding for solid state technology laser research in support of directed energy weapons.

The committee recommends $46.6 million in PE 62307A, an increase of $30.0 million. Of the $30.0 million increase, $20.0 million shall be for missile defense applied technology research conducted by the Army Space and Missile Defense Command. The remaining $10.0 million of the increase shall be for solid state laser technology research conducted by the Army Space and Missile Defense Command.

*Aerostat joint project office*

The budget request contained $81.5 million for the Aerostat Joint Project Office.

The committee is aware of the importance of Micro Electro Mechanical (MEMS) antenna technology to the radar system for the Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor System (JLENS).

The committee recommends $84.5 million, an increase of $3.0 million for MEMS antenna technology in support of JLENS radar development.

*Applied communications and information networking*

The budget request contained $41.8 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 $10.0 million in PE 63008A for ACIN.

*Center for rotorcraft innovation*

The budget request included $41.7 million in PE 62211A for Aviation and Applied Research and Technology. No request was included for a center for rotorcraft innovation.

The committee is concerned that continued shortcomings in national policy planning for rotorcraft research and production is resulting in the inability of the United States to effectively produce competitive world-class rotorcraft products. This is evident by key decision-makers within federal, state, and local governments, as well as private sector users, selecting foreign products to meet their rotorcraft needs. National shortcomings in this regard are further evidenced by the closure of unique National Full Scale Aerodynamic Complex rotorcraft wind tunnel resources at the National Aeronautical and Space Administration (NASA) Ames Research Center at Moffett Field, California.

The committee believes there exists a requirement to establish a center for rotorcraft innovation to coordinate technology strategies and areas of cooperative research efforts and increase public and private resources available for rotorcraft research. The committee understands that the first step toward creation of a center for rotorcraft innovation was recently taken when industry and academic leaders signed an agreement to work together with the federal government to coordinate rotorcraft research.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to establish a center for rotorcraft innovation to facilitate the furtherance of the recently created partnership between the rotorcraft industry and academia to administer collaborative research projects. Members shall include major helicopter manufacturing companies, rotorcraft academic institutions, and technology firms; the Department of Defense; NASA; and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The center shall take advantage of historical and present-day sites of helicopter technology development, rotorcraft academic institutions, and FAA technology facilities. Further, since NASA has concluded it is unable to continue to operate the National Full Scale Aerodynamic Complex, the committee recommends that the Secretary of the Army seek the transfer of the Complex to the Department of the Army.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 62211A, $10.0 million to retain the availability of the wind tunnel facilities at Ames Research Center and $5.0 million for the establishment of a center for rotorcraft innovation.

*Center for tribology*

The budget request contained $69.6 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but included no funding for a center for tribology.

The committee notes that new coatings and other surface treatments commercially available today could extend the useful life of gears and other commercially available parts from 4 to 10 times longer than current treatments. The committee is aware that this technology holds great promise for increasing the reliability for all types of military equipment, extending equipment life, and reducing fuel costs.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to work with the friction, wear and abrasion test equipment manufacturing industry to develop a commercial capability to create and standardize new test apparatus and methods to analyze new coatings more quickly.

*Centers of excellence*

The budget request contained $77.7 million in PE 61104A for university and industry research centers and included $2.5 million for a collaborative academic research effort leveraging Army Training and Doctrine (TRADOC) Battle Labs in accordance with the Army Science and Technology Master Plan.

The committee notes the Army initiative to harness university research expertise for Army-unique science and technology problems. The committee further notes the Army effort to partner university researchers at Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Insitutions (HBCU/MI) with Army TRADOC Battle Labs in an effort to accelerate the transition of research to actual technology demonstration. The committee recognizes the potential benefits in the cognitive research areas of modeling and simulation, data fusion, protective materials, maneuver, health, and human systems integration. The committee encourages a continuation of this initiative.

The committee recommends $80.7 million in PE 61104A, an increase of $3.0 million for the collaborative effort between HBCU/MI centers and TRADOC Battle Labs.

*Combat vehicle electronics*

The budget request contained $16.0 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 $21.0 million in PE 23735A, an increase of $5.0 million to develop standardized next generation electronics architectures for current and future combat vehicle programs.

*Defense language institute/foreign language center*

The budget request contained no funds for the Defense Language Institute Foreign Learning Center (DLI/FLC) for research and development.

The committee notes the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 Public Law 108–136) recommended that the Secretary of the Army establish a research and development line, specifically focused on the latest technologies and instructional methods in language and language learning that are required by the DLI/FLC. The committee is surprised that a budget request was not included in the fiscal year 2005 budget request.

The committee is aware of the increased demands within the Department of Defense for increased student throughput and expanded off-campus and distant learning sites. These current endeavors necessitate innovative approaches in the instruction of foreign languages and the educational processes to administer them.

The committee applauds the progress of DLI/FLC's innovative practices in meeting this challenge and supports the efforts in seeking new methods in teaching foreign languages and language learning to meet the goals of the Department and the National Security Agency.

Therefore the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to establish a new research and development program in fiscal year 2005 for the DLI/FLC, entitled, "Defense Language Institute, Foreign Learning Center" and recommends $5.0 million for this purpose.

*Digital array radar technology development*

The budget request contained $32.0 million in PE 63772A for advanced tactical computer science and sensor technology, but included no funds for digital array radar technology development.

The committee is aware that evolving threats place new demands on sensors and notes that in particular the ground forces need reliable, transportable counter-fire radars to protect against mobile threats.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63772A to develop a transportable, ground-based, digital solid-state multi-mission radar.

*Electronic flight planning*

The budget request contained $2.4 million in PE 23752A for the aircraft engine component improvement program, but included no funding for electronic flight planning.

The committee believes that electronic flight planning will improve force protection and operational performance knowledge of helicopter aircrews in the combat environment.

The committee recommends $5.9 million in PE 23752A, an increase of $3.5 million for electronic flight planning.

*Flexible display initiative*

The budget request contained $41.2 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 $13.5 million in PE 62705A for the flexible display initiative.

*Force XXI battle command brigade and below blue force tracking system*

The committee recognizes the Army's superb efforts to establish a truly network-centric (tactical) command, control, and communications (C3) capability through the fielding of the Force XXI Battle Command Brigade and Below (FBCB2) Blue Force Tracking system by employing a satellite communications network. The committee notes the accelerated fielding of this enhanced version of FBCB2 prior to commencement of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom proved to be an invaluable situational awareness tool for the warfighters and saved lives.

The committee strongly recommends the Department of Defense leverage the Army's investment into a joint solution providing interoperability to all military services. Furthermore, the committee recommends the Army maintain the role of executive agent for this joint capability and directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on its vision for a joint blue force situational awareness capability that builds upon the successes of previous operations.

*Future combat systems*

The budget request included $3,198.1 million in PE 64645A and PE 64647A for the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program.

The committee believes that the March 2004 General Accounting Office assessment is correct and is particularly concerned that the system network, the heart of this transformational concept, is by far the most technically challenging aspect of the FCS program. The committee believes that the demonstrations required by this section should begin early in system development and become increasingly more complex. In order to accomplish the direction of this section in regard to demonstrating the capabilities of the network, the committee recommends that the Secretary of the Army direct the U.S. Army Communications Electronics Command to test emerging network concepts in small scale field exercises at readily accessible range facilities.

Further, the committee believes that to provide for necessary congressional oversight the Department of the Army's budget justification documents should provide separate justification of the major elements of the FCS program, as shown in the accompanying tables.

The committee recommends $2,952.8 million in PE 64645A and PE 64647A for FCS, a reduction of $245.3 million as detailed in section 211 of this report.

*Geospatial information decision support for single integrated air picture*

The budget request contained $91.7 million in PE 63327A for air and missile defense systems engineering, but included no funding for geospatial information decision support for the single integrated air picture (GIDS–SIAP).

The committee notes that there is a need for commanders to have a clear, unambiguous geospatial foundation in order to support a common operational picture. The committee is aware that GIDS–SIAP will integrate disparate geospatial information systems to provide ground and air picture recommendations for the commanders.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63327A for GIDS–SIAP.

*Human systems integration*

The budget request included $16.9 million in PE 62716A for human factors engineering, $61.1 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology, and $71.5 million in PE 62202F for human effectiveness applied research.

The committee recognizes the need to consider human systems integration issues early in the development cycle. Too often, man-machine interface issues are not addressed until late in the development cycle after the configuration of a particular weapon or system has been set. What results is a degraded combat system that is not able to achieve its maximum performance and, at worst, becomes a liability on the battlefield.

The committee notes that all the military departments include some form of human systems integration in their development and acquisition process, but believes that institutionalization and standardization of human systems integration methodologies and modeling tools across the Department of Defense is desirable. To this end, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense conduct a comprehensive Department-wide review of the implementation of human systems integration in defense acquisition programs. Further, the committee recommends additional resources for human factors engineering initiatives in each of the military departments.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in PE 62716A for development of manpower and personnel integration (MANPRINT) tools for modeling and predicting soldier and system performance; increases of $3.0 million in PE 63236N and $2.0 million in PE 62233N to develop cognitive and physiological research data under the Navy's system engineering, acquisition and personnel integration (SEAPRINT) program; and an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62202F for the development of new training algorithms for human performance prediction under the Air Force's improved performance research integration tool (IMPRINT) program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of human systems integration programs within the Department and to report the results of that review to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2004.

*Hydrogen proton exchange membrane*

The budget request contained $69.6 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 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.

*Information dominance center*

The budget request contained no funds for operations and maintenance or research and development for the Army's information dominance center (IDC) at Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

The IDC provides multi-disciplinary Information Operations (IO) support to the Army's commands. Through tailored analytical products generated to meet immediate operational needs, the IDC also monitors potential trouble spots worldwide, preparing to support contingency operations with IO-related products. The committee believes the IDC's use of high-capacity communications links to access selected information from a number of databases maintained by a number of other organizations is truly transformational.

The committee acknowledges that the IDC is one of the Army Chief of Staff's unfunded priorities intelligence objectives. The committee supports the transformation efforts of the IDC and the future plan to incorporate functions of the IDC into the Army's Distributed Common Ground Systems (DCGS).

Therefore, the committee recommends $6.0 million in operations and maintenance, Army for IDC, an increase of $6.0 million, and $4.0 million in PE 33028A, an increase of $4.0 million for research and technology development at the IDC.

*Institute for creative technologies*

The budget request contained $15.0 million in PE 62308A for advanced concepts and simulation, including $1.6 million for the institute for creative technologies (ICT).

The committee notes that the technologies developed at the ICT are being applied to significantly improve fidelity of computer-based training, which is essential to the Army.

The committee supports development of improved training devices and recommends $22.0 million in PE 62308A, an increase of $7.0 million for the ICT.

*Integrated communications navigation identification avionics program*

The committee is aware that during the execution of the now canceled Comanche program, significant progress had been made in development of the Integrated Communications Navigation Identification Avionics (ICNIA) system. The Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) has been selected as the joint standard radio system for all services and has also made significant technical progress and is scheduled to begin testing in the first quarter of fiscal year 2005. After the cancellation of the Comanche program the Army convened an independent assessment panel to compare the relative performance of the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) and ICNIA. The committee is aware that a second evaluation has been requested as a result of the independent assessment team's review.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit the results of the independent assessment panel and subsequent evaluations to the congressional defense committees. The committee further directs the Secretary, prior to a final decision or selection of JTRS or ICNIA as the standard for Army aviation or the obligation of fiscal year 2005 authorized amounts for JTRS, to brief the congressional defense committees on the criteria of selection and the performance comparison of these two avionics systems.

*Joint and combined communications test tool product suite*

The budget request contained $53.5 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense systems integration, but included no funding for the joint and combined communications test tool product suite.

The committee notes that the joint and combined communications test tool product suite will provide a test tool suite that will test interoperability issues within joint and combined forces.

The committee recommends $63.5 million in PE 63305A, an increase of $10.0 million for the joint and combined communications test tool product suite.

*JP–8 soldier fuel cell*

The budget request contained $41.2 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 are essential to success on the modern battlefield to power a variety of devices. 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 $2.0 million in PE 62705A for development of the JP–8 soldier fuel cell.

*LEAN munitions*

The budget request contained $67.2 million in PE 78045A for end item industrial preparedness activities, but included no funds for the second phase of the LEAN Munitions program.

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 life cycle support environment would enable the more timely and affordable production and sustainment of current and future munitions systems.

The committee recommends $70.2 million in PE 70845A, an increase of $3.0 million to continue the LEAN Munitions program.

*Light unmanned aerial vehicle weaponization*

The budget request contained $203.1 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but included no funds for light unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) weaponization.

The committee notes that historically, light UAVs have been unable to carry weapons. The committee is aware that a unique, pat-

ented, electronically-fired, stacked-round technology has been developed that lends itself to the stringent restrictions of lightweight UAV weaponization.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63005A for integration of the unique electronically-fired, stacked-round capability with a light UAV such as the Defense Advanced Research Agency DP–5 UAV.

*Light utility vehicle*

The budget request contained $69.6 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but included no funding for the light utility vehicle.

The committee believes that 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 $5.0 million in PE 62601A to design, develop, and deliver an operational prototype LUV.

*Lightweight structures initiative*

The budget request contained $203.1 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but included no funding for the Army lightweight structures initiative (ALSI).

The committee is aware that the objective of the ALSI program is to develop, design, demonstrate, validate and implement a methodology for producing lightweight vehicle structure components and assemblies for the Army Future Combat Systems. The committee notes that the methodology utilized has been proven to substantially reduce costs and weights of structures in the automotive and aerospace applications.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 63005A for the ALSI.

*Low cost course correction*

The budget request contained $28.2 million in PE 64601A for infantry support weapons, of which no funds were requested for Low Cost Course Correction.

The committee has been encouraged by the demonstration of Low Cost Course Correction (LCCC) technology.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 64601A to accelerate the development of LCCC for projectiles in the 20mm to 100mm range.

*M5 high performance fiber for personnel armor systems*

The budget request contained $21.1 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 $31.1 million in PE 62786A, an increase of $10.0 million to hasten development and evaluation of M5 fiber and M5 based armor.

*Medical technology applied research initiative*

The budget request contained $60.9 million in PE 62787A for medical technology applied research.

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.

The committee recommends the establishment of a medical technology applied research initiative that would provide the opportunity for emerging medical technologies and concepts to compete for funding on the basis of peer-reviewed technical merit. The committee recommends that the medical projects and technologies to be considered for funding under the initiative, include, but are not limited to the following:

(1) Bio-activity of nanomaterials;
(2) Bio-defense gene knockout technology;
(3) Dermal phase meter;
(4) Elgen gene delivery technology;
(5) Fibrin bandage from non-mammalian sources;
(6) Nano-fabricated Bio-artificial kidney; and
(7) Rapid Bio-pathogen detection technology.

The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 62787A for the medical technology applied research initiative.

*Clinical research programs*

The committee understands that the primary federal agency responsible for conducting research into diseases affecting a broad demographic portion of the population is the Department of Health and Human Services. Nonetheless, the Department of Defense (DOD), and in particular the Department of the Army, has at the direction of Congress conducted and managed research for a number of diseases that particularly affect military members, their family members, and military retirees. In fact, the Army provides special scrutiny to these programs, since they are congressional directed and necessarily involve clinical trials conducted over several years.

While the committee applauds the Department's efforts to manage these programs, the committee is concerned that there may be missed opportunities to conduct research into other vital areas. For example, service members, family members, and military retirees are certainly affected by such serious and increasingly prevalent diseases as lung cancer and diabetes, yet no formal program exists for either.

The committee believes that a comprehensive review of these research programs is necessary so that research can be directed into areas that may have been neglected. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review ongoing clinical research efforts within the military departments and report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2005, whether any research programs should be added to the DOD's efforts. The committee believes that lung cancer and diabetes are excellent candidates for military sponsored research and urges the Secretary to give every consideration to establishing formal programs to fight these diseases, as they relate to military service.

*Medium tactical truck development*

The budget request contained $2.9 million in PE 64604A for the continued development of medium tactical truck technologies and enhancements.

The family of medium tactical vehicles (FMTV) A2 will be the next generation of FMTVs. The committee understands additional funds are required to ensure synchronization with the fielding of the Army's Future Combat Systems (FCS) Increment I Unit of Action. The committee also notes these additional funds will enable the spiraling of FCS-like technologies into the tactical truck fleet, ensuring interoperability and maximizing future force capability.

The committee recommends $12.6 million in PE 64604A, an increase of $9.7 million, to further the development of medium tactical truck technologies.

*Miniature sensor development for small and tactical unmanned aerial vehicles*

The budget request contained $22.6 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 $27.6 million in PE 62709A, an increase of $5.0 million for miniaturized hyperspectral and coherent imaging sensors for small and tactical UAVs.

*Modeling and analysis of the response of structures*

The budget request contained $47.2 million in PE 62784A for military engineering technology, 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 $52.2 million in PE 62784A, an increase of $5.0 million for MARS.

*Night vision fusion*

The budget request contained $50.1 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 adver-

saries. 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 $9.5 million in PE 63710A to accelerate development and fielding of pixel level, digital fusion of light intensification and infrared image technology.

*Patient monitor with defibrillator*

The budget request contained $38.4 million in PE 63002A for medical advanced technology development.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63002A for development of advanced technology for a compact, lightweight, full-featured patient monitor with defibrillator.

*Portable and mobile emergency broadband system*

The budget request contained $41.8 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 $4.0 million in PE 63008A to complete critical development of the portable and mobile emergency broadband system.

*Shadow tactical unmanned aerial vehicle*

The budget request contained $27.1 million in PE 35204A for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUAV).

The committee is aware that the three major improvements to the Shadow 200 TUAV based on operational evaluation were incorporation of the tactical common data link (TCDL), changes to reduce target location error, and a larger wing to increase both payload and endurance. The committee understands that the only remaining engineering necessary to include all three improvements in future Shadow 200 production is software modifications associated with TCDL.

The committee fully supports expediting completion of these improvements in order to field the most capable Shadow 200 to ground forces. Therefore the committee recommends $30.6 million in PE 35204A, an increase of $3.5 million to complete required Shadow non-recurring engineering for these improvements.

*Smart responsive nanocomposites*

The budget request contained $75.1 million in PE 61103A for University Research Initiatives, but included no funding for smart responsive nanocomposites (SRN).

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

The committee recommends $79.1 million in PE 61103A, an increase of $4.0 million to develop a smart responsive nanostructured

material, which combines detection of toxins and alarm-release with self-cleaning and self-repairing material.

*Space and missile defense architecture analysis program*

The budget request contained $91.7 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 in providing the essential analytical, modeling, and simulation tools to support advanced concepts and architectures of future forces.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63327A for the ASMD architecture analysis program.

*Strategic materials strategic manufacturing initiative*

The budget request contained $44.7 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 supports an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62624A for SM2i.

*Titanium alloy powder*

The budget request contained $15.4 million in PE 62105A for materials technology, but included no funding for titanium, titanium-alloy powder production.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62105A to enhance the domestic capacity to produce inexpensive, high-quality titanium powder for military use.

*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 $12.0 million in PE 62624A for TEMPER.

*Unmanned systems initiative*

The budget request contained $52.0 million in PE 62303A for missile technology, but included no funding for the unmanned systems initiative.

The committee recognizes the unmanned systems initiative will support battlefield control of multiple unmanned assets.

The committee recommends $62.0 million in PE 62303A, an increase of $10.0 million for the unmanned systems initiative.

## NAVY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $16,346.4 million for Navy research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $16,047.8 million, a decrease of $298.6 million to the budget request.

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY** | | | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0601103N | 1 | University Research Initiatives | 83,508 | | | | 83,508 |
| 0601152N | 2 | In-House Laboratory Independent Research | 17,664 | | | | 17,664 |
| 0601153N | 3 | Defense Research Sciences | 375,812 | 3,000 | | | 378,812 |
| 0601153N | | Nanoscience and Nanomaterials | | | 3,000 | | |
| | | **TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH** | **476,984** | **3,000** | **3,000** | | **479,984** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0602114N | 4 | Power Projection Applied Research | 98,831 | 8,000 | | | 106,831 |
| 0602114N | | Integrated Personnel Protection System | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0602114N | | Interrogator for High-Speed Retro-Reflective Communications | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0602114N | | Terahertz for Photonics for Imaging | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602123N | 5 | Force Protection Applied Research | 96,269 | 7,000 | | | 103,269 |
| 0602123N | | Hybrid POSS Composites | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602123N | | Center for Critical Infrastructure Protection | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0602131M | 6 | Marine Corps Landing Force Technology | 35,398 | | | | 35,398 |
| 0602232N | 7 | Communications, Command and Control, Intell, Surveillance | | | | | |
| 0602233N | 8 | Human Systems Technology | | 2,000 | | | 2,000 |
| 0602233N | | Human Systems Integration | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602234N | 9 | Materials, Electronics and Computer Technology | | | | | |
| 0602235N | 10 | Common Picture Applied Research | 60,134 | 6,000 | | | 66,134 |
| 0602235N | | Theater Undersea Warfare Initiative | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0602236N | 11 | Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research | 63,726 | 17,200 | | | 80,926 |
| 0602236N | | Formable Aligned Carbon Thermosets | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602236N | | Marine Mammal Research Program | | | 2,200 | | |
| 0602236N | | Composite Ceramic UUV | | | 8,000 | | |
| 0602236N | | Composite Ceramic Materials for Aerospace Fabrication | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0602271N | 12 | RF Systems Applied Research | 49,151 | 17,000 | | | 66,151 |
| 0602271N | | Vacuum Technology | | | 10,000 | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0602271N | | Gallium Nitride RF Power Technology | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0602271N | | Wide Band Gap Semiconductor Technology | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0602435N | 13 | Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research | 48,482 | | | | 48,482 |
| 0602747N | 14 | Undersea Warfare Applied Research | 64,060 | 1,000 | | | 65,060 |
| 0602747N | | Low Acoustic Signature Motor/Propulsor | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0602782N | 15 | Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Applied Research | 48,016 | | | | 48,016 |
| | | **TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH** | **564,067** | **58,200** | **58,200** | | **622,267** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603114N | 16 | Power Projection Advanced Technology | 92,359 | 25,000 | | | 117,359 |
| 0603114N | | DP-2 Thrust Vectoring System | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603114N | | Laser Radar Data Exploitation | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603114N | | Low-Cost Terminal Imaging Seeker | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603114N | | Low Power Mega Performance UAV Processing Engine | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0603123N | 17 | Force Protection Advanced Technology/LSC-X | 82,130 | 59,500 | | | 141,630 |
| 0603123N | | Littoral Support Craft Experimental | | | 25,800 | | |
| 0603123N | | Superconducting DC Homopolar Motor | | | 9,200 | | |
| 0603123N | | Project M | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0603123N | | High Temperature Superconducting AC Synchronous Ship Propulsion Motor | | | 8,000 | | |
| 0603123N | | Technologies for Future Naval Capabilities | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603123N | | Electromagnetic Gun Program | | | 9,500 | | |
| 0603123N | | High-Speed Power Node Switching Center | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0603235N | 18 | Common Picture Advanced Technology | 79,521 | 4,000 | | | 83,521 |
| 0603235N | | Consolidated Undersea Situational Awareness | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0603236N | 19 | Warfighter Sustainment Advanced Technology | 61,103 | 15,000 | | | 76,103 |
| 0603236N | | Intermediate Modulus COTS Carbon Fiber Qualification | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0603236N | | Emerging/Critical Interconnection Technology | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0603236N | | Virtual, At Sea Training Initiative | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0603236N | | Human Systems Integration | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603271N | 20 | RF Systems Advanced Technology | 44,046 | 21,500 | | | 65,546 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603271N | | Vacuum Technology | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603271N | | APY-6 Realtime Precision Targeting Radar | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603271N | | Remote Ocean Surveillance System | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603271N | | SCOUT Radar | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603271N | | Spectral Beam Combining Fiber Lasers | | | 1,500 | | |
| 0603640M | 21 | Marine Corps Advanced Technology Demonstration (ATD) | 58,222 | 4,500 | | | 62,722 |
| 0603640M | | Advanced Mine Detection Program | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603640M | | Rapid Deployment Fortification Wall | | | 1,500 | | |
| 0603712N | 22 | Environmental Quality and Logistics Advanced Technology | | | | | |
| 0603727N | 23 | Joint Experimentation | 167,626 | (167,626) | | | |
| 0603727N | | Transfer PDW 81a | | | | (167,626) | |
| 0603729N | 24 | Warfighter Protection Advanced Technology | 16,719 | 11,000 | | | 27,719 |
| 0603729N | | Organ Transplant Technology | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0603729N | | Biomedical Research Imaging | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603729N | | Oxygen Dressing | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603747N | 25 | Undersea Warfare Advanced Technology | 26,515 | | | | 26,515 |
| 0603757N | 26 | Joint Warfare Experiments | 26 | (26) | | | |
| 0603757N | | Transfer PDW 81b | | | | (26) | |
| 0603758N | 27 | Navy Warfighting Experiments and Demonstrations | 16,006 | | | | 16,006 |
| 0603782N | 28 | Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Advanced Technology | 32,899 | | | | 32,899 |
| 0603792N | 29 | Advanced Technology Transition | | | | | |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | **677,172** | **(27,152)** | **140,500** | **(167,652)** | **650,020** |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | | | |
| 0603207N | 30 | Air/Ocean Tactical Applications | 24,431 | | | | 24,431 |
| 0603216N | 31 | Aviation Survivability | 10,820 | 3,000 | | | 13,820 |
| | | Reduced Risk Ordnance | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603237N | 32 | Deployable Joint Command and Control | 42,394 | | | | 42,394 |
| 0603254N | 33 | ASW Systems Development | 4,541 | 11,000 | | | 15,541 |
| 0603254N | | Claymore Marine | | | 7,000 | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603254N | | Tactical E Field Buoy Development | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0603261N | 34 | Tactical Airborne Reconnaissance / UAV CONOPS | 6,448 | (4,548) | | | 1,900 |
| 0603261N | | UAV Concept of Operations | | | | (4,548) | |
| 0603382N | 35 | Advanced Combat Systems Technology | 67,605 | | | | 67,605 |
| 0603502N | 36 | Surface and Shallow Water Mine Countermeasures | 103,308 | 20,000 | | | 123,308 |
| 0603502N | | UUV | | | 20,000 | | |
| 0603506N | 37 | Surface Ship Torpedo Defense | 46,896 | 7,000 | | | 53,896 |
| 0603506N | | Anti Torpedo Torpedo | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0603512N | 38 | Carrier Systems Development (CVN-21) | 157,479 | 10,000 | | | 167,479 |
| 0603512N | | Aviation Ship Integration Center | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603513N | 39 | Shipboard System Component Development | 18,993 | 6,500 | | | 25,493 |
| 0603513N | | DD(X) Ship System Component Development | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603513N | | Integrated-fight-through-power | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603513N | | Ultrasonic Detection Equipment | | | 2,500 | | |
| 0603525N | 40 | PILOT FISH | 78,223 | | | | 78,223 |
| 0603527N | 41 | RETRACT LARCH | 82,532 | | | | 82,532 |
| 0603536N | 42 | RETRACT JUNIPER | 36,915 | | | | 36,915 |
| 0603542N | 43 | Radiological Controls | 946 | | | | 946 |
| 0603553N | 44 | Surface ASW | 17,633 | 16,600 | | | 34,233 |
| 0603553N | | Task Force Anti-Submarine Warfare | | | 16,600 | | |
| 0603559N | 45 | SSGN Design | 19,970 | | | | 19,970 |
| 0603561N | 46 | Advanced Submarine System Development | 81,160 | 17,000 | | | 98,160 |
| 0603561N | | Composite Structures | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0603561N | | Payloads and Sensors | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603562N | 47 | Submarine Tactical Warfare Systems | 5,957 | | | | 5,957 |
| 0603563N | 48 | Ship Concept Advanced Design | 3,723 | | | | 3,723 |
| 0603564N | 49 | Ship Preliminary Design & Feasibility Studies | | | | | |
| 0603570N | 50 | Advanced Nuclear Power Systems (CVN-21) | 169,733 | | | | 169,733 |
| 0603573N | 51 | Advanced Surface Machinery Systems | | | | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603576N | 52 | CHALK EAGLE | 47,786 | | | | 47,786 |
| 0603581N | 53 | Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) | 352,089 | (107,700) | | (107,700) | 244,389 |
| 0603582N | 54 | Combat Systems Integration | 80,840 | 6,000 | | | 86,840 |
| 0603582N | | Laser Diode Arrays | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0603609N | 55 | Conventional Munitions | 34,151 | | | | 34,151 |
| 0603611M | 56 | Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV/AAAV) | 236,969 | | | | 236,969 |
| 0603612M | 57 | Marine Corps Mine/Countermeasures Systems - Adv Dev: Mine Detector | 4,522 | | | | 4,522 |
| 0603635M | 58 | Marine Corps Ground Combat/Support System | 22,440 | | | | 22,440 |
| 0603635M | | NLW | | | | | |
| 0603654N | 59 | Joint Service Explosive Ordnance Development | 18,047 | | | | 18,047 |
| 0603658N | 60 | Cooperative Engagement | 103,452 | | | | 103,452 |
| 0603713N | 61 | Ocean Engineering Technology Development | 26,232 | | | | 26,232 |
| 0603721N | 62 | Environmental Protection | 24,641 | | | | 24,641 |
| 0603724N | 63 | Navy Energy Program | 1,494 | 6,000 | | | 7,494 |
| 0603724N | | One Megawatt Molten Carbonate Fuel Cell | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0603725N | 64 | Facilities Improvement | 1,621 | | | | 1,621 |
| 0603734N | 65 | CHALK CORAL | 58,467 | | | | 58,467 |
| 0603739N | 66 | Navy Logistic Productivity | 7,421 | | | | 7,421 |
| 0603746N | 67 | RETRACT MAPLE | 275,407 | | | | 275,407 |
| 0603748N | 68 | LINK PLUMERIA | 112,997 | | | | 112,997 |
| 0603751N | 69 | RETRACT ELM | 48,130 | | | | 48,130 |
| 0603755N | 70 | Ship Self Defense | 9,493 | | | | 9,493 |
| 0603764N | 71 | LINK EVERGREEN | 63,346 | | | | 63,346 |
| 0603787N | 72 | Special Processes | 44,232 | | | | 44,232 |
| 0603790N | 73 | NATO Research and Development | 10,151 | | | | 10,151 |
| 0603795N | 74 | Land Attack Technology / AWS | 82,049 | 23,000 | | | 105,049 |
| 0603795N | | Affordable Weapon System | | | 23,000 | | |
| 0603851M | 75 | Nonlethal Weapons | 43,321 | | | | 43,321 |
| 0603857N | 76 | Joint Combat ID Evaluation Team | 13,626 | | | | 13,626 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603860N | 77 | Joint Precision Approach and Landing Systems | 32,391 | | | | 32,391 |
| 0603879N | 78 | Single Integrated Air Picture (SIAP) System Engineer (SE) | 20,252 | | | | 20,252 |
| 0603889N | 79 | Counterdrug RDT&E Projects | | | | | |
| 0604272N | 80 | Tactical Air Directional Infrared Countermeasures (TADIRCM) | | | | | |
| 0604707N | 81 | Space and Electronic Warfare (SEW) Architecture/Engineering Support | 25,943 | | | | 25,943 |
| 0604787N | 82 | Joint Warfare Transformation Programs | 22,450 | (22,450) | | | |
| 0604787N | | Transfer PDW 81c | | | | (22,450) | |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | **2,803,667** | **(8,598)** | **126,100** | **(134,698)** | **2,795,069** |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | | | |
| 0604212N | 83 | Other Helo Development | 186,970 | | | | 186,970 |
| 0604214N | 84 | AV-8B Aircraft - Eng Dev | 12,284 | | | | 12,284 |
| 0604215N | 85 | Standards Development | 57,675 | | | | 57,675 |
| 0604216N | 86 | Multi-Mission Helicopter Upgrade Development | 78,757 | | | | 78,757 |
| 0604217N | 87 | S-3 Weapon System Improvement | | | | | |
| 0604218N | 88 | Air/Ocean Equipment Engineering | 4,506 | | | | 4,506 |
| 0604221N | 89 | P-3 Modernization Program | 9,554 | | | | 9,554 |
| 0604230N | 90 | Naval Coastal Warfare | 5,201 | | | | 5,201 |
| 0604231N | 91 | Tactical Command System | 49,180 | | | | 49,180 |
| 0604234N | 92 | Advanced Hawkeye | 597,015 | | | | 597,015 |
| 0604245N | 93 | H-1 Upgrades | 90,389 | | | | 90,389 |
| 0604261N | 94 | Acoustic Search Sensors | 13,363 | 15,000 | | | 28,363 |
| 0604261N | | Automatic Radar Periscope Detection Discrimination | | | 15,000 | | |
| 0604262N | 95 | V-22A | 304,164 | | | | 304,164 |
| 0604264N | 96 | Air Crew Systems Development | 8,838 | | | | 8,838 |
| 0604269N | 97 | EA-18G | 357,502 | | | | 357,502 |
| 0604270N | 98 | EW Development | 48,956 | | | | 48,956 |
| 0604273N | 99 | VHXX Executive Helo Development | 777,398 | (220,000) | | (220,000) | 557,398 |
| 0604280N | 100 | Joint Tactical Radio System - Navy (JTRS-Navy) | 78,624 | 15,000 | | | 93,624 |
| 0604280N | | Digital Modular Radio | | | 15,000 | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0604300N | 101 | DD(X) Systems Engineering | 1,431,585 | (211,100) | | (221,100) | 1,220,485 |
| 0604300N | | Advanced Gun System for DD(X) | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0604307N | 102 | Aegis Combat System Engineering | 146,463 | 21,800 | | | 168,263 |
| 0604307N | | Open Architecture | | | 21,800 | | |
| 0604311N | 103 | LPD-17 Class System Integration | 8,988 | | | | 8,988 |
| 0604312N | 104 | JASSM | 27,047 | | | | 27,047 |
| 0604329N | 105 | Small Diameter Bomb (SDB) | 9,961 | | | | 9,961 |
| 0604366N | 106 | Standard Missile Improvements | 99,022 | | | | 99,022 |
| 0604373N | 107 | Airborne MCM | 50,514 | | | | 50,514 |
| 0604503N | 108 | Submarine Systems Development | 75,359 | 29,000 | | | 104,359 |
| 0604503N | | Advanced Processor Build Integration | | | 20,000 | | |
| 0604503N | | Affordable Towed Array Construction | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0604503N | | AN/BLQ-10 Test and Support | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0604504N | 109 | Air Control | 13,102 | | | | 13,102 |
| 0604507N | 110 | Enhanced Modular Signal Processor | 1,075 | | | | 1,075 |
| 0604512N | 111 | CV Launch / Recovery System | 28,631 | 4,000 | | | 32,631 |
| 0604512N | | Aviation Shipboard Information Technology Initiative | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0604518N | 112 | Combat Information Center Conversion | 8,228 | | | | 8,228 |
| 0604558N | 113 | Virginia Class Design Development | 143,270 | 10,000 | | | 153,270 |
| 0604558N | | Multi Mission Modules | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0604561N | 114 | SSN-21 Developments | 3,020 | | | | 3,020 |
| 0604562N | 115 | Submarine Tactical Warfare System | 43,404 | | | | 43,404 |
| 0604567N | 116 | Ship Contract Design/ Live Fire T&E (CVN-21) | 130,908 | | | | 130,908 |
| 0604574N | 117 | Navy Tactical Computer Resources | 2,381 | | | | 2,381 |
| 0604601N | 118 | Mine Development | 6,123 | | | | 6,123 |
| 0604603N | 119 | SLAM-ER | | | | | |
| 0604610N | 120 | Lightweight Torpedo Development | 9,965 | | | | 9,965 |
| 0604610N | | MK-54 System PIP | | [2,000] | | | [2,000] |
| 0604618N | 121 | Joint Direct Attack Munition | | | | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0604654N | 122 | Joint Service Explosive Ordnance Development | 8,081 | | | | 8,081 |
| 0604703N | 123 | Personnel, Training, Simulation, and Human Factors | 3,005 | | | | 3,005 |
| 0604710N | 124 | Navy Energy Program | | | | | |
| 0604721N | 125 | Shipboard IW | 17,981 | | | | 17,981 |
| 0604727N | 126 | Joint Standoff Weapon Systems | 9,531 | | | | 9,531 |
| 0604755N | 127 | Ship Self Defense (Detect & Control) | 48,154 | 40,600 | | | 88,754 |
| 0604755N | | Integrated Radar Optical Surveillance and Sighting System | | | 3,500 | | |
| 0604755N | | Evolved Sea Sparrow | | | 15,300 | | |
| 0604755N | | Open Architecture Warfare Systems | | | 21,800 | | |
| 0604756N | 128 | Ship Self Defense (Engage: Hard Kill) | 51,213 | | | | 51,213 |
| 0604757N | 129 | Ship Self Defense (Engage: Soft Kill/EW) | 28,233 | | | | 28,233 |
| 0604771N | 130 | Medical Development | 6,942 | 15,000 | | | 21,942 |
| 0604771N | | Hemoglobin-based Oxygen Carrier | | | 13,000 | | |
| 0604771N | | Pseudofollicullitus Barbae Research | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0604777N | 131 | Navigation/ID System | 28,104 | | | | 28,104 |
| 0604784N | 132 | Distributed Surveillance System | 7,776 | | | | 7,776 |
| 0604800N | 133 | Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) | 2,264,507 | | | | 2,264,507 |
| 0604910N | 134 | Smart Card Program | 695 | | | | 695 |
| 0605013M | 135 | USMC Information Technology Development | 9,301 | | | | 9,301 |
| 0605013N | 136 | Information Technology Development | 109,543 | (80,000) | | | 29,543 |
| 0605013N | | Enterprise Resource Planning | | | | (83,000) | |
| 0605013N | | Open Architecture Wireless Sensors | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0605014N | 137 | Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS) | | | | | |
| 0605500N | 138 | Multi-mission Maritime Aircraft (MMA) | 496,029 | | | | 496,029 |
| 0508713N | 139 | Navy Standard Integrated Personnel System (NSIPS) | | | | | |
| | | **TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | **8,008,517** | **(360,700)** | **163,400** | **(524,100)** | **7,647,817** |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | | | |
| 0604256N | 140 | Threat Simulator Development | 23,866 | | | | 23,866 |
| 0604258N | 141 | Target Systems Development | 35,677 | | | | 35,677 |
| 0604759N | 142 | Major T&E Investment | 39,787 | | | | 39,787 |
| 0605152N | 143 | Studies and Analysis Support - Navy | 2,183 | | | | 2,183 |
| 0605154N | 144 | Center for Naval Analyses | 43,982 | | | | 43,982 |
| 0605155N | 145 | Fleet Tactical Development | 2,338 | | | | 2,338 |
| 0605502N | 146 | Small Business Innovative Research | | | | | |
| 0605804N | 147 | Technical Information Services | 696 | | | | 696 |
| 0605853N | 148 | Management, Technical & International Support | 31,407 | | | | 31,407 |
| 0605856N | 149 | Strategic Technical Support | 3,493 | | | | 3,493 |
| 0605861N | 150 | RDT&E Science and Technology Management | 66,117 | | | | 66,117 |
| 0605862N | 151 | RDT&E Instrumentation Modernization | 19,370 | | | | 19,370 |
| 0605863N | 152 | RDT&E Ship and Aircraft Support | 81,308 | | | | 81,308 |
| 0605864N | 153 | Test and Evaluation Support | 255,926 | | | | 255,926 |
| 0605865N | 154 | Operational Test and Evaluation Capability | 13,044 | | | | 13,044 |
| 0605866N | 155 | Navy Space and Electronic Warfare (SEW) Support | 2,941 | | | | 2,941 |
| 0605867N | 156 | SEW Surveillance/Reconnaissance Support | 12,160 | | | | 12,160 |
| 0605873M | 157 | Marine Corps Program Wide Support | 19,701 | | | | 19,701 |
| 0909999N | 158 | Financing for Cancelled Account Adjustments | | | | | |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | **653,996** | | | | **653,996** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603660N | 159 | Advanced Development Projects | | | | | |
| 0603661N | 160 | Retract Violet | | | | | |
| 0101221N | 161 | Strategic Sub & Weapons System Support | 108,782 | | | | 108,782 |
| 0101224N | 162 | SSBN Security Technology Program | 43,408 | | | | 43,408 |
| 0101226N | 163 | Submarine Defensive Warfare Systems | 8,453 | | | | 8,453 |
| 0101402N | 164 | Navy Strategic Communications/E-6B | 31,391 | | | | 31,391 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0203761N | 165 | Rapid Technology Transition (RTT) | 14,630 | | | | 14,630 |
| 0204136N | 166 | F/A-18 Squadrons | 134,580 | | | | 134,580 |
| 0204152N | 167 | E-2 Squadrons | 6,055 | | | | 6,055 |
| 0204163N | 168 | Fleet Telecommunications (Tactical) | 19,784 | | | | 19,784 |
| 0204229N | 169 | Tomahawk Weapons System | 28,776 | | | | 28,776 |
| 0204311N | 170 | Integrated Surveillance System | 16,965 | | | | 16,965 |
| 0204413N | 171 | Amphibious Tactical Support Units | 2,604 | | | | 2,604 |
| 0204571N | 172 | Consolidated Training Systems Development | 21,644 | | | | 21,644 |
| 0204574N | 173 | Cryptologic Direct Support | 1,460 | | | | 1,460 |
| 0204575N | 174 | Electronic Warfare (EW) Readiness Support | 12,139 | | | | 12,139 |
| 0205601N | 175 | HARM Improvement / AARGM | 163,371 | 2,000 | | | 165,371 |
| 0205601N | | Embedded National Tactical Receiver - AARGM | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0205604N | 176 | Tactical Data Links | 18,977 | | | | 18,977 |
| 0205620N | 177 | Surface ASW Combat System Integration | 10,612 | | | | 10,612 |
| 0205632N | 178 | MK-48 ADCAP | 21,620 | | | | 21,620 |
| 0205633N | 179 | Aviation Improvements | 62,635 | | | | 62,635 |
| 0205658N | 180 | Navy Science Assistance Program | 3,821 | | | | 3,821 |
| 0205675N | 181 | Operational Nuclear Power Systems | 64,554 | | | | 64,554 |
| 0206313M | 182 | Marine Corps Communications Systems | 268,638 | | | | 268,638 |
| 0206623M | 183 | Marine Corps Ground Combat/Supporting Arms Systems | 44,828 | | | | 44,828 |
| 0206624M | 184 | Marine Corps Combat Services Support | 10,731 | | | | 10,731 |
| 0207161N | 185 | Tactical Air Intercept Missiles | 4,061 | | | | 4,061 |
| 0207163N | 186 | Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) | 9,085 | | | | 9,085 |
| 0301303N | 187 | Maritime Intelligence | | | | | |
| 0301323N | 188 | Collection Management | | | | | |
| 0301327N | 189 | Technical Reconnaissance and Surveillance | | | | | |
| 0303109N | 190 | Satellite Communications (SPACE) | 573,092 | 8,000 | | | 581,092 |
| 0303109N | | Joint Integrated Systems Technology for Digital Networking | | | 8,000 | | |
| 0303140N | 191 | Information Systems Security Program | 18,676 | 17,700 | | | 36,376 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0303140N | | Common Submarine Radio Room | | | 17,700 | | |
| 0304111N | 192 | Special Activities | | | | | |
| 0305149N | 193 | COBRA JUDY | 80,694 | | | | 80,694 |
| 0305160N | 194 | Defense Meteorological Satellite Program | 4,215 | | | | 4,215 |
| 0305188N | 195 | Joint C4ISR Battle Center (JBC) | 43,569 | | | | 43,569 |
| 0305192N | 196 | Joint Military Intelligence Programs | 4,746 | | | | 4,746 |
| 0305204N | 197 | Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles | 53,439 | | | | 53,439 |
| 0305205N | 198 | Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicles | 113,438 | | | | 113,438 |
| 0305206N | 199 | Airborne Reconnaissance Systems | 10,191 | 3,000 | | | 13,191 |
| 0305206N | | Passive Collision Avoidance and Reconnaissance | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0305207N | 200 | Manned Reconnaissance Systems | 20,203 | | | | 20,203 |
| 0305208N | 201 | Distributed Common Ground Systems | 3,635 | 6,000 | | | 9,635 |
| 0305208N | | Enterprise Targeting and Strike System | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0305927N | 202 | Naval Space Surveillance | | | | | |
| 0307207N | 203 | Aerial Common Sensor (ACS) (JMIP) | 24,909 | | | | 24,909 |
| 0308601N | 204 | Modeling and Simulation Support | 7,262 | | | | 7,262 |
| 0702207N | 205 | Depot Maintenance (Non-IF) | | | | | |
| 0708011N | 206 | Industrial Preparedness | 56,565 | | | | 56,565 |
| 0708730N | 207 | National Shipbuilding Research Program | 10,265 | | | | 10,265 |
| XXXXXXX | 999 | Classified Programs | 1,003,485 | | | | 1,003,485 |
| | | **TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | **3,161,988** | **36,700** | **36,700** | | **3,198,688** |
| | | **TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY** | **16,346,391** | **(298,550)** | **527,900** | **(826,450)** | **16,047,841** |

Items of Special Interest

*Advanced composite structures program*

The budget request contained $81.2 million in PE 63561N, for advanced submarine systems development.

The committee notes that the success of the Navy's Phase I Large Scale Vessel (LSV) advanced composite sail program suggests that the use of composite materials can impart improved performance, significant increases in load carrying capacity and stealth characteristics to submarine sails and to surface combatant superstructures and hulls. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Secretary of the Navy expand the program to include the fabrication and test of full-scale composite structures.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63561N to continue the program for development and evaluation of advanced composite structures for submarine and surface combatant applications.

*Advanced gun system for DD(X) multi-mission destroyer*

The budget request contained $1,431.6 million in PE 64300N for DD(X) total ship systems engineering development and demonstration, including $46.5 million for the advanced gun system (AGS), $20.3 million of which is for continued development and testing of the engineering development model of the long-range land attack projectile.

The committee notes that the acquisition strategy for the DD(X) multi-mission destroyer includes the development and testing of engineering development models of the major component systems of the DD(X), including AGS, to ensure that these systems are ready for fielding with the first ship of the DD(X) class. The AGS system consists of a major caliber gun, automated ammunition handling systems, and the long-range land attack projectile family of munitions.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64300N to continue development, integration, and testing of the long-range, land-attack projectile family of munitions with the AGS.

*Advanced laser diode arrays*

The budget request contained $80.8 million in PE 63582N for combat systems integration advanced development and prototyping. The budget included no funds for continued development of advanced laser diode arrays.

The committee notes that the Navy is developing electrically driven high energy lasers for potential use in ship self defense against a variety of surface and air threats. High reliability and high power continuous wave diode arrays, efficient laser optical configurations, and advanced solid-state laser gain materials will be among the key technologies needed to reach the power levels required in a solid-state laser weapon system.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63582N to continue the development of advanced laser diode arrays.

*Advanced mine detection program*

The budget request contained $58.2 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.

*Advanced processor build integration*

The budget request contained $75.3 million in PE 64503N for system development and demonstration for SSN–688 and Trident submarine modernization.

The committee has strongly supported the use of the acoustic rapid commercial-off-the-shelf technology insertion (ARCI) program and use of advanced processor software builds (APB) to upgrade sonar systems on submarines, surface combatants, and other platforms. Use of the ARCI/APB process has enabled the United States Navy to regain the advantage in sonar systems that it lost in the 1980s.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2005 budget request includes sufficient funds for APB integration to provide the fiscal year 2004 advanced processor build (APB–04) software update for 668I and SSGN submarine sonar systems. However, additional funding is needed to integrate APB–04 into the 688, SEAWOLF, and SSBN class ARCI systems and ensure that thirteen ships, for which the update is not presently funded, receive the updates before their planned deployments in fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 64503N for the Navy's unfunded requirement for integration of APB–04 update into the 688, SEAWOLF, and SSBN class ARCI systems.

*Aegis open architecture*

The budget request contained $146.5 million in PE 64307N for Aegis combat system engineering systems development and demonstration.

The Aegis combat system engineering program includes the development of upgrades for cruiser and destroyer Aegis combat systems and the integration of new equipment and systems to keep pace with the threat and capture advances in technology. The committee notes that experiences aboard Aegis-equipped ships and shore sites have shown that the use of currently available commercial-off-the-shelf equipment requires periodic refreshment and additional development effort as new technologies become available and computer operating systems, device drivers, and interfaces are updated. To overcome these problems, the Navy is developing an open architecture computing environment for Aegis-equipped cruisers and destroyers as a part of the Navy's overall open architecture program. The goal of the program is to evolve combat systems into

a "system of systems" that resides on a common computing environment which will be less complex, more easily upgraded, and have lower total ownership costs.

The committee recommends $168.3 million in PE 64307N, an increase of $21.8 million to accelerate the development and introduction of an open architecture computing environment for the Aegis combat system.

*Affordable towed array construction*

The budget request contained $75.6 million in PE 64503N for submarine system equipment development, including $5.2 million to continue the development of affordable towed array technology initiatives for the development of fiber optic thin line towed arrays technology initiatives. The affordable towed array construction (ATAC) 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 processes would provide increased performance, reliability and operational capabilities at reduced costs.

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 $82.0 million in PE 63795N for land attack technology advanced component development and prototypes, and included $28.9 million for development and demonstration of the affordable weapon system (AWS).

The 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 positioning inertial navigation system guidance; a control unit; 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 six and twenty missiles and could be carried on land, sea, or air platforms. 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 $60,000.

Based on the results of the AWS advanced technology demonstration, the Department of Defense and the Navy decided to transition the AWS from the technology base to an accelerated advanced com-

ponent development and prototype program that demonstrates the ability to produce the missile at the projected cost; provides up to 100 missiles and launch and fire control equipment for developmental and operational testing; and supports user evaluation of the AWS for potential use by the fleet. Congress provided $28.0 million to support the program in fiscal year 2004. The committee notes that shortfalls in science and technology funding for the AWS transition and delays in award of the development and production contract have delayed the program and completion of operational test and evaluation until the spring of 2005 and resulted in increased costs to complete the initial missile production buy.

The committee recommends an increase of $23.0 million in PE 63795N to complete a 100–missile build of the AWS and support developmental and operational testing and fleet evaluation of the system.

*Airborne mine neutralization system*

The budget request contained $50.5 million in PE 64373N for airborne mine countermeasures system development and demonstration, including $15.6 million for continued development of the Airborne Mine Neutralization System (AMNS)

The AMNS is an expendable, remotely operated mine neutralization device that is deployed in shallow and deep water from the MH–53E and MH–60S mine countermeasures helicopters to explode unburied bottom and anchored sea mines, which are impractical or unsafe to counter using existing minesweeping techniques.

In an audit of the AMNS program completed in February 2004, the Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG) concluded that the program is well-managed overall. However, the DOD IG cited the decision to transition the MH–53E to a Rapid Deployment Capability as premature and recommended that the ASN(RDA) rescind approval and require full operational test and evaluation of the system to assure that it is operationally effective and capable of supporting real-world contingency operations. The DOD IG also found that the Navy did not perform an adequate analysis of alternatives to evaluate the cost- and operational- effectiveness of alternative courses of action and that the Program Executive Officer (Littoral and Mine Warfare) should not proceed further with the development and acquisition of the AMNS unless a comprehensive, independent analysis of alternatives justifies proceeding.

The committee recognizes that operational necessity may require the rapid deployment of interim or developmental capabilities in times of emergency, but also recognizes and supports the requirement that such systems be operationally capable and effective. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2004, the actions that will be taken by the Department of the Navy to respond to the DOD IG's findings.

*Airborne reconnaissance systems*

The budget request contained $10.2 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 $13.2 million in PE 35206N, an increase of $3.0 million for PCAR.

*AN/BLQ–10 test and support*

The budget request contained $75.3 million in PE 64503N for system development and demonstration for SSN–688 and Trident submarine modernization, including $1.4 million for submarine support equipment.

The submarine support equipment program develops and evaluates improvements in submarine electronic warfare support measures, including implementation of state-of-the-art technologies for periscope, mast, and engineering improvements in the AN/BLQ–10 tactical electronic support system.

The committee notes proposals for adaptation and evaluation of a commercial-off-the-shelf tester for electronic circuit card assemblies that could be used aboard submarines.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 64503N for adaptation and evaluation of a commercial-off-the-shelf tester for electronic circuit card assemblies for the AN/BLQ–10 tactical electronic support system.

*Anti-torpedo torpedo*

The budget request contained $46.9 million in PE 63506N for surface ship torpedo defense advanced component development and prototyping.

The surface ship torpedo defense program develops the Tripwire AN/WSQ–11 torpedo defense system, which includes the Tripwire towed sensor and processor to detect a threat torpedo and provide launch orders for the associated anti-torpedo torpedo countermeasure. The committee notes that the anti-torpedo torpedo as the "offensive" response to the Tripwire launch detection is a critical part of the surface ship torpedo defense.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63506N to accelerate development of the anti-torpedo torpedo as a part of the surface ship torpedo defense system.

*Automatic radar periscope detection and discrimination*

The budget request contained $13.4 million in PE 64261N for acoustic search sensors system development and demonstration, including $2.9 million to continue development of the automatic radar periscope detection and discrimination (ARPDD) project.

The ARPDD project provides fully automated periscope detection, classification and tracking capability to reliably detect periscopes and masts of submerged submarines and to discriminate periscopes from other targets. The committee notes that the Navy regards this capability as essential for effective detection of submarines in congested littoral waters. The current program of record provides for a four-year development cycle, followed by developmental and operational testing and a low rate initial production decision in fiscal year 2011. The budget request would be used for project planning and acquisition program documentation in preparation for award-

ing a contract for development of an airborne ARPDD capability. The committee notes that acceleration of the program is a priority for the Navy.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 64261N to accelerate ARPDD system development and demonstration and rapid introduction of the capability into the fleet.

*Aviation ship integration center*

The budget request contained $157.5 million in PE 63512N for carrier systems advanced technology development and prototyping. No funds were included 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 aviation 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.

Congress appropriated $9.8 million for the Aviation Ship Integration Center in fiscal year 2004. The Chief of Naval Operations has indicated the center is a critical unfunded requirement for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63512N for the Aviation Ship Integration Center.

*Aviation shipboard information technology initiative*

The budget request contained $28.6 million in PE 64512N for system development and demonstration for shipboard aviation systems, but included no funds for continuation of the integrated aviation shipboard information technology initiative.

The aviation shipboard information technology initiative seeks to use state-of-the-art information technology and decision support systems to automate the current manually intensive process for collecting and distributing the information required to manage aviation operations on board aircraft carriers more efficiently and effectively. The committee notes continued progress in the initiative, now renamed the Aviation Data Management and Control Systems (ADMACS). The development of a common operating picture for carrier aviation operations and the ability through process automation and integration of key operational systems to provide an accurate status of weapons, aircraft, personnel, launch, and recovery systems throughout the ship should result in significant workload reductions, reduced mission planning and execution time, and an increased sortie generation rate. In addition to the operational impact of ADMACS, the committee notes estimates of operations and support cost savings of $2.0 million per year per ship and workload savings of 45 man-years per year per ship. Congress has provided a total of $7.8 million for the program since fiscal year 2002.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64512N to continue the development of ADMACS. The committee expects the Navy to include funding for any further development of ADMACS in the Navy's core aviation program beginning with the fiscal year 2006 budget request.

*Biomedical research imaging*

The budget request contained $16.7 million in PE 63729N for warfighter protection advanced technology development.

The committee continues to note the progress being made in the use of advanced imaging technology in biomedical research. The program develops new tools and diagnostic procedures that improve the efficiency and accuracy of biomedical research in bone marrow transplantation and breast and prostate cancer, and the potential for new collaboration between previous unconnected medical specialties. The committee believes that these findings have important implications for advances in real-time medical diagnosis and treatment and for the application of advanced data fusion technologies in other areas.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63729N to continue research in the applications of advanced imaging technology to biomedical research.

*Center for critical infrastructure protection*

The budget request contained $96.3 million for force protection applied research, but included no funding for the Center for Critical Infrastructure Protection (CCIP).

The committee believes that the Department of Defense should place a greater emphasis on its acknowledged mission of protecting critical defense infrastructure, such as ports, railroads, and pipelines. Sustained force protection of fixed defense-critical national assets requires additional research on sustained and integrated surveillance and sensing capabilities. The CCIP is an innovative program that will explore such technologies on a continuing basis, helping to develop the most comprehensive security systems for the nation's critical defense infrastructure.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62123N for this important research.

*Claymore marine*

The budget request contained $4.5 million in PE 63254N for anti-submarine warfare (ASW) systems development.

The committee notes that the Navy established the Claymore Marine program to investigate and demonstrate a new littoral anti-submarine warfare (ASW) system that integrates the previously developed ATD–111 airborne ASW and mine hunting system with new signal processing algorithms to achieve a significant increase in performance.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63254N for the Claymore Marine program.

*Common submarine radio room*

The budget request contained $18.7 million in PE 33140N for information systems security program operational systems development.

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 now plans to standardize radio rooms across all submarine classes using the CSRR model. CSRR will reduce the cost, training, and maintenance of 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 $36.4 million in PE 33140N, an increase of $17.7 million for the Navy's unfunded requirement for the CSRR.

*Composite ceramic unmanned underwater vehicle*

The budget request contained $63.7 million in PE 62236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology development, but included no funding for development of a composite ceramic unmanned underwater vehicle.

The committee notes that the high cost of development and manufacture of advanced underwater vehicles (UUV) and that the long design and development lifecycle have significantly limited introduction of innovative UUV capabilities. The committee is aware that the composite ceramic unmanned underwater vehicle program plans to use advanced ceramic material research for the rapid development of high-performance, low cost, modular UUVs. The committee supports the development of high-performance UUVs, using advanced composite technology, ceramic component technology and water-soluble tooling, and integration of next- generation sensors, guidance and control, propulsion and payloads. The committee expects that this technology could replace steel construction with light-weight, high strength, corrosion resistant ceramics and polymers.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 62236N for composite ceramic unmanned underwater vehicle applied research.

*Consolidated undersea situational awareness*

The budget request contained $79.5 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 that 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 would offer 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. 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 core technology has been installed and successfully demonstrated in an operational tactical submarine trainer and a follow-on at-sea demonstration is scheduled later in 2004. The committee believes that successful development of the CUSAS decision support system would provide a capability that would significantly assist submarine commanders to make rapid and informed decisions in critical combat operations.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63235N to continue development of CUSAS.

*DD(X) multi-mission destroyer*

The fiscal year 2005 budget request included $1,450.6 million for the DD(X) multi-mission destroyer, including $1,431.5 million in PE 64300N and $19.0 million in PE 63513N, to continue detailed design and, using RDT&E funding, to begin construction of the first ship of the DD(X) class. Of the amount requested, $221.1 million is for construction.

DD(X) is a multi-mission surface combatant tailored for land attack in support of the ground campaign and maritime dominance. In addition, the DD(X) program will provide a baseline for development of technology and engineering to support a range of future surface ships such as the CG(X) future cruiser and the Littoral Combat Ship. A Milestone B acquisition decision is scheduled for mid-fiscal year 2005. Delivery of the first ship of the class to the fleet is currently planned for fiscal year 2011. The Navy wants to procure a total of 24 DD(X)s at a unit procurement cost of $1,200 million to $1,400 million.

The committee has strongly supported the DD(X) program since its inception. DD(X) will be the advanced technology platform for transformational technologies including an integrated power system and electric drive; an advanced gun system; a new multi-function radar/volume search radar suite; optimal manning through advanced system automation; stealth through reduced acoustic, magnetic, infrared, and radar cross-section signatures; and enhanced survivability through automated damage control and fire protection systems. The committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) noted that the ship's operational requirements and key performance parameters, which affect the mission capabilities, design, and size of the ship, were under review. Subsequently, the Navy decided to reduce the size of the DD(X) from a full load displace of approximately 18,000 tons to 14,000 tons.

In its report, "Defense Acquisitions—Assessments of Major Weapons Programs," dated March 2004, the General Accounting Office (GAO) assessed the DD(X) as entering system development with none of its 12 critical technologies fully mature (and thereby subject to a higher risk of completing development at the planned cost and schedule). The program manager is pursuing risk mitigation by constructing and testing engineering development models for the critical technologies; however, the acquisition strategy calls for engineering development model construction and testing to be done concurrently with system design. The decision to reduce the weight of the ship prompted redesign of the advanced gun system

and hull form engineering development models. Because of schedule slippage, only two engineering development models (the hull form and the integrated power system) would be mature by the award of the lead ship construction contract, currently planned for September 2005. Current testing schedules call for the integrated power system, dual band radar suite, total ship computing environment, and peripheral vertical launching system to continue development beyond the lead ship production decision. In the GAO's view, should any of these innovative technologies encounter challenges that cannot be accommodated within the current design margins, redesign of other technologies and of the integrated ship system may be needed. Redesign would likely result in additional costs and schedule delays and affect the planned installation schedule. In addition, because the DD(X) acquisition strategy focuses on developing and maturing technologies that could be leveraged across multiple ship classes, delay in the maturation of critical technologies would increase the risk for other development programs.

The committee notes that the engineering development models of the integrated power system and the advanced gun system are scheduled to complete land-based testing by the end of fiscal year 2005 and the multi-function radar will have completed two-thirds of its land-based and at-sea testing by that date. The committee believes that it would be prudent to delay the award of the contract for construction of the first ship of the class from fiscal year 2005 to fiscal year 2006 in order to accommodate any results from the testing of these critical systems in the design of the ship prior to beginning construction. The committee recommends that the DD(X) program be restructured to reduce concurrency and develop technology "off-ramps" for technologies that do not mature.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $221.1 million in PE 64300N and deferring the initiation of construction of the lead ship from fiscal year 2005 to fiscal year 2006.

*Deployable joint command and control*

The budget request contained $42.4 million in PE 63237N for research and development of the Deployable Joint Command and Control System (DJC2) and $32.5 million for procurement of two DJC2 cores (120 seats total) for the European Command.

The committee supports the concept of establishing a standing joint force headquarters within each of the regional combatant commands (RCCs) and of providing standardized joint command and control capabilities for the commands. However, the committee questions the acquisition strategy to procure, equip, and provide technology updates for this program. The committee is concerned that the schedule to procure and equip the first set of two cores per RCCs is too aggressive and may not accomplish its schedule due to lack of technology integration for the information systems and applications that are required for this program.

While the committee understands that each combatant commander would like four core systems, for a potential of up to 240 seats per RCC, the committee notes the Department has not devised a capital planning strategy to pay for the second set of two cores per RCC. Furthermore, there is no justification to show how the Department plans to pay for updating hardware and software

systems to prevent them from becoming obsolete by fiscal year 2008.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the commander, Joint Forces Command, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2005, detailing a systems architecture, performance metrics, management plan for the development of DJC2, and a capital planning investment strategy as to how the Department plans to fund the second set of two cores per combatant command.

*Digital modular radio*

The budget request contained $78.6 million in PE 64280N for system development and demonstration for the Joint Tactical Radio System-Navy (JTRS–Navy). No funds were requested to continue system development and demonstration for the digital modular radio (DMR).

DMR is a digital, modular, software programmable, multi-channel, multi-function and multi-band (2 megahertz—2 gigahertz) radio system that would provide improved fleet radio communications in the high, very-high, and ultra-high frequency radio bands. DMR would replace and be interoperable and backwards compatible with currently deployed Navy radio systems.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has mandated that all future tactical radio procurements must be compliant with the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS). The committee also notes that the contract for a commercial-off-the-shelf, non-development initiative DMR was awarded before the JTRS architecture and acquisition strategy was established.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 64280N to continue development of the DMR and bring the DMR operating environment software to full compliance with the JTRS common architecture (version 2.2).

*DP–2 thrust vectoring system*

The budget request contained $92.4 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology development, but included no funding for continuation of the DP–2 thrust vectoring system demonstration.

DP–2 is a proof-of-concept program to demonstrate the use of jet-powered, thrust vector control in a light weight composite airframe to achieve vertical takeoff and short takeoff and landing in a one-half scale flight test vehicle. The committee notes the progress to date in the program and believes that the potential for a successful proof-of-concept demonstration justifies continuation of the program.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63114N to continue development and demonstration of the DP–2 thrust vector system concept, leading to potential flight test of the one-half scale airframe.

*Electromagnetic gun program*

The budget request contained $82.1 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development.

In section 211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), Congress directs the Secretary

of Defense to establish and carry out a collaborative program among the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Army, the Navy, and other appropriate Department of Defense activities, for evaluation and demonstration of advanced technologies and concepts for advanced gun systems that use electromagnetic propulsion for direct and indirect fire applications. The committee believes that the development of electromagnetic gun technology would have potentially high payoff for U.S. armed forces in both direct and indirect fire weapons systems, and that the major investment made by the Department of Defense (principally by the Army) in this technology over the last 20 years is beginning to provide significant returns. In the fiscal year 2005 budget request, the committee notes significant shortfalls in Department of the Navy funding for the program.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $9.5 million in PE 63123N for electromagnetic gun technology advanced development.

*Embedded national tactical receiver integration with advanced anti-radiation guided missile*

The budget request included $163.4 million in PE 25601N for operational systems development for high-speed anti-radiation missile (HARM) improvement, including $53.5 million for the advanced anti-radiation guided missile (AARGM).

The embedded national tactical receiver (ENTR) is a circuit card capable of receiving global surveillance information. Integrating the ENTR in the AARGM would facilitate the engagement of time sensitive and critical targets by adding the ability for the missile to receive threat data from national assets, thereby enlarging the target set and increasing aircrew situational awareness. The capability of such a system to receive near real time intelligence data will enhance the suppression of enemy air defense by increasing the ability to engage the most current surface-to-air missile threats in denied access area.

The committee recommends $165.4 million in PE 25601N, an increase of $2.0 million to integrate the ENTR in the AARGM.

*Emerging/critical interconnection technology*

The budget request contained $61.1 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology development but no funds were requested for continuation of the electronic interconnection research and development program.

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. Congress appropriated $3.5 million in fiscal year 2004 for this program.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63236N to continue the program for development of emerging and critical printed circuit interconnection technology. The committee expects that the electronic interconnection research and development program will be included in the Navy's core research and development program in the fiscal year 2006 budget request.

*Enterprise resource planning*

The budget request contained $109.5 million in PE 65013N for information technology (IT) development, including the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) program.

The Navy ERP program is intended to provide a standard set of tools to Navy organizations to facilitate business process reengineering and provide interoperable data for acquisition, financial, and logistics operations. The committee understands that this new program would converge the four existing ERP pilot programs in various Navy commands into one larger ERP.

The committee believes the Navy should select the most comprehensive ERP pilot for the entire Navy's use and terminate the other three pilots. Accordingly, the committee recommends $26.5 million in PE 65013N for IT programs, a decrease of $83.0 million for the ERP program.

*Enterprise targeting and strike system*

The budget request contained $3.6 million in PE 35208N for the development of the Navy's enterprise targeting and strike system (eTSS). This program will employ web-enabled enterprise technologies across existing operational capabilities. By using commercial e-business technologies, eTSS transforms the Navy's targeting, strike and mission-planning systems by integrating combat platforms and their support components into a single hardware dispersed web-enabled enterprise. The committee supports this nonproprietary, open standards solution that is consistent with the Department of the Navy's other important information technology programs. The committee also supports the program's goal of supporting globally distributed, joint, collaborative, time critical, strike operations within the Global Information Grid (GIG) architecture.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $9.6 million in PE 35208N, an increase of $6.0 million, for the acceleration and deployment of eTSS.

*Evolved sea sparrow missile capability for large decks*

The budget request contained $48.2 million in PE 64755N for ship self defense (detect and control) system development and demonstration.

The committee notes the requirement for large deck amphibious ships and aircraft carriers to be capable of countering the anti-ship cruise missile (ASCM) threat.

The committee notes that the Navy has identified the Evolved Sea Sparrow Missile (ESSM) capability for large deck amphibious ships as a critical unfunded requirement in the fiscal year 2005 budget request. Additional funds are required to develop the com-

plete SSDS Mk 2 software configuration modification for LHD 1 class ships; initiate integration of the ESSM into the SSDS Mk 2 computer program; and procure the Reconfigured NATO Sea Sparrow Missile System (RNSSMS), a Mk 29 missile launching system, an AN/SPQ–9B radar system, and a cooperative engagement capability (CEC) system for the LHD 1.

The committee recommends the following to address the Navy's unfunded requirement for providing the ESSM capability on large deck amphibious ships:

(1) An increase of $15.3 million in PE 64755N for SSDS Mk 2 system development and demonstration;

(2) An increase of $8.7 million for one Reconfigured NATO Sea Sparrow Missile System (RNSSMS);

(3) An increase of $6.0 million for one AN/SPQ–9B radar system; and

(4) An increase of $4.2 million for one cooperative engagement capability system.

*Formable aligned carbon thermosets*

The budget request contained $63.7 million in PE 62236N for warfighter sustainment applied research, but included no funds for formable aligned carbon thermosets (FACTS).

The committee continues to support the development and demonstration of FACTS, which employ stretch broken fibers to give the composite material plasticity akin to metals. FACTS also significantly eases the formation of composite parts for use in aircraft and other construction where weight savings and reduced operation and maintenance costs are desired. The use of FACTS is expected to increase significantly the percentage of airframes that can be fabricated from composites, reduce the cost of the composite structure, permit the use of more efficient designs, and significantly lower the weight of the airframes.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62236N to continue the program for development and demonstration of FACTS product technology.

*Gallium nitride radio-frequency power technology*

The budget request contained $49.2 million in PE 62271N for radio frequency systems applied research.

Gallium nitride (GaN) radio frequency power microelectronics is a wide band gap power semiconductor technology that has several key advantages over radio frequency component technologies now in use, including higher power density, better heat dissipation, and increased bandwidth. This new technology could lead to dramatic improvements in system performance, such as significant increases in the range of radar systems and enabling such systems to more effectively identify threat signatures in the presence of terrain background clutter. Congress authorized $3.0 million for GaN microelectronics and materials development in fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62271N to continue the program for applied research in GaN wide band gap semiconductor materials and power microelectronics.

*Hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier*

The budget request contained $6.9 million in PE 64771N for medical system development and demonstration. No funds were specifically requested 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 U.S. Food and Drug Administration approval and subsequent licensing of the product for military and civilian trauma applications.

The committee recommends an increase of $13.0 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 $82.1 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development, including $16.0 million 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. 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 is informed that the Navy's budget request is not sufficient to maintain the program schedule.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63123N to maintain the schedule for development of the AC synchronous high temperature superconducting motor.

*Hybrid POSS composites development*

The budget request contained $96.3 million in PE 62123N for force protection applied research.

The committee notes that the use of composite materials in naval aircraft continues to increase and the use of composites for ship and submarine applications is becoming more acceptable. Organic polymers are the main component of the composite resin technology that is currently in use; however, the limited capability of composites to survive the effects of a shipboard fire is the main obstacle to more extensive use and there are no resin systems which entirely meet military standards. The committee notes that hybrid (organic-inorganic) POSS polymers have been demonstrated that meet the fire retardance standard of Military Specification 2031, but have not yet been qualified for use on board ships. The committee is aware that in fiscal year 2004, the Navy has committed to conduct a 1/4-scale demonstration of the fire retardancy of hybrid POSS composite resins. The committee believes that it is important that the POSS resin technology be fully demonstrated in fiscal year 2005 in order to insure that the resin is qualified as a candidate for use in the DD(X) multi-mission destroyer and the Littoral Combat Ship.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62123N to continue applied research in the design, fabrication, testing, and qualification of POSS composites for shipboard use by the Navy.

*Integrated personnel protection system*

The budget request contained $98.8 million in PE 62114N for power protection applied research.

The committee notes Navy requirements for improving the protection of Navy ships and personnel from natural or combat hazards ashore and afloat. Although many advances have been made in personnel protection equipment for Navy personnel, many situations exist in which current personnel protective equipment is inadequate. The committee is aware of advances in technologies for protection of Navy personnel from fire, chemical, and biological hazards that, when combined with an integrated individual display system and interconnected through an ultra-wideband personnel communications network, would provide enhanced situational awareness and communications capabilities for the monitoring of personnel situations and coordination of crew response in critical situations.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62114N for applied research in integrated personnel protection systems.

*Integrated radar optical surveillance and sighting system*

The budget request contained $48.2 million in PE 64755N for ship self defense (detect and control) system development and demonstration.

The committee notes that, in view of the current world situation and the worldwide deployment of United States naval forces, protection of high value surface assets has become highly important.

The integrated radar optical surveillance and sighting system (IROS3) integrates commercial-off-the-shelf systems in a non-pro-

prietary, network architecture to provide a digital radar picture, electro-optical sensor, non-lethal deterrent, and remote engagement by small arms and minor caliber guns. In addition to providing a capability to detect and classify asymmetric surface threats, maintain 360-degree situational awareness around the ship, and effectively engage small close-in threats, IROS3 would also enhance the capability for surface warfare, navigation, maritime intercept operations and related naval missions. Congress provided $4.2 million in fiscal year 2004 to continue development of the IROS3.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 64755N for demonstration and evaluation of the IROS3 system.

*Intermediate modulus carbon fiber qualification*

The budget request contained $61.1 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology development. No funds were requested to continue the qualification of commercially available intermediate modulus carbon fibers.

The committee supports efforts to transition new materials and processes for use in present and future aircraft and missile systems. The committee is encouraged by the Navy's efforts to establish a second production source for intermediate modulus carbon fiber to ensure more competitive practices. In fiscal year 1997, the Navy initiated an effort to develop a protocol for the qualification of new materials, second source materials, and new processes for use on naval aircraft and missile systems. The Navy has developed a certification protocol for the qualification of commercially available intermediate modulus carbon fibers, which are used to strengthen aircraft and missile bodies. To date $5.5 million has been provided for this qualification program.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63236N to complete the qualification program for commercially available intermediate modulus carbon fibers.

*Interrogator for high-speed retro-reflective communications*

The budget request contained $98.8 million in PE 62114N for power project applied research, but included no funding for a high-speed retro-reflectometer communications data link.

The committee notes that the Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) has been conducting extensive research into the use of modulated retro-reflectors, which would eliminate the need for an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) to carry a laser for downlink communications. NRL's progress to date is promising and includes the development of a prototype interrogator with fine steering optics and software, laser tracking algorithms, hardware and software, electronics, and return signal collection and demodulation to effectively test a ship-to-shore communications scenario. A second prototype will be demonstrated in an air-to-ground scenario.

The committee notes that additional funding in fiscal year 2005 would permit NRL to develop and demonstrate a miniaturized prototype high-speed data link with an interrogator designed for easy transport, setting the stage for demonstrations of further system applications.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62114N to continue development of a laser interrogator for high-speed retro-reflectometer communications data link.

*Joint integrated systems technology*

The budget request contained $573.1 million in PE 33109N for Satellite Communications (SATCOM) operational system development.

The Joint Integrated Satellite Communications (JIST) is a web-based satellite communications planning and management technology that utilizes the Department of Defense's existing internet protocol router to expand the flexibility and efficiency of military satellite communications across a broad spectrum of radio frequencies. The committee continues to believe that developmental systems like JIST, based on common standards, are key to increased satellite communications efficiency and maximizing the utilization of available spectrum resources across legacy and follow-on satellite communications systems.

The committee recommends $581.1 million in PE 33109N, an increase of $8.0 million to continue the JIST program for development of a uniform web-based architecture for SATCOM mission planning and resource allocation.

*Joint Strike Fighter*

The budget request included $2,264.5 million in the Department of the Navy and $2,307.4 million in the Department of the Air Force for the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program.

In order to maintain competition for the engine for the JSF, Congress has mandated the funding of an alternate engine program and the JSF Joint Program Office (JPO) is working with the contractor propulsion teams to provide for completely interchangeable engines.

The committee believes that the earliest possible engine production lot competition is beneficial to the JSF program. The committee directs the JSF JPO plan to compete, at the earliest possible date, engine common hardware as well as the turbomachinery, while maintaining PW F135 and GE F136 engine interchangeability.

*Laser radar data exploitation*

The budget request contained $92.4 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology development.

The committee notes that laser radar (LADAR) seekers provide high-quality, high-resolution, three-dimensional imagery of the target area that is used by the seeker for autonomous target recognition (ATR) and location. The committee also notes the development of LADAR imagery viewing software for engineering analysis of the ATR algorithms and believes that such technology can be exploited for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance purposes. The imagery, if down-linked or otherwise made available to the user, could be used to support three-dimensional target area visualization, aim point analysis, mission planning, and attack plan rehearsal.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63114N for the continued development of software tools for laser radar imagery analysis and the development of concepts of operations and procedures for exploiting LADAR imagery for mission planning, mapping, and three-dimensional target area visualization.

*Littoral combat ship*

The budget request contains $352.1 million in PE 63581N for the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS), including $244.4 million for LCS development and $107.7 million for construction, using RDT&E funds for the first ship of the LCS class.

The LCS is a planned new Navy surface combatant for fighting in heavily contested littoral waters that would be the smallest member of the DD(X) family of next-generation surface combatants and has been identified in budget reviews as a key component of Navy transformation. A fast, agile, and stealthy surface combatant, LCS missions include mine countermeasures, littoral anti-submarine warfare, and countering fast attack craft (i.e. "swarm boats") in heavily contested littoral waters. Secondary missions include intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; homeland defense/maritime intercept; special operations forces support; and logistics support for movement of personnel and supplies.

LCS would be the first Navy ship to separate capability from hull form. Modular mission payloads and open-system architecture are intended to be used to configure the LCS for particular missions. LCS would be much smaller and faster than the Navy's current major surface combatants (2,000–3,000 ton displacement and a maximum speed of 40 to 50 knots) and would have a reduced crew size of 15 to 50 core members. Three contractor teams are competing for the LCS prime contract and two will be selected later this year for the next phase of the competition. The Navy wants to procure 56 LCSs at an estimated unit cost of $150.0 to $220.0 million for the ship alone and $250.0 million, including a representative mission payload package. The total acquisition cost for the program could exceed $14,000 million. Congress provided $166.0 million for LCS in fiscal year 2004. The Chief of Naval Operations has identified an unfunded requirement of $74.7 million for LCS mission module development in fiscal year 2005.

Prior to announcing the LCS program, the Navy did not conduct a formal analysis of alternatives to demonstrate that a ship like the LCS would be more cost-effective for performing the stated missions than potential alternative approaches. In the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–772), the conferees raised a number of issues with respect to the development of LCS. The Secretary of the Navy's report on those issues was a brief, summary document that provided little detail with regard to the analysis performed by the Navy in developing the requirement and the concept for LCS. The Navy's March 2004 report on LCS requirements, concepts of operations, acquisition strategy, and systems that would be replaced by LCS was also a relatively brief summary document that provided little new information about the LCS program. Congress has directed the General Accounting Office to report by March 1, 2005, on the LCS program's analytical justification, concept of operations, technical maturity, and potential costs.

The committee continues to have concerns about the lack of a rigorous analysis of alternative concepts for performance of the LCS mission, the justification for the force structure sought by the Navy, and whether the program's acquisition strategy is necessary to meet an urgent operational need. In view of continued unfunded requirements for mission module development and experimentation

and what the committee believes is the need for more thorough evaluation program, the committee is concerned about the Navy's ability to resolve these issues before committing to the design for the LCS and beginning construction of the first ship. Finally, the committee is concerned about whether the program schedule provides sufficient time and capabilities for experimentation and evaluation of the operational concepts for LCS before committing to major serial production of the ship.

Consequently, the committee recommends $244.4 million in PE 63581N for the LCS, a decrease of $107.7 million for LCS construction. The committee also recommends that the construction of the first Flight 0 LCS be delayed until fiscal year 2006.

*Littoral support craft-experimental*

The budget request contained $82.1 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development, including $10.2 million to continue development and demonstration of the Littoral Surface Craft-Experimental (LSC–X).

The LSC–X or "X–Craft" is a science and technology platform designed for experimentation with lifting bodies, drag reduction and mission modularity. A high-speed, all-aluminum catamaran, the LSC–X displaces 1,400 tons at full load. Performance requirements are speeds of 50 knots at a combat load of about 1,200 tons and 40 knots in sea state four, and a range of 4,000 nautical miles without replenishment. The LSC–X will be capable of landing two helicopters up to the size of the SH–60R, transporting and operating autonomous vehicles, and carrying several reconfigurable mission modules in standard twenty-foot-equivalent unit boxes. The operating crew will be minimal and the vessel will be built to commercial American Bureau of Shipping standards. As expressed in the committee report on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–436), the committee continues to believe that an experimental vessel such as the LSC–X would be an effective experimental test bed for many of the technologies that might be chosen for use on the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS). The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to carry out such an experimentation program as a part of the process for developing the operational and design requirements for the LCS.

The committee recommends an increase of $25.8 million in PE 63123N to complete construction of the LSC–X, high-speed performance testing at-sea, and mission module demonstrations.

*Low acoustic signature motor/propulsor*

The budget request contained $64.1 million in PE 62747N for undersea warfare advanced technology development.

The committee notes that the low acoustic signature motor propulsor for electrically powered undersea vehicles (LAMPREY) will demonstrate an integrated motor-propulsor and power converter with extremely low acoustic signature for undersea vehicles. When integrated with an already developed, high power lithium-propulsion system, the LAMPREY program will represent a new propulsion system for an upgraded MK–48 Advanced Capability torpedo. The LAMPREY test vehicle will also represent a 1/20th-scale submarine and will provide valuable data for a larger scale version of the propulsion system that could ultimately be used in

Virginia class submarines. Congress provided $2.1 million in fiscal year 2003 and $1.8 million in fiscal year 2004 for the LAMPREY program.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62747N to complete on-range testing of the LAMPREY test vehicle to verify acoustic performance of the propulsion system and maximum speed, range, and maneuvering characteristics.

*Low-cost terminal imaging seeker*

The budget request contained $92.4 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology development.

The committee notes that the Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, China Lake is demonstrating a low-cost precision guidance upgrade kit for a low-cost terminal imaging seeker (LCTIS) that is an out-growth of the low-cost guided imaging rocket (LOGIR) project. The committee believes that the technology which would be demonstrated in the LCTIS could have application to the advanced precision kill weapon system, the joint common missile, and the small diameter bomb and would be a risk reduction alternative for all three of these programs. The committee notes that the plan for use of additional fiscal year 2005 funding for the LCTIS project would include development and test of seeker guidance and control alternatives and seeker signal processing algorithms.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63114N for LCTIS advanced technology development and demonstration.

*Low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines*

The budget request contained $92.4 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology, but included no funding for low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines.

The committee continues to support the development of improved signal processing capability for unmanned aerial vehicles for precision targeting and other missions. The committee notes that the massively parallel processing technology being developed under the low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines program should provide significantly enhanced on-board sensor processing capabilities that will address the difficult computational challenge of on-board sensor processing capabilities for unmanned aerial vehicles and will greatly enhance sensor performance and surveillance capabilities. Congress appropriated $1.5 million for the program in fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63114N to accelerate advanced technology development of low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines.

*Marine mammal research program*

The budget request contained $63.7 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, conducts joint visual and acoustic surveys of the behavior of humpback whales, and 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.

*Nanoscience and nanomaterials*

The budget request contained $375.8 million in PE 61153N for defense research sciences, including $65.8 million for basic research in advanced naval materials sciences.

The committee notes continuing progress in research in nanoscience and nanomaterials. The committee is also aware that the application of these new concepts and technologies in improved materials, novel structures, and integrated multifunctional composite materials and structures that address high priority Navy science and technology needs and future Navy capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 61153N for basic research in nanoscience and nanomaterials.

*One megawatt molten carbonate fuel cell demonstrator*

The budget request contained $1.5 million in PE 63724N for advanced component development and prototyping for the Navy energy program. No funds were requested for the development and demonstration of a one megawatt molten carbonate fuel cell.

The committee notes that reliable, grid-independent and environmentally "clean" power plants would provide many advantages for Department of Defense use. The ability of such power plants to generate electricity independent from the local electrical utilities would enhance base security by satisfying the critical military need of providing uninterruptible electrical service.

The committee recommends $7.5 million in PE 63724N, an increase of $6.0 million for the development and demonstration of a one megawatt molten carbonate fuel cell.

*Open architecture warfare systems*

The budget request contained $48.2 million in PE 64755N for ship self defense (detect and control) system development and demonstration.

The committee notes that open architecture warfare systems support the Navy's top priority of modernizing warfighting capabilities to meet the concepts described in Sea Power 21 and that open architecture is the technology enabler that supports the Navy's FORCEnet and joint interoperability. Established in a commercially based computing environment, open architecture provides the common internet protocol technology base that will be critical to the seamless interchange of information among elements of the Navy's battle management command and control systems and the operational and planning capabilities required to make network-centric warfare effective.

The Navy has identified a requirement for $21.8 million in fiscal year 2005 to fully fund the implementation of open architecture and establish a single functional information architecture for Navy surface forces. The committee notes that providing these funds in fiscal year 2005 would complete the engineering effort to modernize and report the software for Ship Self Defense System Mark 2 (SSDS MK 2) combat system applications and comply with the required technical and functional system design standards that are the necessary precursors for implementing the single integrated operational picture.

The committee recommends an increase of $21.8 million in PE 64755N for the Navy's unfunded requirement for open architecture systems development.

*Open architecture wireless sensors*

The budget request contained $9.3 million in PE 65013N for information technology system development and demonstration.

The committee notes that the applications of wireless networking have achieved significant cost reductions and benefits to the U.S. Navy in ship building through the use of wearable computers, personal data assistants, and wireless communications devices that enable supervisors, engineers, technicians, and construction workers to coordinate their activities more efficiently. The committee believes that the future insertion of wireless network applications through the shipboard environment and the converging of multiple networks into a single ship-wide network could facilitate significant improvements in ship operations, damage control, maintenance, and other activities.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 65013N for development and demonstration of open architecture wireless sensors and their applications to improvements in ship operations, maintenance and monitoring of ship systems, damage control, and other activities.

*Organ transplant technology*

The budget request contained $16.7 million in PE 63729N for warfighter protection advanced technology development. No funds were requested for continuation of the organ transfer technology program.

The committee continues to note progress in the development of immune therapies by investigators at the Naval Medical Research Center that have been shown to prevent the rejection of tissue and organ transplants without the need for continuous use of immunosuppressive drugs. In fiscal year 2001, the Chief of Naval Research initiated a program to capitalize on these newly developed methods of treatment. The committee notes the continuing progress in the clinical trials program. The committee believes that the ability to transplant massive tissue segments without rejection could revolutionize the treatment of combat casualties who suffer significant tissue loss or organ damage from blast, missile fragments, or burns.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63729N to continue the organ transfer technology clinical trials program.

*Project M*

The budget request contained $82.1 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development. No funds were included for continuation of Project M.

The committee notes the progress in the Office of Naval Research (ONR) program to evaluate the ability of Project M technology to mitigate the high shock and vibration experienced by the Navy SEALS Mark V patrol craft crew and passengers in high-speed special operations. The committee is aware that at-sea tests of the technology are scheduled for the summer of 2004.

The committee also notes the application of Project M technology to reduce the magnetic signature of electric propulsion motors. As the Navy places increased emphasis on the introduction of the "electric" ship and the use of electric motors for ship propulsion, reduction of the magnetic signature of the ship as a defense against magnetic-influence mines, particularly in littoral operations, will become increasingly important. The committee strongly recommends that the Navy consider the exploitation of the Project M technology for magnetic signature reduction in new construction ships such as the DD(X) destroyer and the Littoral Combat Ship.

The committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) directed the Secretary of the Navy and the Commander, Special Operations Command, to report to the congressional defense committees on plans for transition of Project M shock reduction technology to potential operational use, and the Secretary to report Department of the Navy plans for further development, evaluation, and exploitation of Project M technology for magnetic signature reduction. The committee expects the results of the shock-mitigation at-sea trials to be included in the report.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63123N to continue the development and demonstration of Project M technology.

*Rapid deployment fortification wall*

The budget request contained $58.2 million in PE 63640M for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstration. No funds were requested to continue the development and evaluation of the rapid deployment fortification wall.

In the fiscal year 2004 budget the committee initiated a program for development and evaluation of a rapid deployment fortification wall (RDFW) which would provide a significantly faster means for force protection than the use of sand bags. The RDFW has been selected for force protection evaluation at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. The committee is informed that additional funding for the evaluation would permit its evaluation as a vehicular barrier and a more comprehensive evaluation of the speed of installation, labor savings, construction, and structural integrity, and innovative uses of the RDFW.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63640M to continue evaluation of the RDFW.

*Real-time precision targeting radar*

The budget request contained $44.0 million in PE 63271N for radio frequency systems advanced technology development. No funds were requested for the AN/APY–6 radar.

The committee notes the Navy's operational requirement for reducing the targeting cycle for engaging time-critical mobile targets and enhancing the ability to detect, locate and strike these targets in all weather conditions. The committee also notes as a part of the future naval capabilities program that the Office of Naval Research is developing the AN/APY–6 multi-mode, high-resolution surveillance radar as a real-time precision targeting radar for all-weather surveillance, detection and location of such targets. The objective of the program is to provide the warfighter with a lightweight, low-cost, high-resolution radar, with synthetic aperture radar and ground moving target indicator capability for use in both manned and unmanned platforms for reconnaissance, surveillance, and targeting.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63271N for continuation of the development and demonstration of the AN/APY–6 real-time precision targeting radar.

*Reduced risk ordnance*

The budget request contained $10.8 million in PE 63216N for aviation survivability advanced component development and prototyping, including $1.2 million for aircrew and ordnance safety.

The committee notes that current submunitions in naval weapon systems use fuzes that have reliabilities in the range of 90 to 94 percent. As a result, a significant number of deployed submunitions fail to detonate and become unexploded ordnance that pose a safety hazard to warfighters who might encounter the unexploded submunitions on the battlefield, to technicians who must clear the battlefield, and to civilians who might come upon them accidentally.

The committee notes that in the past, highly reliable fuzes have been too expensive for use in submunitions. However, new technologies are being developed for all-electronic fuzes that would have a much higher reliability (approximately 99 percent) and could be produced at a cost that would make such fuzes affordable for use in submunitions.

The committee recommends $13.8 million in PE 63216N, an increase of $3.0 million for development and demonstration of highly reliable, all-electronic fuzes for use in submunitions.

*Remote ocean surveillance system*

The budget request contained $44.0 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 indicates 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 provide 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.

*Ship system component development*

The budget request contained $19.0 million in PE 63513N for ship system component advanced technology development and prototyping.

The committee notes that with the integration of advanced power systems into future combat ships there is a need to address the manufacturing methods and process technology that will improve the manufacturability and affordability of advanced solid state power electronics systems early in the development cycle. This effort should begin with the manufacturing methods and processes for high density advanced motors, solid-state switches, distribution systems, and other power electronics systems that will be used in the DD(X) multi-mission destroyer.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63513N for development and demonstration of improvements in manufacturing methods and process technology for high power switches and conversion equipment that will be used in the DD(X) program.

*Spectral beam combining fiber lasers*

The budget request contained $44.0 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 $1.5 million in PE 63271N for advanced development and evaluation of the technology for spectral beam combining fiber lasers.

*Submarine payloads and sensors program*

The budget request contained $81.2 million in PE 63561N, for advanced submarine systems development.

The committee notes that the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency/Navy submarine payloads and sensors program resulted in the development of a number of innovative, but realistic payload, sensor, and platform concepts that would enable a revolutionary expansion of capabilities and allow the submarine (Virginia Class and SSGN) to play a more decisive role in joint force operations, especially in the ability to exert greater influence over events on shore.

The committee recommends and increase of $10.0 million in PE 63561N to continue the program for continued development and demonstration of advanced submarine payloads and sensor capabilities.

*Superconducting direct current homopolar motor*

The budget request contained $82.1 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development, including $42.7 million for advanced development of surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and electrical systems, of which $5.0 million would continue the 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. 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 $9.2 million in PE 63123N to continue the program for development of a 26.5 megawatt prototype superconducting DC homopolar motor for ship main propulsion.

*Tactical E-field buoy development*

The budget request contained $4.5 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 $4.0 million in PE 63254N to continue the program for accelerated component and prototype design, development, and laboratory and at-sea testing of a tactical E-field buoy for littoral anti-submarine warfare.

*Task force anti-submarine warfare*

The budget request contained $17.6 million in PE 63553N for surface anti-submarine warfare (ASW).

Task Force Antisubmarine Warfare (ASW) was established in 2003 at the direction of the Chief of Naval Operations to examine fleet shortcomings in anti-submarine warfare operational capabilities and recommend improvements in technology, operational concepts, and training techniques. The program focuses on fundamentally changing the way ASW is conducted, to render enemy sub-

marines impotent against United States and coalition forces. According to the Navy, changing the calculus of antisubmarine warfare will require developing off-board and distributed systems, minimizing force-on-force engagements, reducing the time required to conduct an ASW engagement, and supporting rapid maneuver of ASW forces.

The committee notes that the Navy plans a multi-level trials program for development of active-passive distributed sensor systems and promising technologies proposed by industry. Two at-sea experiments are planned that would employ active-passive distributed sensor systems to test hardware concepts, evaluate candidate software algorithms, and collect the data required for further software development. The plan also includes advanced development of a minimum of two promising industry-proposed technologies. The program has been established as one of the Chief of Naval Operations highest priority unfunded requirements.

The committee recommends an increase of $16.6 million in PE 63553N for Task Force ASW multi-level trials for technical and operational evaluation of developmental ASW systems and concepts of operation.

*Theater undersea warfare initiative*

The budget request contained $60.1 million in PE 62235N for common picture applied research. No funds were requested to continue the theater undersea warfare initiative.

The committee notes that Congress has added a total of $14.5 million in fiscal years 2003 and 2004 for the Theater Undersea Warfare Initiative, which seeks to enhance the Navy's network centric capability for maritime patrol aircraft (MPA) and provide a near real-time, collaborative communication, command, and control capability for MPA operations. The program utilizes the High Performance Computing Center in Maui, Hawaii, to support network-centric undersea warfare (USW) and as a repository for tactical environmental data services; the oceanographic and atmospheric master library, and sensor and platform data bases. The committee notes that over the long term the Office of Naval Research intends to use the program to provide enhanced USW capabilities to the fleet and to transfer the technology developed in the program to USW support activities.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62235N to continue the theater undersea warfare initiative.

*Ultrasonic detection equipment*

The budget request contained $19.0 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component advanced technology development and prototyping.

The committee notes the recently completed shipboard demonstration of a commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) ultrasonic tester aboard the USS Gunston Hall that evaluated the effectiveness and the practicality of inexpensive ultrasonic testers to assess the material condition of specific shipboard components and equipment. Areas examined during the demonstration included watertight door integrity, fluid systems leakage, valve leak-by identification, compartment integrity inspections, gear-train and bearing inspections, faulty electrical component identification, and rotating machinery

integrity. The results of the demonstration indicated that the use of relatively inexpensive, COTS ultrasonic testers as a diagnostic tool to assist sailors in conducting periodic maintenance is practical and cost-effective, and supports the implementation of condition-based maintenance in the surface fleet. Based on the results of the test, the committee recommends the adoption of such testers for use in the fleet.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63513N for fielding and evaluation of COTS ultrasonic testers for use by the fleet.

*VH–XX executive helicopter development*

The budget request contained $777.4 million for the VH–XX executive development program, a program that is developing a replacement for the VH–3D helicopter.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy has delayed the decision to enter the system design and development (SDD) phase of the VH–XX program from fiscal year 2004 to fiscal year 2005, and understands that the VH–XX program SDD phase would select one helicopter manufacturer to develop and produce the VH–XX helicopter. The committee further understands that this decision resulted principally from the awareness of the complexities in equipping helicopter commercial variants with the communication systems required to perform the VH–XX mission. While the committee commends the Department for taking the additional time necessary to further refine requirements and to conduct design and integration planning, it notes that the budget planned for both fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005 assumed that the VH–XX SDD program would begin in the third quarter of fiscal year 2004. Since the committee believes that the VH–XX SDD program will not begin until at least the second quarter of fiscal year 2005, it also believes that $26.0 million in fiscal year 2004 appropriations can be applied to fiscal year 2005 requirements and that $194.0 requested for fiscal year 2005 exceeds requirements.

Consequently, the committee recommends $557.4 million for the VH–XX executive helicopter development program, a decrease of $220.0 million.

*Virginia class multi-mission modules*

The budget request contained $143.2 million in PE 64558N for Virginia class submarine design development system development and demonstration.

The committee notes the experience gained in the development, design, and implementation of multi-mission capabilities in the USS Jimmy Carter (SSN–23). The committee believes that the modular design of the Virginia class submarine continues to lend itself to the evaluation of multi-mission module concepts for that submarine that could be considered for insertion in selected hull numbers of the class to increase payload capacity, capability for technology insertion, and adaptability to new missions.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64558N to continue the program for evaluation of modular payload concepts and multi-mission modules for Virginia class submarine variants that would increase payload capacity and mission capability.

*Virtual at-sea training initiative*

The budget request contained $61.1 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology development.

In view of recent reductions in the number of available naval live-fire training ranges, the committee recognizes the benefit 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 for solving the problem of maintaining readiness despite the reduction in live fire training ranges. The committee, therefore, supports the Navy's continued development of VAST by the Office of Naval Research for transition into a Department of Defense acquisition program.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63236N for continued development of the VAST initiative.

*Wide band gap semiconductor power electronics*

The budget request contained $46.3 million in PE 62712E and $3.5 million in PE 62271N for applied research in wide band gap semiconductor electronics and wide band gap semiconductor electronic devices. Section 212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) requires the Secretary of Defense to carry out a cooperative program to develop and demonstrate advanced technologies and concepts for future Navy radar systems and other applications with particular emphasis on development of high frequency and high power wide band gap semiconductor materials and devices.

The committee notes the progress in the development of silicon carbide and other wide band gap materials in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency program and in the Navy program and the potential for transition of the materials technology to applications in advanced power and high frequency semiconductor devices.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62271N for wide band gap semiconductor power electronics applied research.

## AIR FORCE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $21,114.7 million for Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $21,528.0 million, an increase of $413.3 million to the budget request.

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE** | | | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0601102F | 1 | Defense Research Sciences | 217,304 | 2,000 | | | 219,304 |
| 0601102F | | Chabot Space and Science Center | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0601103F | 2 | University Research Initiatives | 115,865 | | | | 115,865 |
| 0601108F | 3 | High Energy Laser Research Initiatives | 12,331 | | | | 12,331 |
| | | **TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH** | **345,500** | **2,000** | **2,000** | | **347,500** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0602102F | 4 | Materials | 73,660 | | | | 73,660 |
| 0602201F | 5 | Aerospace Vehicle Technologies | 74,679 | | | | 74,679 |
| 0602202F | 6 | Human Effectiveness Applied Research | 71,483 | 3,000 | | | 74,483 |
| 0602202F | | Improved Performance Research Integration Tool | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0602203F | 7 | Aerospace Propulsion | 92,650 | 15,500 | | | 108,150 |
| 0602203F | | Integrated Cooling and Power System Magnetic Bearing | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0602203F | | Fuel Cell Technology-Proton Exchange Membrane | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602203F | | Advanced Vehicle and Propulsion Center | | | 8,500 | | |
| 0602203F | | Engineering Research Lab Equipment Upgrade | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0602204F | 8 | Aerospace Sensors | 78,804 | | | | 78,804 |
| 0602204F | | Combat Optical Receiver for Smart Loitering Standoff Munitions | | [2,000] | | | [2,000] |
| 0602500F | 9 | Multi-disciplinary Space Technology | 84,581 | | | | 84,581 |
| 0602601F | 10 | Space Technology | 88,909 | 8,000 | | | 96,909 |
| 0602601F | | Integrated Control for Autonomous Space Systems | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0602601F | | Satellite Tool Kit Technology Integration | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0602602F | 11 | Conventional Munitions | 52,251 | | | | 52,251 |
| 0602605F | 12 | Directed Energy Technology | 36,532 | 10,000 | | | 46,532 |
| 0602605F | | Ultra Short Pulse Laser Technology | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602702F | 13 | Command Control and Communications | 82,147 | 4,500 | | | 86,647 |
| 0602702F | | Collaborative Information and Knowledge Management | | | 4,500 | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0602805F | 14 | Dual Use Science and Technology Program | 5,151 | | | | 5,151 |
| 0602890F | 15 | High Energy Laser Research | 45,333 | | | | 45,333 |
| | | **TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH** | **786,180** | **41,000** | **41,000** | | **827,180** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603112F | 16 | Advanced Materials for Weapon Systems | 34,284 | 14,000 | | | 48,284 |
| 0603112F | | Metals Affordability Initiative | | | 14,000 | | |
| 0603203F | 17 | Advanced Aerospace Sensors | 30,634 | | | | 30,634 |
| 0603205F | 18 | Flight Vehicle Technology | | | | | |
| 0603211F | 19 | Aerospace Technology Dev/Demo | 29,145 | | | | 29,145 |
| 0603216F | 20 | Aerospace Propulsion and Power Technology | 79,914 | | | | 79,914 |
| 0603231F | 21 | Crew Systems and Personnel Protection Technology | 32,794 | | | | 32,794 |
| 0603270F | 22 | Electronic Combat Technology | 28,282 | 12,000 | | | 40,282 |
| 0603270F | | Day-Night Electro Optical Tracker Countermeasures | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0603270F | | Light Weight Modular Support Jammer | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0603311F | 23 | Ballistic Missile Technology | | | | | |
| 0603333F | 24 | Unmanned Air Vehicle Dev/Demo | | | | | |
| 0603401F | 25 | Advanced Spacecraft Technology | 60,124 | 14,000 | | | 74,124 |
| 0603401F | | Satellite Simulation Toolkit | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603401F | | Streaker Small Launch Vehicle | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0603401F | | Intelligent Free Space Optical Satellite Communication Node | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603444F | 26 | Maui Space Surveillance System (MSSS) | 6,306 | 10,000 | | | 16,306 |
| 0603444F | | High Accuracy Network Determination System (HANDS) | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603500F | 27 | Multi-disciplinary Advanced Development Space Technology | 51,114 | 7,000 | | | 58,114 |
| 0603500F | | Upper Stage Engine Technology | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0603601F | 28 | Conventional Weapons Technology | 22,398 | 9,000 | | | 31,398 |
| 0603601F | | BLU-109H | | | 9,000 | | |
| 0603605F | 29 | Advanced Weapons Technology | 31,103 | | | | 31,103 |
| 0603723F | 30 | Environmental Engineering Technology | | | | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603789F | 31 | C3I Advanced Development | 28,524 | 5,000 | | | 33,524 |
| 0603789F | | Identification of Time Critical Targets | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603801F | 32 | Special Programs | 320,503 | | | | 320,503 |
| 0603850F | 33 | Integrated Broadcast Service | 2,294 | | | | 2,294 |
| 0603924F | 34 | High Energy Laser Advanced Technology Program | 8,547 | | | | 8,547 |
| 0207423F | 35 | Advanced Communications Systems | 12,051 | | | | 12,051 |
| 0401840F | 36 | AMC Command and Control System | 6,038 | | | | 6,038 |
| 0804757F | 37 | Joint National Training Center | 2,939 | | | | 2,939 |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | **786,994** | **71,000** | **71,000** | | **857,994** |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | | | |
| 0603260F | 38 | Intelligence Advanced Development | 4,612 | | | | 4,612 |
| 0603287F | 39 | Physical Security Equipment | 22,640 | 13,000 | | | 35,640 |
| 0603287F | | Xray Base Protection System | | | 8,000 | | |
| 0603287F | | Quick Reaction Perimeter Intrusion Detection | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603421F | 40 | NAVSTAR Global Positioning System III | 40,568 | | | | 40,568 |
| 0603430F | 41 | Advanced EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE) | 612,049 | | | | 612,049 |
| 0603432F | 42 | Polar MILSATCOM (SPACE) | 960 | | | | 960 |
| 0603434F | 43 | National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite Sys (SPACE) | | | | | |
| 0603438F | 44 | Space Control Technology | 15,046 | | | | 15,046 |
| 0603742F | 45 | Combat Identification Technology | 19,582 | | | | 19,582 |
| 0603790F | 46 | NATO Research and Development | 3,930 | | | | 3,930 |
| 0603791F | 47 | International Space Cooperative R&D | 552 | | | | 552 |
| 0603845F | 48 | Transformational SATCOM (TSAT) | 774,836 | (100,000) | | (100,000) | 674,836 |
| 0603850F | 49 | Integrated Broadcast Service | 23,927 | | | | 23,927 |
| 0603851F | 50 | Intercontinental Ballistic Missile | 72,503 | | | | 72,503 |
| 0603854F | 51 | Wideband Gapfiller System RDT&E (Space) | 73,499 | 15,000 | 15,000 | | 88,499 |
| 0603856F | 52 | Air Force/National Program Cooperation (AFNPC) | | | | | |
| 0603858F | 53 | Space-Based Radar | 327,732 | | | | 327,732 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603859F | 54 | Pollution Prevention | 2,692 | | | | 2,692 |
| 0603860F | 55 | Joint Precision Approach and Landing Systems | 18,385 | | | | 18,385 |
| 0604015F | 56 | Next Generation Bomber | | 100,000 | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| 0604327F | 57 | Hard and Deeply Buried Target Defeat System (HDBTDS) Program | 6,383 | | | | 6,383 |
| 0604731F | 58 | Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV) | | | | | |
| 0604855F | 59 | Operationally Responsive Launch | 35,362 | 10,000 | 6,000 | | 45,362 |
| 0604855F | | Blue MAJIC | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0604856F | 60 | Common Aero Vehicle (CAV) | 21,610 | 12,000 | 12,000 | | 33,610 |
| 0305178F | 61 | National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS) | 307,668 | | | | 307,668 |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | **2,384,536** | **50,000** | **150,000** | **(100,000)** | **2,434,536** |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | | | |
| 0603840F | 62 | Global Broadcast Service (GBS) | 33,447 | | | | 33,447 |
| 0604012F | 63 | Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System (JHMCS) | 2,867 | | | | 2,867 |
| 0604222F | 64 | Nuclear Weapons Support | 13,301 | | | | 13,301 |
| 0604226F | 65 | B-1B | 59,462 | | | | 59,462 |
| 0604233F | 66 | Specialized Undergraduate Flight Training | 3,359 | | | | 3,359 |
| 0604239F | 67 | F-22 | 210,000 | | | | 210,000 |
| 0604240F | 68 | B-2 Advanced Technology Bomber | 245,049 | 98,000 | | | 343,049 |
| 0604240F | | Global Strike | | | 98,000 | | |
| 0604270F | 69 | EW Development / B-52 | 138,393 | | | | 138,393 |
| 0604280F | 70 | Joint Tactical Radio | 49,856 | | | | 49,856 |
| 0604287F | 71 | Physical Security Equipment | 9,744 | | | | 9,744 |
| 0604329F | 72 | Small Diameter Bomb (SDB) | 76,489 | | | | 76,489 |
| 0604421F | 73 | Counterspace Systems | 75,863 | | | | 75,863 |
| 0604435F | 74 | Advanced Polar MILSATCOM | | | | | |
| 0604441F | 75 | Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS) High EMD | 508,448 | 35,000 | 35,000 | | 543,448 |
| 0604479F | 76 | Milstar LDR/MDR Satellite Communications (SPACE) | 1,380 | | | | 1,380 |
| 0604600F | 77 | Munitions Dispenser Development | 28,048 | | | | 28,048 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0604602F | 78 | Armament/Ordnance Development | 8,353 | | | | 8,353 |
| 0604604F | 79 | Submunitions | 4,824 | | | | 4,824 |
| 0604617F | 80 | Agile Combat Support | 10,053 | | | | 10,053 |
| 0604618F | 81 | Joint Direct Attack Munition | | | | | |
| 0604706F | 82 | Life Support Systems | 6,630 | | | | 6,630 |
| 0604731F | 83 | Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV) | | | | | |
| 0604735F | 84 | Combat Training Ranges | 18,714 | | | | 18,714 |
| 0604740F | 85 | Integrated Command & Control Applications (IC2A) | 258 | 6,000 | | | 6,258 |
| 0604740F | | Distributed Mission Interoperability Tool Kit | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0604750F | 86 | Intelligence Equipment | 1,349 | | | | 1,349 |
| 0604754F | 87 | Tactical Data Link Infrastructure | | | | | |
| 0604762F | 88 | Common Low Observables Verification System (CLOVerS) | 10,303 | | | | 10,303 |
| 0604800F | 89 | Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) | 2,307,420 | | | | 2,307,420 |
| 0604851F | 90 | Intercontinental Ballistic Missile | 91,687 | | | | 91,687 |
| 0604853F | 91 | Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program | 27,000 | | | | 27,000 |
| 0605011F | 92 | RDT&E for Aging Aircraft | 15,665 | 4,000 | 2,000 | | 19,665 |
| 0605011F | | Enterprise Availability and Cost Optimization System | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0207131F | 93 | A-10 Squadrons | | | | | |
| 0207256F | 94 | Joint Unmanned Combat Air System | 2,911 | | | | 2,911 |
| 0207434F | 95 | Link-16 Support and Sustainment | 141,012 | | | | 141,012 |
| 0207443F | 96 | Family of Interoperable Operational Pictures (FIOP) | 44,947 | | | | 44,947 |
| 0207450F | 97 | Multi-Sensor C2 Aircraft (MC2A) | 538,860 | | | | 538,860 |
| 0207701F | 98 | Full Combat Mission Training | 5,894 | | | | 5,894 |
| 0305176F | 99 | Combat Survivor Evader Locator | | | | | |
| 0401318F | 100 | CV-22 | 16,439 | | | | 16,439 |
| XXXXXXX | 100a | KC-767 | | 80,000 | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| | | **TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | **4,708,025** | **223,000** | **223,000** | | **4,931,025** |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | | | |
| 0604256F | 101 | Threat Simulator Development | 34,517 | | | | 34,517 |
| 0604759F | 102 | Major T&E Investment | 58,933 | | | | 58,933 |
| 0605101F | 103 | RAND Project Air Force | 24,970 | | | | 24,970 |
| 0605306F | 104 | Ranch Hand II Epidemiology Study | 4,813 | | | | 4,813 |
| 0605502F | 105 | Small Business Innovation Research | | | | | |
| 0605712F | 106 | Initial Operational Test & Evaluation | 28,839 | | | | 28,839 |
| 0605807F | 107 | Test and Evaluation Support / Eglin AFB Range | 356,266 | | | | 356,266 |
| 0605860F | 108 | Rocket Systems Launch Program (SPACE) | 7,984 | | | | 7,984 |
| 0605864F | 109 | Space Test Program (STP) | 44,521 | | | | 44,521 |
| 0605976F | 110 | Facilities Restoration and Modernization - Test and Evaluation Support | 58,936 | | | | 58,936 |
| 0605978F | 111 | Facilities Sustainment - Test and Evaluation Support | 23,067 | | | | 23,067 |
| 0804731F | 112 | Cyber Crime Center | 323 | | | | 323 |
| 0909900F | 113 | Financing for Expired Account Adjustments | | | | | |
| 0909980F | 114 | AC-130U Claim | 100,000 | | | | 100,000 |
| 1001004F | 115 | International Activities | 3,945 | | | | 3,945 |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | **747,114** | | | | **747,114** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0605024F | 116 | Anti-Tamper Technology Executive Agency | 7,858 | | | | 7,858 |
| 0101113F | 117 | B-52 Squadrons | 25,766 | | | | 25,766 |
| 0101120F | 118 | Advanced Cruise Missile | 7,740 | | | | 7,740 |
| 0101122F | 119 | Air-Launched Cruise Missile (ALCM) | 11,837 | | | | 11,837 |
| 0101313F | 120 | Strat War Planning System - USSTRATCOM | 23,391 | | | | 23,391 |
| 0101314F | 121 | Night Fist - USSTRATCOM | 4,987 | | | | 4,987 |
| 0101815F | 122 | Advanced Strategic Programs | 8,393 | | | | 8,393 |
| 0102326F | 123 | Region/Sector Operation Control Center Modernization Program | 19,047 | | | | 19,047 |
| 0203761F | 124 | Warfighter Rapid Acquisition Process (WRAP) Rapid Transition Fund | 24,935 | | | | 24,935 |
| 0207028F | 125 | Joint Expeditionary Force Experiment | | | | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0207131F | 126 | A-10 Squadrons | 22,590 | | | | 22,590 |
| 0207133F | 127 | F-16 Squadrons (APG-68V9) | 99,606 | | | | 99,606 |
| 0207134F | 128 | F-15E Squadrons (APG-63V3) | 115,246 | 17,200 | | | 132,446 |
| 0207134F | | Active Electronically Scanned Array Radar | | | 17,200 | | |
| 0207136F | 129 | Manned Destructive Suppression | 16,976 | | | | 16,976 |
| 0207138F | 130 | F-22 Squadrons | 354,528 | | | | 354,528 |
| 0207141F | 131 | F-117A Squadrons | 29,661 | | | | 29,661 |
| 0207161F | 132 | AIM 9 Product Improvement | 5,558 | | | | 5,558 |
| 0207163F | 133 | Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) | 33,266 | | | | 33,266 |
| 0207224F | 134 | Personnel Recovery Vehicle - New Rescue Helo | 12,342 | | | | 12,342 |
| 0207247F | 135 | AF TENCAP | 10,673 | | | | 10,673 |
| 0207248F | 136 | Special Evaluation Program | 199,040 | | | | 199,040 |
| 0207253F | 137 | Compass Call | 3,990 | | | | 3,990 |
| 0207268F | 138 | Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program | 165,609 | | | | 165,609 |
| 0207277F | 139 | Eagle Vision | 1,879 | | | | 1,879 |
| 0207325F | 140 | Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM) | 45,777 | | | | 45,777 |
| 0207410F | 141 | Air and Space Ops Center | 27,695 | | | | 27,695 |
| 0207412F | 142 | Battle Control System | 11,634 | | | | 11,634 |
| 0207417F | 143 | Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) | 288,787 | | | | 288,787 |
| 0207423F | 144 | Advanced Communications Systems / TACP | 20,066 | | | | 20,066 |
| 0207424F | 145 | Evaluation and Analysis Program | | | | | |
| 0207433F | 146 | Advanced Program Technology | 249,391 | | | | 249,391 |
| 0207438F | 147 | Theater Battle Management (TBM) C4I | 37,210 | | | | 37,210 |
| 0207445F | 148 | Fighter Tactical Data Link | 50,976 | | | | 50,976 |
| 0207446F | 149 | Bomber Tactical Data Link | 120,256 | | | | 120,256 |
| 0207448F | 150 | C2ISR Tactical Data Link | 25,441 | | | | 25,441 |
| 0207449F | 151 | Command and Control (C2) Constellation | 44,035 | | | | 44,035 |
| 0207581F | 152 | Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (Joint STARS) | 89,247 | 11,000 | | | 100,247 |
| 0207581F | | Blue Force Combat ID Upgrades | | | 11,000 | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0207590F | 153 | Seek Eagle | 23,159 | | | | 23,159 |
| 0207591F | 154 | Advanced Program Evaluation | 474,734 | | | | 474,734 |
| 0207601F | 155 | USAF Modeling and Simulation | 18,693 | | | | 18,693 |
| 0207605F | 156 | Wargaming and Simulation Centers | 6,377 | | | | 6,377 |
| 0208006F | 157 | Mission Planning Systems | 136,701 | | | | 136,701 |
| 0208021F | 158 | Information Warfare Support | 7,230 | | | | 7,230 |
| 0208160F | 159 | Technical Evaluation System | | | | | |
| 0208161F | 160 | Special Evaluation System | | | | | |
| 0301310F | 161 | National Air Intelligence Center | | | | | |
| 0301314F | 162 | COBRA BALL | | | | | |
| 0301315F | 163 | Missile and Space Technical Collection | | | | | |
| 0301324F | 164 | FOREST GREEN | | | | | |
| 0301398F | 165 | Management Headquarters GDIP | | | | | |
| 0302015F | 166 | E-4B National Airborne Operations Center (NAOC) | 11,172 | | | | 11,172 |
| 0303110F | 167 | Defense Satellite Communications System (SPACE) | | | | | |
| 0303131F | 168 | Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN) | 33,183 | | | | 33,183 |
| 0303140F | 169 | Information Systems Security Program | 79,625 | 8,000 | | | 87,625 |
| 0303140F | | Worldwide Infrastructure Security Environment | | | 8,000 | | |
| 0303141F | 170 | Global Combat Support System | 18,637 | | | | 18,637 |
| 0303150F | 171 | Global Command and Control System | 3,611 | 2,000 | | | 5,611 |
| 0303150F | | Applied Research in Computing Enterprise Services | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0303401F | 172 | Communications Security (COMSEC) | | | | | |
| 0303601F | 173 | MILSATCOM Terminals | 272,149 | | | | 272,149 |
| 0304111F | 174 | Special Activities | | | | | |
| 0304311F | 175 | Selected Activities | | | | | |
| 0305099F | 176 | Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) | 7,291 | | | | 7,291 |
| 0305110F | 177 | Satellite Control Network (SPACE) | 17,833 | | | | 17,833 |
| 0305111F | 178 | Weather Service | 16,526 | | | | 16,526 |
| 0305114F | 179 | Air Traffic Control, Approach, and Landing System (ATCALS) | 7,371 | | | | 7,371 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0305116F | 180 | Aerial Targets | 5,178 | | | | 5,178 |
| 0305128F | 181 | Security and Investigative Activities | 484 | | | | 484 |
| 0305142F | 182 | Applied Technology and Integration | | | | | |
| 0305148F | 183 | Air Force Tactical Measurement and Signature Intelligence (MASINT) Systems/ | 7,905 | | | | 7,905 |
| 0305159F | 184 | Defense Reconnaissance Support Activities (SPACE) | 219,345 | | | | 219,345 |
| 0305160F | 185 | Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (SPACE) | | | | | |
| 0305164F | 186 | NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (User Equipment) (SPACE) | 104,114 | | | | 104,114 |
| 0305165F | 187 | NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (Space and Control Segments) / OCS | 148,344 | | | | 148,344 |
| 0305172F | 188 | Combined Advanced Applications | | | | | |
| 0305174F | 189 | Space Warfare Center | 411 | | | | 411 |
| 0305182F | 190 | Spacelift Range System (SPACE) | 47,253 | | | | 47,253 |
| 0305191F | 191 | Personnel Security Investigations Program - Air Force | 118,787 | | | | 118,787 |
| 0305193F | 192 | Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO) | 1,097 | | | | 1,097 |
| 0305202F | 193 | Dragon U-2 (JMIP) | 87,745 | (6,300) | | | 81,445 |
| 0305202F | | ASIP Sensor Development | | | | (6,300) | |
| 0305205F | 194 | Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicles | | (2,000) | | | (2,000) |
| 0305205F | | Network Centric Collaborative Targeting | | | | (2,000) | |
| 0305206F | 195 | Airborne Reconnaissance Systems | 55,464 | | | | 55,464 |
| 0305207F | 196 | Manned Reconnaissance Systems / COBRA BALL | 13,283 | 11,500 | | | 24,783 |
| 0305207F | | Geo Processor | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0305207F | | COBRA BALL | | | 7,500 | | |
| 0305208F | 197 | Distributed Common Ground Systems / RAS-1R | 21,232 | | | | 21,232 |
| 0305219F | 198 | Predator UAV (JMIP) | 81,346 | | | | 81,346 |
| 0305220F | 199 | Global Hawk UAV (JMIP) | 336,159 | (18,000) | | (18,000) | 318,159 |
| 0305887F | 200 | Electronic Combat Intelligence Support | 963 | | | | 963 |
| 0305906F | 201 | NCMC - TW/AA System | 64,822 | | | | 64,822 |
| 0305910F | 202 | SPACETRACK (SPACE) | 161,838 | 9,000 | | | 170,838 |
| 0305910F | | Space Situational Awareness Initiative | | | 9,000 | | |
| 0305911F | 203 | Defense Support Program (SPACE) | | | | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0305913F | 204 | NUDET Detection System (SPACE) | 35,398 | | | | 35,398 |
| 0305917F | 205 | Space Architect | 12,907 | | | | 12,907 |
| 0308601F | 206 | Modeling and Simulation Support | | | | | |
| 0308699F | 207 | Shared Early Warning (SEW) | 3,345 | | | | 3,345 |
| 0401115F | 208 | C-130 Airlift Squadron | 150,242 | 3,000 | | | 153,242 |
| 0401115F | | Realtime Weight and Balance Measurement | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0401119F | 209 | C-5 Airlift Squadrons | 332,982 | | | | 332,982 |
| 0401130F | 210 | C-17 Aircraft | 199,692 | | | | 199,692 |
| 0401132F | 211 | C-130J Program | 36,305 | | | | 36,305 |
| 0401134F | 212 | Large Aircraft IR Countermeasures (LAIRCM) | 73,684 | | | | 73,684 |
| 0401218F | 213 | KC-135s | 1,079 | | | | 1,079 |
| 0401219F | 214 | KC-10s | 18,452 | (9,100) | | | 9,352 |
| 0401219F | | KC-10 GATM | | | | (9,100) | |
| 0408011F | 215 | Special Tactics/Combat Control | 1,067 | | | | 1,067 |
| 0702207F | 216 | Depot Maintenance (Non-IF) | 1,431 | | | | 1,431 |
| 0702806F | 217 | Acquisition and Management Support | 1,596 | | | | 1,596 |
| 0708011F | 218 | Industrial Preparedness | 38,012 | | | | 38,012 |
| 0708012F | 219 | Logistics Support Activities | | | | | |
| 0708026F | 220 | Productivity, Reliability, Availability, Maintain. Prog Ofc (PRAMPO) | | | | | |
| 0708611F | 221 | Support Systems Development | 50,238 | | | | 50,238 |
| 0708612F | 222 | Computer Resources Support Improvement Program (CRSIP) | | | | | |
| 0808716F | 223 | Other Personnel Activities | 110 | | | | 110 |
| 0901212F | 224 | Service-Wide Support (Not Otherwise Accounted For) | | | | | |
| 0901218F | 225 | Civilian Compensation Program | 7,272 | | | | 7,272 |
| 0901538F | 226 | Financial Management Information Systems Development | 15,732 | | | | 15,732 |
| XXXXXXX | 999 | Classified | 5,551,279 | | | | 5,551,279 |
| | | **TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | **11,356,318** | **26,300** | **61,700** | **(35,400)** | **11,382,618** |
| | | **TOTAL. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE** | **21,114,667** | **413,300** | **548,700** | **(135,400)** | **21,527,967** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Advanced vehicle and propulsion center and engineering research lab equipment upgrade*

The budget request contained $92.7 million in PE 62203F for aerospace propulsion, but contained no funds for the advanced vehicle and propulsion center and engineering research lab oratory equipment upgrade.

The committee recognizes the value added to Air Force Space Command projects through the Air Force Research Laboratory's effort to merge modeling and simulation capabilities with advanced technologies involving the advanced vehicle and propulsion center. Additionally, the committee notes the need to upgrade propulsion laboratory equipment to support the exploration of emerging technologies.

The committee recommends increases of $8.5 million in PE 62203F for the advanced vehicle and propulsion center and $1.0 million for the engineering research lab equipment upgrade.

*Advanced wideband signals intelligence geo-processor*

The budget request contained $13.3 million in PE 35207F, but contained no funding for the advanced wideband processor and high frequency geo-processor (AWP/HGP).

The committee notes that our asymmetrical adversaries are more commonly using widely available high-technology communications for command and control networks. Airborne collectors are experiencing an increasing challenge in collecting these types of low probability of intercept (LPI)/ low probability or detection (LPD) signals in a dense co-channel environment with rapid geolocation capability. The Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) has developed a promising technology that enables signals intelligence collection suites to collect against these signals and provide real-time geo-coordinates of these signals. Flight testing is being conducted and follow-on field testing needs to be accomplished with subsequent integration of this capability into an operational intelligence collector such as the RC–135.

Therefore the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 35207F for the AWP/HGP project for the RC–135 aircraft.

*B–2 development*

The budget request contained $245.0 million in PE 64240F for B–2 system development, but included no funds to develop the extremely high frequency (EHF) satellite communications (SATCOM) system, or for a global strike capabilities initiative (GSCI). 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 EHF SATCOM system is being developed to provide high bandwidth communications for both nuclear and conventional B–2 missions. The committee notes that the Congress appropriated $12.6 million in fiscal year 2004 for this system, understands that $24.0 million is required in fiscal year 2005 to complete EHF SATCOM development. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $24.0 million for the EHF SATCOM system.

The GSCI would incrementally upgrade B–2 aircraft with capabilities that address warfighting gaps identified by the Air Force and Joint Force Commanders. For fiscal year 2005, the committee understands that the most urgent capabilities required through the GSCI would include: defensive management system processor upgrades; integrated avionics block development to address deficiencies in the standby flight instruments; Link 16 information exchange between B–2 and other aircraft, and flight management control processor software; and global air traffic management system upgrades. Additionally, the committee understands that the GSCI for fiscal year 2005 would begin development of small diameter bomb (SDB) integration on the B–2, and expects that this effort would eventually provide the B–2 with a capability to deliver 160 to 240 SDBs. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $74.0 million for the GSCI, and expects that $13.0 million would upgrade the defensive management system, $51.0 million would develop an integrated avionics block upgrade, and $10.0 million would provide for SDB design concepts and program planning necessary to implement an SDB development and integration program.

In total, the committee recommends $343.0 million for B–2 system development, an increase of $98.0 million.

*Blue MAJIC*

The budget request contained $35.4 million in PE 64855F for operationally responsive launch, but included no funding for Blue MAJIC.

The committee understands the importance of blue force tracking in the effort to reduce fratricide and increase force protection. The committee recognizes Blue MAJIC would 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 an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64855F for Blue MAJIC.

*Cobra Ball*

The budget request contained $13.3 million in PE 35207F for the manned reconnaissance system, but contained no funds for Cobra Ball.

The committee notes Cobra Ball's ability to exploit unused spectral data content and its increased sensitivity and accuracy in the medium wave infrared spectrum and believes it necessary to accelerate this effort.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PE 35207F for Cobra Ball.

*Combat optical receiver for smart and loitering standoff weapons*

The budget request included $78.8 million in PE 62204F for aerospace sensors.

The committee directs that $2.0 million be made available within funds authorized for PE 62204F for the combat optical receiver for smart and loitering standoff weapons.

*Collaborative information technologies*

The budget request included $5.3 million in PE 62702F, project 4917, for collaborative information technologies to develop emerging technologies for the next generation of distributed, collaborative command and control systems.

The committee recommends an additional $4.5 million in PE 62702F, project 4917, to develop an initial operational capability for application of collaborative information technologies to joint and Air Force capability planning, technology assessment, and enterprise management activities.

*Common aero vehicle*

The budget request contained $21.6 million in PE 64856F for the Common Aero Vehicle (CAV).

The committee is aware that additional funding is required to complete CAV analysis; ensure validation of system components and operational capabilities; fund launch vehicle procurement; and provides flight test planning and range safety support.

The committee recommends $33.6 million in PE 64856F, an increase of $12.0 million for CAV.

*Defensive electro-optical tracker countermeasures technologies*

The budget request included $12.4 million in PE 63270F to develop and demonstrate advanced warning and countermeasures technologies to negate electro-optical, infrared, and laser threats to aerospace platforms.

The committee recommends an additional $6.0 million in PE 63270F to increase the technology readiness levels to accelerate transition of this capability to system development and demonstration.

*Distributed mission interoperability toolkit*

The budget request contained $300,000 in PE 64740F for integrated command and control applications, which includes the Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit (DMIT) program.

The committee notes that the DMIT is a suite of tools that enable an enterprise architecture for on-demand, trusted, interoperability among mission-oriented command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence (C4I) systems based on lessons learned from Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The committee notes that this program leverages best practices from the commercial sector to positively impact the Department of Defense's C4I programs through the use of open architectures, existing and emerging web standards, and state-of-the-art technologies. The committee believes DMIT will enable rapid and adaptive integration between legacy and new information systems.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $6.3 million in PE 64740F, an increase of $6.0 million.

*Enterprise availability and cost optimization system*

The budget request contained $15.7 million in PE 65011F for development of products and services to improve the performance of aging aircraft systems but included no funds for the enterprise availability and cost optimization system (EACOS).

The committee understands that the program offices supporting aging aircraft systems are each generating their own criteria and processes for identifying enhancements and measuring success. The committee further understands that, as a result of this situation, common problems are being addressed and resolved multiple times in dissimilar manners, and believes that the EACOS, can standardize this process and result in the identification of common solutions.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 65011F.

*F–15C/D active electronically scanned array radar*

The budget request contained $115.2 million in PE 27134F for F–15 development programs, but included no funds for the F–15C/D active electronically scanned array (AESA) radar.

The F–15C/D AESA radar, also known as the APG–63(V) 3 radar, would replace the current APG–63(V) 1 radar, and provide a five hundred percent improvement in reliability while reducing the APG–63(V)1's mobility requirements by eight hundred percent. The committee understands that the F–15C/D AESA radar would also provide significant operational improvements and notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included the F–15C/D AESA as his highest unfunded priority for fiscal year 2005.

Consequently, the committee recommends $132.4 million in PE 27134F, an increase of $17.2 million for F–15C/D AESA radar.

*Global Hawk United States Southern Command demonstration*

The budget request contained $336.2 million in PE 35220F for the Air Force Global Hawk high altitude endurance, unmanned aerial vehicle (HAE/UAV) program.

The committee notes that section 221 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2001 (Public Law 106–398) directed the Secretary of Defense to require and coordinate a concept demonstration of the Global Hawk HAE/UAV. The purpose of the demonstration was to demonstrate the capability of the Global Hawk to operate in an airborne surveillance mode, using available, non-developmental technology in a counter-drug surveillance scenario designed to replicate actual conditions typically encountered in the performance of the counter-drug surveillance mission of the U.S. Southern Command.

The committee believes the Department has not met the requirements of this congressionally directed action.

The committee has received the Air Force January 28, 2004, memorandum that states the directive will be met by utilizing the HAE/UAVs existing ground target moving indicator (GMTI) with surface search modes. The committee notes that the specific intent of section 221, is to provide an airborne air surveillance alternative for U.S. Southern Command through a concept demonstration performed under actual conditions of counter-drug airborne surveillance missions. Additionally, the committee notes that the authorized funds were to also pursue the initiation of concurrent development of an improved surveillance radar, such as an airborne moving target indicator (AMTI) capability, for this purpose.

The committee has determined that the Air Force's present plan does not meet the mandated objective contained in section 221. The

committee suspects the Air Force used the $18.0 million set aside in 2001 for the counter-drug demonstration to meet other requirements of the Global Hawk development program. The committee concludes that $18.0 million of Global Hawk requirements, as presented in the 2005 budget request, have been met through the use of the funds set aside for the counter-drug demonstration, and therefore has reduced funds for Global Hawk requirements accordingly.

The committee directs, once again, the Secretary of Defense to conduct a long endurance air-to-air radar surveillance mission concept demonstration of the Global Hawk HAE/UAV that meets the congressional intent of section 221 of Public Law 106–945.

The committee recommends $318.2 million in PE 35220F, a reduction of $18.0 million based on the failure of the Department to conduct a demonstration of the Global Hawk UAV for the Southern Command's airborne surveillance concept demonstration for the drug-interdiction mission.

*Global positioning system*

The budget request contained $148.3 million in PE 35165F for the global positioning system, including $40.6 million for the global positioning system block III (GPS III).

Lessons learned from recent operations have confirmed the value of precision guided munitions in warfare. The committee understands this success relies greatly on the support provided by GPS. Development of GPS III would enhance accuracy, availability and anti-jam capability, while reducing system life-cycle costs. The committee strongly supports this development effort, but is concerned that the first launch, scheduled for fiscal year 2012, is unnecessarily delayed. The committee recommends acceleration of block III satellites consistent with program priorities.

The committee recommends the budget request.

*High accuracy network determination system*

The budget request contained $6.3 million in PE 63444F for the Maui space surveillance system, but included no money for the High Accuracy Network Determination System (HANDS).

The committee recognizes that HANDS would reduce the potential for collisions of space assets by reducing errors in the current space-object maintenance catalog.

The committee recommends $16.3 million in PE 63444F, an increase of $10.0 million for HANDS.

*Identification of time critical targets*

The budget request included $28.5 million in PE 63789F for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence (C3I), including $5.4 million to develop and demonstrate advanced data and information fusion capabilities for identification of time critical targets (targets under trees).

The committee supports the need for enhanced fusion of intelligence data. Increased funding in fiscal year 2005 would permit the demonstration of fusion technologies for continuous tracking of time critical targets and track continuity to provide more accurate common operational pictures through the use of the Distributed Common Ground System.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63789F for data fusion technologies enabling identification of time critical targets.

*Integrated cooling and power system magnetic bearing technology*

The budget request included $92.7 million in PE 62203F for Aerospace Propulsion Systems, including $2.2 million to continue development of advanced bearing concepts for turbine engine applications.

Advanced avionics, electronic warfare systems, and radars in new and upgraded tactical aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles provide significantly increased capability, but demand advanced solutions to meet power and cooling requirements. One enabling technology to meet these requirements is a magnetic bearing turbo-generator.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62203F for integrated cooling and power system magnetic bearing technology.

*Integrated control for autonomous space systems*

The budget request contained $88.9 million in PE 62601F for space technology, but contained no funds for integrated control for autonomous space systems (ICASS).

The committee notes that ICASS is intended to provide advanced satellite control and measurement technologies. The committee realizes ICASS has the potential to greatly expand the Department of Defense capability to deploy and control super-compact structures.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62601F for the development of ICASS.

*Intelligent free space optical satellite communication node*

The budget request contained $60.1 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but contained no funds for the intelligent free space optical satellite communication node.

The committee is concerned about the development risk of the transformational communications architecture and notes that any laser-based satellite communication 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 recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63401F to develop an intelligent free space optical communications node.

*Joint surveillance target attack radar system blue force tracking and combat identification*

The procurement budget request contained $45.3 million for various E–8C joint surveillance target attack radar system (JSTARS) modifications, but included no funds for the blue force tracking and combat identification (CID) upgrade. Additionally, the research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) budget request contained $89.2 for JSTARS development, but also included no funds to develop the JSTARS blue force CID.

The committee understands that, as a result of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the Department of the Air Force has identified critical needs to prosecute mobile targets; provide a common operating picture of friendly and enemy forces to warfighting decision makers; and accurately distinguish between friendly and enemy forces. The committee also understands that the JSTARS blue force tracking and CID upgrades would network friendly forces in real time with the JSTARS E–8C aircraft in all weather conditions to address these critical needs.

Consequently, the committee recommends $55.3 million for E–8C procurement modifications, an increase of $10.0 million for the JSTARS blue force tracking and CID upgrade; and $100.2 million in PE 27581F, an increase of $11.0 million to develop the JSTARS blue force combat tracking and CID components.

*KC–10 global air traffic management development*

The budget request contained $18.5 million in PE 41219F for the KC–10 global air traffic management (GATM) development program.

The KC–10 GATM program is an engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) program that would improve the navigation and communication systems used on KC–10 aircraft. Subsequent to submission of the budget request, the Department of the Air Force canceled the GATM development program due to cost increases. As a result of this decision, the Department informed the committee that it would prefer to transfer these funds into the procurement appropriation to acquire, among other systems, two flight training devices for $7.8 million and a high-frequency data link for $1.2 million. While the committee supports the procurement of flight training devices and communication systems, it believes that existing flight training devices are adequate to meet requirements and that the high-frequency data link can be deferred until fiscal year 2006.

Consequently, the committee recommends $9.4 million in PE 41219F, a decrease of $9.1 million, for the KC–10 GATM development program.

*Lightweight modular support jammer*

The budget request included $28.3 million in PE 63270F for electronic combat technology, including $12.4 million for electro-optical, infrared warning and countermeasures technology.

Countering the threat posed by infrared missiles remains a high priority for the military services. The lightweight modular support jammer (LMSJ) provides a scalable, open architecture, digital receiver and jammer capability for multiple electronic warfare programs and platforms. Additional funding would permit the integration of LMSJ with the Advanced Threat Alert and Response receiver and accelerated testing of the end-to-end system concept.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63270F for LMSJ.

*Metals affordability*

The budget request included $34.3 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapon systems.

The committee supports the continued government-industry collaboration provided through the Metals Affordability Initiative, pro-

viding 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.

*Next generation bomber program*

The budget request contained no funds in PE 64015F for the next generation bomber program.

In the committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) for fiscal year 2004, the committee noted both the increasing age of the Department of the Air Force's B–52 bomber fleet and existing plans to begin a next generation bomber program between the years of 2012 to 2015. The committee concluded that Air Force deferral of a next generation bomber program to 2012 to 2015 would be too late to assure a sufficient bomber force structure to meet future requirements for long-range strike in light of the prospect that future basing for shorter range aircraft may not be assured. Consequently, the committee recommended an increase of $100.0 million for this purpose and notes that $45.0 million was appropriated. However, the committee is dismayed that budget justification documents accompanying the fiscal year 2005 budget request reveal that these funds would be used to develop, mature and study integration of next generation style technologies with the existing bomber fleet, rather than beginning a next generation bomber program that would develop, and eventually procure, new bomber aircraft to meet future long range strike requirements.

For fiscal year 2005, the committee notes that, despite its expectation that the Department of the Air Force would begin a program to develop and procure a next generation bomber beginning in fiscal year 2004, the Department does not include any funds for this purpose until fiscal year 2008, with additional funding planned for fiscal year 2009. While the committee recognizes that the Department of the Air Force has accelerated its next generation bomber plan from the 2012 to 2015 timeframe to fiscal year 2008, the committee remains steadfast in its prior year view that development of a next generation bomber aircraft needs to be initiated, since most of the Air Force's bomber fleet consists of 94 B–52 aircraft which are now approximately 42 years old.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $100.0 million in PE 64015F for the next generation bomber program, and strongly urges the Department of the Air Force to budget for a next generation bomber program each year in its Future Years Defense Program.

*Operationally responsive launch*

The budget request contained $35.4 million in PE 64855F for operationally responsive launch.

The committee strongly supports an operationally responsive launch capability and its objective of developing an affordable, reliable, time responsive launch system, including Scorpius. The committee believes integration of operationally responsive launches would greatly increase the speed of delivering critical space capabilities to the warfighter.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 64855F for development of an operationally responsive launch capability, including Scorpius.

*Satellite simulation toolkit*

The budget request contained $60.1 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but contained no funds for integrated control for a satellite simulation toolkit (SST).

SST provides value to the acquisition and development of space systems via coherent systems engineering and virtual prototyping. The committee is aware of the need to complete development and integration of new and legacy models for the full implementation of SST based effects.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63401F for SST.

*Satellite tool kit technical integration concept of operations for tactical satellite*

The budget request contained $88.9 million in PE 62601F for space technology, but contained no funds for satellite tool kit technical integration.

The committee notes that satellite tool kit technical integration would provide tactical data to the warfighter indicating when a satellite overflight will occur to allow single pass tasking and downlink of time-sensitive surveillance information. This program would benefit in-theater warfighters by enabling immediate access to tactical intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets to enable the collection and delivery of timely surveillance information to enable battlefield superiority. Additionally, these assets provide surge capability to augment existing national assets or help reconstitute space capabilities lost due to enemy action.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62601F for satellite tool kit technical integration.

*Space-based infrared system*

The budget request included $508.4 million in PE 64441F for development of the space-based infrared system (SBIRS).

When finally deployed, SBIRS will provide improved early-warning capabilities and technical intelligence. The committee notes that the SBIRS program has had persistent cost, schedule and technical problems over the last three years of its development. Unexpected technical difficulties on the first SBIRS payload resulted in cost overruns and schedule delays. These problems and further technical difficulties have in turn resulted in a delay of at least one year for the first launch of a SBIRS satellite into geostationary orbit.

The committee notes that the Commander of United States Strategic Command testified to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee in February, 2004 that continuation of the SBIRS program is absolutely essential to his command. The committee remains supportive of the SBIRS program because of the critical nature of its mission. The committee notes the recent technical issues with the geosynchronous sensors and concurs with the recovery plan as presented by the Undersecretary of the Air Force.

The committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million in PE 64441F to address the SBIRS budget shortfall, overcome development difficulties and minimize the schedule delay.

*Space-based radar*

The budget request contained $327.7 million in PE 63858F for space-based radar (SBR).

The committee recognizes the benefits SBR will provide through a persistent, near real-time, high resolution surveillance capability deep into enemy territory and denied areas, benefiting both military and intelligence communities. The committee believes the country cannot afford separate SBR systems to address the needs of these two communities and, as such, it is imperative to develop this system with full support and involvement of the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community (IC). The committee strongly urges the Department and the IC to work in a joint manner toward the development of a SBR capability.

The committee notes unfavorable schedule and cost performance of several space system acquisition programs. As a result of this trend, the committee recommends a legislative provision (sec. 216) affecting the progression to Milestone B for SBR.

The committee recommends the budget request.

*Space cadre*

The committee is committed to the development of highly skilled and knowledgeable professionals to address the acquisition, policy, and technology aspects of space necessary to ensure United States preeminence in tomorrow's space environment. The committee is aware of the ongoing effort by the Department of Defense to institute the space human capital resources strategy as described in the February 2004 report to the congressional defense committees titled, "Space Human Capital Resources Strategy."

The committee notes that this three-phased strategy will initiate the development of a professional space cadre. The committee supports this effort and encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue this effort. The committee recommends that the Department include in its strategy a thorough review of education, training, and the development of a robust, joint space curriculum.

*Space situational awareness initiative*

The budget request contained $161.8 million in PE 35910F for Spacetrack, but included no funds for the space situational awareness initiative.

The committee notes the importance of this upgrade for the future of the counter space mission. Moreover, the committee understands the effort will require nearly eight years to achieve a full operational capability and believes it is prudent to initiate this effort immediately.

The committee recommends $170.8 million in PE 35910F, an increase of $9.0 million for the space situational awareness initiative.

*Streaker small launch vehicle*

The budget request contained $60.1 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but included no funds for the Streaker small launch vehicle (SLV).

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense desires to develop this capability to affordably launch small satellites to low earth orbits for a variety of purposes. The committee notes that the Streaker SLV has the potential to provide affordable responsive launch for small satellites.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63401F for the Streaker SLV.

*Transformational satellite communications*

The budget request contained $774.8 million in PE 63845F for the transformational communications satellite (TSAT) system.

The General Accounting Office expressed concerns in report GAO–04–71R about the immaturity of the TSAT technology and the significant engineering challenges facing a laser-based satellite communications system. The committee remains concerned that the TSAT system is still being driven by an aggressive schedule that does not adequately take into account the immaturity of several key enabling technologies and challenging integration issues.

While the committee supports the goal of TSAT and recognizes the modest steps the Air Force has taken to address the concerns raised in the committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) last year, the committee believes a slower, more realistic schedule for this program is warranted.

The committee recommends $674.8 million in PE 63845F, a decrease of $100.0 million for the TSAT program.

*Ultra short pulse laser technology*

The budget request contained $36.5 million in PE 62605F for directed energy technology, but included no funding for ultra short pulse laser technology.

The committee is aware that ultra short pulse laser technology has the potential to be a breakthrough in size, weight and effectiveness for many applications.

The committee recommends $46.5 million in PE 62605F, an increase of $10.0 million for ultra short pulse laser.

*Upper stage engine technology*

The budget request contained $51.1 million in PE 63500F for multi-disciplinary space technology, but contained no funds for upper stage engine technology.

Upper stage engine technology supports the Air Force's goal to improve liquid oxygen/hydrogen simulation and forecasting tools. The committee recognizes this goal will reduce the risk associated with new technology transition into upper stage engines for reusable and expendable launch vehicles.

The committee recommends $58.1 million in PE 63500F, an increase of $7.0 million for upper stage engine technology.

*Wideband gapfiller system*

The budget request included $73.5 million in PE 63854F and $40.3 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, for the wideband gapfiller satellite (WGS) communications system.

WGS will provide a significant increase in communications bandwidth for warfighters. The committee notes the Air Force's plan to acquire and launch three satellites over the course of fiscal years

2005 and 2007. The committee also notes plans during fiscal year 2005 to negotiate a contract to acquire two additional satellites that would be launched starting in fiscal year 2009. This plan could leave a three-year production gap between the third and fourth satellites, a gap that could increase program risk and cost resulting from parts obsolescence, personnel fluctuations, and the potential need to re-qualify subcontractors. The committee also notes that the Department of Defense supplements its satellite communications network by leasing commercial satellite communications capacity at a cost of about $300.0 million per year. The committee believes that deferring additional military satellite communications acquisition may not be cost effective.

The committee believes that the Air Force decision to proceed with WGS acquisition is correct, but the acquisition strategy that results in this production gap is not well considered.

The committee recommends $88.5 million in PE 63854F, an increase of $15.0 million for additional WGS spare parts.

*Worldwide infrastructure security environment*

The budget request contained $79.6 million in PE 33140F for information security systems programs, but included no funding for the worldwide infrastructure security environment (WISE).

The committee supports this initiative to provide protection and response to attacks that exploit our reliance on computers. This program will manage the complex interactions between physical access, network access, authentication, monitoring, and environmental controls to provide defense against sophisticated hackers. This program also addresses the cyber threat of the year 2010 and beyond with a unique approach to protect information on the Global Information Grid through transaction authentication.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $87.6 million in PE 33140F, an increase of $8.0 million for WISE.

## DEFENSE-WIDE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $20,739.8 million for Defense-wide research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $20,769.3 million, an increase of $29.4 million to the budget request.

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEFENSEWIDE** | | | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0601101D8Z | 1 | In-House Laboratory Independent Research | | | | | |
| 0601101E | 2 | Defense Research Sciences | 143,729 | 5,000 | | | 148,729 |
| 0601101E | | Optoelectronics and Optical Communications | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0601101E | | Super Lattice Nanotechnology | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0601103D8Z | 3 | University Research Initiatives | | | | | |
| 0601105D8Z | 4 | Force Health Protection | | | | | |
| 0601108D8Z | 5 | High Energy Laser Research Initiatives | | | | | |
| 0601111D8Z | 6 | Government/Industry Cosponsorship of University Research | | | | | |
| 0601114D8Z | 7 | Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research | 9,590 | | | | 9,590 |
| 0601384BP | 8 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program | 36,769 | 15,000 | 15,000 | | 51,769 |
| | | **TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH** | **190,088** | **20,000** | **20,000** | | **210,088** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0602227D8Z | 9 | Medical Free Electron Laser | 9,668 | 10,000 | 10,000 | | 19,668 |
| 0602228D8Z | 10 | Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) Science | 14,192 | | | | 14,192 |
| 0602234D8Z | 11 | Lincoln Laboratory Research Program | 25,441 | | | | 25,441 |
| 0602301E | 12 | Computing Systems and Communications Technology | 342,614 | (20,000) | | | 322,614 |
| 0602301E | | Program Reduction | | | | (20,000) | |
| 0602302E | 13 | Embedded Software and Pervasive Computing | | | | | |
| 0602383E | 14 | Biological Warfare Defense | 147,533 | 10,000 | | | 157,533 |
| 0602383E | | Asymmetric Protocols | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602384BP | 15 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program see RDA-30/121 | 104,385 | 25,000 | | | 129,385 |
| 0602384BP | | Applied Research Initiative | | | 25,000 | | |
| 0602702E | 16 | Tactical Technology | 339,175 | (39,000) | | | 300,175 |
| 0602702E | | Stimulated Isomer Energy Release | | | | (4,000) | |
| 0602702E | | Walrus Hybrid Airlift Vehicle | | | | (10,000) | |
| 0602702E | | High-speed/Hypersonic reusable demonstration | | | | (15,000) | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0602702E | | Program Reduction | | | | (10,000) | |
| 0602712E | 17 | Materials and Electronics Technology | 502,044 | (10,000) | | | 492,044 |
| 0602712E | | Program Reduction | | | | (10,000) | |
| 0602716BR | 18 | WMD Defeat Technology | 249,786 | 10,000 | | | 259,786 |
| 0602716BR | | Nuclear Weapons Effects | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602717BR | 19 | WMD Defense Technologies | 116,113 | | | | 116,113 |
| 0602787D8Z | 20 | Medical Technology | 10,084 | | | | 10,084 |
| 0602890D8Z | 21 | High Energy Laser Research | | | | | |
| 1160401BB | 22 | Special Operations Technology Development | 13,109 | 3,000 | | | 16,109 |
| 1160401BB | | Spike Missile Development and Production | | | 3,000 | | |
| 1160407BB | 23 | SOF Medical Technology Development | 2,162 | | | | 2,162 |
| | | **TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH** | **1,876,306** | **(11,000)** | **58,000** | **(69,000)** | **1,865,306** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603002D8Z | 24 | Medical Advanced Technology | 2,063 | 5,000 | | | 7,063 |
| 0603002D8Z | | Anti-radiation Drug and Trials Program | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603104D8Z | 25 | Explosives Demilitarization Technology | | | | | |
| 0603121D8Z | 26 | SO/LIC Advanced Development | 32,682 | | | | 32,682 |
| 0603122D8Z | 27 | Combating Terrorism Technology Support | 46,719 | 27,500 | | | 74,219 |
| 0603122D8Z | | SVS Collaborative and Virtual Reality Training Pilot | | | 2,500 | | |
| 0603122D8Z | | Advanced Combating Terrorism Technology | | | 25,000 | | |
| 0603160BR | 28 | Counterproliferation Advanced Development Technologies | 74,456 | | | | 74,456 |
| 0603175C | 29 | Ballistic Missile Defense Technology | 204,320 | 4,000 | 4,000 | | 208,320 |
| 0603225D8Z | 30 | Joint DoD-DoE Munitions Technology Development | 23,319 | | | | 23,319 |
| 0603232D8Z | 31 | Automatic Target Recognition | | | | | |
| 0603285E | 32 | Advanced Aerospace Systems | 361,067 | (55,000) | | | 306,067 |
| 0603285E | | Program Reduction | | | | (20,000) | |
| 0603285E | | Walrus Hybrid Airlift Vehicle | | | | (10,000) | |
| 0603285E | | Transfer to 63122D8Z | | | | (25,000) | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603384BP | 33 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program - Advanced Development | 117,343 | 35,000 | 35,000 | | 152,343 |
| 0603400D8Z | 34 | J-UCAS | 284,617 | | | | 284,617 |
| 0603704D8Z | 35 | Special Technical Support | | | | | |
| 0603711BR | 36 | Arms Control Technology | | | | | |
| 0603712S | 37 | Generic Logistics R&D Technology Demonstrations | 27,542 | 2,000 | | | 29,542 |
| 0603712S | | Connectory for Rapid ID of Tech Resources | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603716D8Z | 38 | Strategic Environmental Research Program | 56,936 | | | | 56,936 |
| 0603727D8Z | 39 | Joint Warfighting Program | 9,936 | | | | 9,936 |
| 0603739E | 40 | Advanced Electronics Technologies | 218,151 | (5,000) | | | 213,151 |
| 0603739E | | Program Reduction | | | | (5,000) | |
| 0603750D8Z | 41 | Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations | 213,901 | | | | 213,901 |
| 0603755D8Z | 42 | High Performance Computing Modernization Program | 186,666 | 6,000 | | | 192,666 |
| 0603755D8Z | | SMDC Simulation Center | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0603760E | 43 | Command, Control and Communications Systems | 225,784 | (20,000) | | | 205,784 |
| 0603760E | | Program Reduction | | | | (20,000) | |
| 0603762E | 44 | Sensor and Guidance Technology | 337,117 | (25,000) | | | 312,117 |
| 0603762E | | Program Reduction | | | | (25,000) | |
| 0603763E | 45 | Marine Technology | | | | | |
| 0603764E | 46 | Land Warfare Technology / FCS | 63,121 | | | | 63,121 |
| 0603765E | 47 | Classified DARPA Programs | 238,131 | (25,000) | | | 213,131 |
| 0603765E | | Program Reduction | | | | (25,000) | |
| 0603766E | 48 | Network-Centric Warfare Technology | 125,124 | (15,000) | | | 110,124 |
| 0603766E | | Program Reduction | | | | (15,000) | |
| 0603769DSE | 49 | Distributed Learning Advanced Technology Development | 13,756 | | | | 13,756 |
| 0603781D8Z | 50 | Software Engineering Institute | 21,599 | | | | 21,599 |
| 0603805S | 51 | Dual Use Application Programs | | | | | |
| 0603826D8Z | 52 | Quick Reaction Special Projects/Challenge Program | 64,389 | 105,000 | | | 169,389 |
| 0603826D8Z | | IED Electronic Counter Measures and Jammers | | | 30,000 | | |
| 0603826D8Z | | Optical Surveillance Systems | | | 25,000 | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603826D8Z | | Quick Reaction Counter Rocket and Mortar Capability | | | 50,000 | | |
| 0603832D8Z | 53 | Joint Wargaming Simulation Management Office | 46,017 | | | | 46,017 |
| 0603924D8Z | 54 | High Energy Laser Advanced Technology Program | | | | | |
| 0603942D8Z | 55 | Technology Link | 1,934 | | | | 1,934 |
| 0605160D8Z | 56 | Counterproliferation Support | 1,958 | | | | 1,958 |
| 1160402BB | 57 | Special Operations Advanced Technology Development | 48,803 | 16,000 | | | 64,803 |
| 1160402BB | | Remote Sensor Power Source | | | 4,000 | | |
| 1160402BB | | Advanced ID Capability for AC-130U | | | 3,000 | | |
| 1160402BB | | ANGELFIRE Active Protection | | | 6,000 | | |
| 1160402BB | | Surveillance Augmentation Vehicle - Insertable on Request | | | 3,000 | | |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | **3,047,451** | **55,500** | **200,500** | **(145,000)** | **3,102,951** |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | | | |
| 0603228D8Z | 58 | Physical Security Equipment | | | | | |
| 0603709D8Z | 59 | Joint Robotics Program | 11,771 | | | | 11,771 |
| 0603714D8Z | 60 | Advanced Sensor Applications Program | 17,581 | 18,000 | 10,000 | | 35,581 |
| 0603714D8Z | | Multi-Wavelength Surface Scanning Biologics Sensor | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603714D8Z | | Advanced Solid State Dye Laser | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603736D8Z | 61 | CALS Initiative | | | | | |
| 0603851D8Z | 62 | Environmental Security Technical Certification Program | 32,546 | | | | 32,546 |
| 0603869C | 63 | Meads Concepts | | | | | |
| 0603879C | 64 | Advanced Concepts, Evaluations And Systems | 256,159 | (50,000) | | (50,000) | 206,159 |
| 0603880C | 65 | Ballistic Missile Defense System Segment | | | | | |
| 0603881C | 66 | Ballistic Missile Defense Terminal Defense Segment | 937,748 | 47,000 | 47,000 | | 984,748 |
| 0603882C | 67 | Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment | 4,384,775 | 30,000 | | | 4,414,775 |
| 0603882C | | Solid State S Band Radar | | | 30,000 | | |
| 0603883C | 68 | Ballistic Missile Defense Boost Defense Segment | 492,614 | | | | 492,614 |
| 0603884BP | 69 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program | 104,195 | | | | 104,195 |
| 0603884C | 70 | Ballistic Missile Defense Sensors | 591,957 | (51,000) | | (56,000) | 540,957 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603884C | | Post Ramos Project | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603886C | 71 | Ballistic Missile Defense System Interceptor | 511,262 | (67,000) | | (75,000) | 444,262 |
| 0603886C | | Boost Phase Hit-to-Kill | | | 8,000 | | |
| 0603888C | 72 | Ballistic Missile Defense Test & Targets | 713,658 | | | | 713,658 |
| 0603889C | 73 | Ballistic Missile Defense Products | 418,608 | (60,000) | | (60,000) | 358,608 |
| 0603890C | 74 | Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Core | 479,764 | (30,000) | | (30,000) | 449,764 |
| 0603890C | | Wide Bandwidth Technology | | [4,000] | | | [4,000] |
| 0603910D8Z | 75 | Strategic Capability Modernization | | | | | |
| 0603920D8Z | 76 | Humanitarian Demining | 13,747 | | | | 13,747 |
| 0603923D8Z | 77 | Coalition Warfare | 5,886 | | | | 5,886 |
| 0604400D8Z | 78 | J-UCAS | 422,873 | | | | 422,873 |
| 0604722D8Z | 79 | Joint Service Education and Training Systems Development | | | | | |
| 0605017D8Z | 80 | Reduction Of Total Ownership Cost | 27,351 | | | | 27,351 |
| 0303191D8Z | 81 | Joint Electromagnetic Technology (JET) Program | 6,679 | | | | 6,679 |
| | 81a | Joint Experimentation | | 167,626 | 167,626 | | 167,626 |
| | 81b | Joint Warfare Experiments | | 26 | 26 | | 26 |
| | 81c | Joint Warfare Transformation Programs | | 22,450 | 22,450 | | 22,450 |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | **9,429,174** | **27,102** | **298,102** | **(271,000)** | **9,456,276** |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | | | |
| 0604384BP | 82 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program | 152,379 | 13,000 | | | 165,379 |
| 0604384BP | | Joint Biological Point Detection System | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0604384BP | | Joint Service Lightweight Standoff Chemical Agent Detector | | | 8,000 | | |
| 0604618D8Z | 83 | MANPADS Defense Program | 14,135 | (14,135) | | (14,135) | |
| 0604709D8Z | 84 | Joint Robotics Program | 13,845 | | | | 13,845 |
| 0604764K | 85 | Advanced IT Services Joint Program Office (AITS-JPO) | 18,183 | | | | 18,183 |
| 0604771D8Z | 86 | Joint Tactical Information Distribution System (JTIDS) | 18,515 | | | | 18,515 |
| 0604861C | 87 | Theater High-Altitude Area Defense System - TMD | | | | | |
| 0604865C | 88 | Patriot PAC-3 Theater Missile Defense Acquisition | | | | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0605013BL | 89 | Information Technology Development | 10,683 | | | | 10,683 |
| 0605013D8Z | 90 | Prototype Accounting Systems | | | | | |
| 0605014SE | 91 | Information Technology Development | 52,407 | | | | 52,407 |
| 0605015BL | 92 | Information Technology Development-Standard Procurement System (SPS) | 6,690 | | | | 6,690 |
| 0605016D8Z | 93 | Financial Management System Improvements | 94,767 | (49,000) | | (49,000) | 45,767 |
| 0303129K | 94 | Defense Message System | 6,623 | | | | 6,623 |
| 0303140K | 95 | Information Systems Security Program | 2,493 | | | | 2,493 |
| 0303141K | 96 | Global Combat Support System | 17,867 | | | | 17,867 |
| 0303158K | 97 | Joint Command and Control Program (JC2) | 3,000 | | | | 3,000 |
| 0305840K | 98 | Electronic Commerce | 3,466 | | | | 3,466 |
| 0305840S | 99 | Electronic Commerce | 2,345 | | | | 2,345 |
| 0901200D8Z | 100 | BMMP Domain Management and Systems Integration | 7,472 | | | | 7,472 |
| | | **TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | **424,870** | **(50,135)** | **13,000** | **(63,135)** | **374,735** |
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | | | |
| 0603704D8Z | 101 | Special Technical Support | 19,274 | | | | 19,274 |
| 0603757D8Z | 102 | Training Transformation (T2) | | | | | |
| 0603835D8Z | 103 | Transformation Initiatives Program | 9,977 | | | | 9,977 |
| 0603858D8Z | 104 | Unexploded Ordnance Detection and Clearance | | | | | |
| 0604774D8Z | 105 | Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS) | 19,691 | | | | 19,691 |
| 0604875D8Z | 106 | Joint Systems Architecture Development | 4,989 | | | | 4,989 |
| 0604943D8Z | 107 | Thermal Vicar | 7,263 | | | | 7,263 |
| 0605104D8Z | 108 | Technical Studies, Support and Analysis | 30,618 | 1,000 | | | 31,618 |
| 0605104D8Z | | NDU Technology Pilot Program | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0605110BR | 109 | Critical Technology Support | 1,937 | | | | 1,937 |
| 0605114D8Z | 110 | BLACK LIGHT | 21,535 | | | | 21,535 |
| 0605116D8Z | 111 | General Support to C3I | | | | | |
| 0605117D8Z | 112 | Foreign Material Acquisition and Exploitation | 35,572 | | | | 35,572 |
| 0605123D8Z | 113 | Interagency Export License Automation | 5,882 | | | | 5,882 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0605124D8Z | 114 | Defense Travel System | 28,508 | | | | 28,508 |
| 0605126J | 115 | Joint Theater Air and Missile Defense Organization | 86,409 | | | | 86,409 |
| 0605128D8Z | 116 | Classified Program USD(P) | | | | | |
| 0605130D8Z | 117 | Foreign Comparative Testing | 35,633 | 1,550 | | | 37,183 |
| 0605130D8Z | | Weather SCOUT UAV | | | 1,550 | | |
| 0605170D8Z | 118 | Support to Networks and Information Integration | 11,490 | | | | 11,490 |
| 0605200D8Z | 119 | General Support to USD (Intelligence) | 4,830 | | | | 4,830 |
| 0605384BP | 120 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program | 42,652 | | | | 42,652 |
| 0605502BR | 121 | Small Business Innovation Research | | | | | |
| 0605502C | 122 | Small Business Innovative Research - MDA | | | | | |
| 0605502D8Z | 123 | Small Business Innovative Research | | | | | |
| 0605502E | 124 | Small Business Innovative Research | | | | | |
| 0605710D8Z | 125 | Classified Programs - C3I | | | | | |
| 0605790D8Z | 126 | Small Business Innovation Research/Challenge Administration | 1,999 | | | | 1,999 |
| 0605798S | 127 | Defense Technology Analysis | 7,279 | | | | 7,279 |
| 0605799D8Z | 128 | Force Transformation | 19,591 | 25,000 | | | 44,591 |
| | | Operationally Responsive Satellite | | | 25,000 | | |
| 0605801K | 129 | Defense Technical Information Services (DTIC) | 45,203 | | | | 45,203 |
| 0605803SE | 130 | R&D in Support of DoD Enlistment, Testing and Evaluation | 10,598 | | | | 10,598 |
| 0605804D8Z | 131 | Development Test and Evaluation | 8,882 | | | | 8,882 |
| 0605898E | 132 | Management Headquarters (Research and Development) DARPA | 46,689 | | | | 46,689 |
| 0303169D8Z | 133 | Information Technology Rapid Acquisition | 19,958 | (17,000) | | | 2,958 |
| 0303169D8Z | | Rapid Acquisition Process | | | | (17,000) | |
| 0305193D8Z | 134 | Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO) | 12,878 | | | | 12,878 |
| 0305193G | 135 | Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO) | | | | | |
| 0901585C | 136 | Pentagon Reservation | 13,884 | | | | 13,884 |
| 0901598C | 137 | Management Headquarters - MDA | 141,923 | | | | 141,923 |
| 0901598D8W | 138 | IT Software Dev Initiatives | 1,700 | | | | 1,700 |
| 0909999E | 139 | Financing for Cancelled Account Adjustments | | | | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| XXXXXXX | 999 | Classified Programs | 14,482 | 20,400 | | | 34,882 |
| XXXXXXX | | Program Increase | | | 20,400 | | |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | **711,326** | **30,950** | **47,950** | (17,000) | **742,276** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0604805D8Z | 140 | Commercial Operations and Support Savings Initiative | | | | | |
| 0605127T | 141 | Partnership for Peace (PfP) Information Management System | 6,995 | | | | 6,995 |
| 0607384BP | 142 | Chemical and Biological Defense | 2,178 | | | | 2,178 |
| 0208043J | 143 | Classified Programs | 1,663 | | | | 1,663 |
| 0208045K | 144 | C4I Interoperability | 41,074 | | | | 41,074 |
| 0208052J | 145 | Joint Analytical Model Improvement Program | 5,577 | | | | 5,577 |
| 0300205R | 146 | Information Technology Systems | | | | | |
| 0301011G | 147 | Cryptologic Activities | | | | | |
| 0301301L | 148 | General Defense Intelligence Program | | | | | |
| 0301318BB | 149 | HUMINT (Controlled) | | | | | |
| 0301398L | 150 | Management Headquarters GDIP, DIA | | | | | |
| 0301555BB | 151 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| 0301556BB | 152 | SPECIAL PROGRAM | | | | | |
| 0302016K | 153 | National Military Command System-Wide Support | 1,240 | | | | 1,240 |
| 0302019K | 154 | Defense Info Infrastructure Engineering and Integration | 2,517 | | | | 2,517 |
| 0303126K | 155 | Long Haul Communications (DCS) | 11,401 | | | | 11,401 |
| 0303127K | 156 | Support of the National Communications System | | | | | |
| 0303131K | 157 | Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN) | 7,261 | | | | 7,261 |
| 0303140D8Z | 158 | Information Systems Security Program | 11,135 | | | | 11,135 |
| 0303140G | 159 | Information Systems Security Program | 477,846 | | | | 477,846 |
| 0303149J | 160 | C4I for the Warrior | 4,177 | | | | 4,177 |
| 0303149K | 161 | C4I for the Warrior | 24,712 | | | | 24,712 |
| 0303150K | 162 | Global Command and Control System | 43,693 | | | | 43,693 |
| 0303153K | 163 | Joint Spectrum Center | 18,941 | | | | 18,941 |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0303165K | 164 | Defense Collaboration Tool Suite (DCTS) | 8,503 | | | | 8,503 |
| 0303170K | 165 | Net-Centric Enterprise Services (NCES) | 52,059 | | | | 52,059 |
| 0303610K | 166 | Teleport Program | 10,272 | | | | 10,272 |
| 0304210BB | 167 | Special Applications for Contingencies | 20,758 | | | | 20,758 |
| 0304345BQ | 168 | National Imagery and Mapping Program | | | | | |
| 0305102BQ | 169 | Defense Imagery and Mapping Program | | (200) | | | (200) |
| 0305102BQ | | TPED of SYERS-2 | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0305102BQ | | National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency | | | | (3,200) | |
| 0305125D8Z | 170 | Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) | 28,021 | | | | 28,021 |
| 0305127BZ | 171 | Foreign Counterintelligence Activities | | | | | |
| 0305127V | 172 | Foreign Counterintelligence Activities | | | | | |
| 0305146BZ | 173 | Defense Joint Counterintelligence Program (JMIP) | 32,939 | | | | 32,939 |
| 0305146D8Z | 174 | Defense Joint Counterintelligence Program (JMIP) | | | | | |
| 0305183L | 175 | Defense Human Intelligence (HUMINT) Program (DHIP) | | | | | |
| 0305190D8Z | 176 | C3I Intelligence Programs | | | | | |
| 0305191D8Z | 177 | Technology Development | | | | | |
| 0305193G | 178 | Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO) | | | | | |
| 0305193L | 179 | Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO) | | | | | |
| 0305199D8Z | 180 | Net Centricity | 214,222 | (70,000) | | (70,000) | 144,222 |
| 0305202G | 181 | Dragon U-2 (JMIP) | | | | | |
| 0305206G | 182 | Airborne Reconnaissance Systems | | | | | |
| 0305207G | 183 | Manned Reconnaissance Systems | | | | | |
| 0305208BQ | 184 | Distributed Common Ground Systems | | | | | |
| 0305208G | 185 | Distributed Common Ground Systems | | | | | |
| 0305208L | 186 | Distributed Common Ground Systems | | | | | |
| 0305883L | 187 | Hard and Deeply Buried Target (HDBT) Intel Support | | | | | |
| 0305884L | 188 | Intelligence Planning and Review Activities | | 10,000 | | | 10,000 |
| 0305884L | | Measures and Signatures Intelligence Consortium | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0305885G | 189 | Tactical Cryptologic Activities | | | | | |

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0305889G | 190 | Counterdrug Intelligence Support | | | | | |
| 0305917D8Z | 191 | National Security Space Architect (NSSA) | | | | | |
| 0708011S | 192 | Industrial Preparedness | 11,005 | 12,200 | | | 23,205 |
| 0708011S | | Smart Machine Platform Initiative | | | 12,200 | | |
| 0708012S | 193 | Logistics Support Activities | 11,389 | | | | 11,389 |
| 0902298J | 194 | Management Headquarters (JCS) | 22,421 | | | | 22,421 |
| 1001018D8Z | 195 | NATO Joint STARS | 30,399 | | | | 30,399 |
| 1160279BB | 196 | Small Business Innovative Research/Small Bus Tech Transfer Pilot Prog | | | | | |
| 1160401BB | 197 | Special Operations Technology Development | | | | | |
| 1160402BB | 198 | Special Operations Advanced Technology Development | | | | | |
| 1160404BB | 199 | Special Operations Tactical Systems Development | 311,966 | | | | 311,966 |
| 1160405BB | 200 | Special Operations Intelligence Systems Development | 25,015 | | | | 25,015 |
| 1160407BB | 201 | SOF Medical Technology Development | | | | | |
| 1160408BB | 202 | SOF Operational Enhancements | 57,643 | | | | 57,643 |
| XXXXXXX | 999 | Classified | 3,563,600 | 5,000 | | | 3,568,600 |
| XXXXXXX | | Program Increase | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | **TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | **5,060,622** | **(43,000)** | **30,200** | **(73,200)** | **5,017,622** |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E, DEFENSE WIDE** | **20,739,837** | **29,417** | **667,752** | **(638,335)** | **20,769,254** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Accelerating transition and fielding of advanced technologies for emerging critical operational needs*

The pace at which new technology moves from the laboratory to a fielded system has been an area of continuing concern to the Department of Defense and to Congress. Scaling technology up in size and integrating it with other technologies can present problems, not identified in the laboratory, that delay a program and/or greatly increase program costs. More emphasis and an increased share of the science and technology program have been directed toward the use of technology demonstrations and joint experiments to solve these problems before beginning an acquisition program and speeding the transition of new technology to operational capabilities the user faster and at less cost.

The transition of technology from discovery and demonstration to development and fielding is also difficult because the Department's planning and budgeting process frequently creates a funding gap. Revolutionary technologies that "change minds" and ways of doing things often occur faster than the present defense budget and the appropriations process can respond. Additionally, it is difficult to reallocate fiscal funding for a revolutionary technology within current year funding. The institutional process within the Department lacks the flexibility at all levels: service laboratory; research; development and engineering center; systems command; military departments, and the defense secretariat—to capitalize on new discoveries in academia or institute, service or national laboratory, large industry or small business, and to rapidly develop, demonstrate, and transition the new technology to the military user. There are a number of initiatives underway to address this problem: the Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration program, the Army's Rapid Fielding Initiative, the congressionally sponsored Technology Transition Initiative and the Defense Challenge program. Section 806 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) requires the Secretary of Defense to prescribe rapid acquisition and deployment procedures. Section 1443 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) provides special emergency procurement authority for use in support of contingency operations or in response to a nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological attack. During the committee hearing on the Defense science and technology budget request for fiscal year 2005, the Director, Defense and Engineering testified about the establishment of the quick reaction special projects program, which he characterized as a flexible continuum of technology transition projects that moves products from the Department to the warfighter quickly.

Many of these initiatives are at an early stage and changes to acquisition and budgeting systems to provide the Department with greater flexibility to take advantage of rapidly developing technology are slow to be institutionalized. The committee is encouraged by many of the improvements in the rapid fielding of technology to support the war on terrorism, but also recognizes that there is much to be done. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2004, any additional recommendations for measures to

accelerate the more rapid transition and fielding of advanced technologies to meet emerging critical needs.

*Advanced metal casting technology*

The budget request contained $27.5 million in PE 78011S, for manufacturing technology research and development, including $2.3 million for procurement readiness optimization—advanced casting technology.

The committee notes the success of collaborative problem solving environments that have been prototyped in several of the military services' engineering support activities, each of which has been custom designed to reflect the needs of the weapons systems and processes used by the military services. The committee also notes the development of casting technology for cost reduction, including advances in steel casting, development of a foundry tooling database, use of casting software visualization tools to reduce trial and error, improvements in melting and molding processes, use of cheaper tooling materials for short run production, and other technologies for reducing production time. The committee considers these interrelated programs to be of great value to the Department of Defense and to the national industrial base as well.

The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to allocate additional resources in future budgets for development of further improvements in collaborative problem solving and casting manufacturing technologies.

*Advanced sensor applications program*

The budget request contained $17.6 million in PE 63714D8Z for the advanced sensor applications program. The committee is concerned that promising projects executed by the Navy's PMA 264 program office are appreciably underfunded for special programs under development.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63714D8Z for the advanced sensor applications program. Additional details are contained in the classified annex to this report.

*Advanced tactical laser program*

The committee supports the efforts across the Department's science and technology community to develop tactically useful directed energy weapons. The committee believes that the attributes of such weapons, such as stealth, precision, and minimal collateral damage, make high powered laser tactical weapons ideal in the fight against terrorism. The committee is concerned, however, that the research effort is not directed as precisely as the weapons themselves. For example, the committee understands that chemical laser systems are the most highly developed high powered lasers, but that several efforts are underway to develop more tactically feasible solid state high powered laser systems. Given the large size of chemical laser systems, the committee believes that the Special Operations Command's (SOCOM) Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) for the development of a chemical laser system for an AC–130 gunship may not lead to a militarily useful system before solid state systems mature.

Accordingly, the committee will continue to carefully monitor the SOCOM ACTD, and directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services should the military utility assessment for the advanced tactical laser be delayed beyond fiscal year 2007.

*Anti-radiation drug and trials program*

The budget request contained $2.1 million in PE 63002D8Z for medical advanced technology development, including $120,000 for development of the 5-adrostendiol (5–AED) advanced radioprotectant ("anti-radiation") drug.

The committee notes progress in the development of 5–AED, the Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute leading candidate for a whole body radioprotectant drug compound: pre-clinical safety and toxicity assessments, small and large animal trials, and extension of the work to pre-clinical trials in a large animal model have been initiated.

The committee recommends $7.1 million in PE 63002D8Z, an increase of $5.0 million to support final efficacy and human toxicity trials of the 5–AED radioprotectant drug.

*Asymmetric protocols for biological defense*

The budget request contained $147.5 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 protection 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 that 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. The committee believes that the results of the research to date are promising and the research should continue, but also believes that the research protocols and results to date should undergo an independent peer review. The committee directs the Director of Defense Research and Engineering to conduct such a review and report the results of the review to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2004.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62383E to continue research in asymmetric protocols that would provide broad spectrum protection for biological defense.

*Ballistic missile defense*

The budget request contained $9,200.0 million for ballistic missile defense.

The committee notes that the budget request reflects an increase of $1,500.0 million over the fiscal year 2004 budget request and recommends a reallocation of the fiscal year 2005 request to focus on near term missile defense capability development and testing.

The committee recommends $9,023.0 million, a reduction of $177.0 million.

*Advanced concepts*

The budget request contained $256.2 million in PE 63879C for Advanced Concepts, Evaluations and Systems, an increase of $106.0 million from the fiscal year 2005 projection in the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

The committee has reservations that such an increase is justified or that it can be effectively executed. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to focus their advanced concepts work on earlier block applications.

The committee recommends $206.2 million in PE 63879C, a decrease of $50.0 million.

*Boost defense segment*

The budget request contained $492.6 million in PE 63883C for boost defense. The committee notes with approval the Department of Defense restructuring of the Airborne Laser (ABL) program in late 2003. The committee also recognizes that the future of the ABL program depends upon successful completion of the ground laser test and the flight test of the beam-control fire control system. These milestones must be completed in order for the committee to further support the program after fiscal year 2005. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2005, on the status of these two major component tests as well as a recommendation for the future of the program.

The committee recommends the budget request for boost defense.

*Core*

The budget request contained $479.8 million in PE 63890C for system core activities.

The committee notes that funding for the systems engineering and integration effort has increased significantly from fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends $449.8 million, a decrease of $30.0 million. The committee encourages the Director of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to focus the national team on the near term block 2004 and 2006 efforts.

The committee also understands that development of wide bandwidth technology is critical for the MDA to transmit test data over extensive distances in support of the test and evaluation program. The committee is encouraged by the recent success of a feasibility demonstration of seamless collaboration utilizing mobile satellite communications from the Reagan Test Site to the Joint National Integration Center.

Within the funds available, the committee recommends $4.0 million for the development of wide bandwidth technology in support of the MDA test program.

*Midcourse defense segment*

The budget request contained $4,384.8 million in PE 63882C for the ballistic missile defense (BMD) midcourse defense segment.

The Navy has previously funded research and development efforts for an S-band radar prototype. Development of a Solid State S-Band Radar will support future Aegis BMD system capability.

The committee recommends $4,414.8 million in PE 63882C, an increase of $30.0 million for the development of a Solid State S-Band Radar to support Aegis BMD system radar capability.

*Post Ramos Project*

The committee notes that the Department of Defense announced its intention to terminate the Russian-American Observation Satellite (RAMOS) program earlier this year. The committee also understands that the Department desires to explore other opportunities for missile defense cooperative programs with the Russian Federation that build upon the experience gained in the RAMOS program.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63884C to explore future opportunities for missile defense cooperation with the Russian Federation.

*Products*

The budget request contained $418.6 million in PE 63889C for products.

The committee notes that the request represents a $113.0 million increase from a fiscal year 2005 projection in the 2004 budget request. The committee also notes that the funding for Command and Control, Battle Management and Communications (C2BMC) has increased significantly from fiscal year 2004 with C2BMC efforts spread across blocks 2004, 2006 and 2008, even though block 2004 has not undergone full operational testing. While the committee supports in principle the concept of spiral development, it also notes that development of C2BMC software is complex and that successful spirals are grounded in successful testing of an initial baseline.

The committee recommends $358.6 million in PE 63889C, a decrease of $60.0 million and urges the Department of Defense to focus C2BMC efforts on near term block requirements.

*Sensors*

The budget request contained $592.0 million in PE 63884C for sensors.

The committee notes that funding in PE 63884C for block 2006 ballistic missile defense radars has increased by $156.0 million from the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

The committee is concerned with the projected costs of the Forward Deployable Radar (FDR) since the FDR program uses radar technology already developed for the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system.

The committee recommends $536.0 million in PE 63884C, a decrease of $56.0 million for sensors.

*System interceptor*

The budget request contained $511.3 million in PE 63886C for system interceptor. The committee notes that the request reflects a $360.2 million increase from the fiscal year 2004 authorization.

The committee supports pursuing the land-based Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI) in block 2010 as an alternative to the Airborne Laser for boost phase defense. However, the committee also notes that the request contains funds for block 2012 even though the block 2010 effort just started in 2004. The block 2012 program includes options for a sea-based KEI. The block 2012 sea-based element is designed to integrate the block 2010 land-based KEI element into operational sea-based platforms.

The committee notes that block 2010 will serve as the foundation for the block 2012 program and that progress must first be achieved in the land-based KEI program prior to beginning work in earnest on future sea-based programs. The committee also notes that designation of a platform for the sea-based interceptor is dependent upon future decisions on future Navy force structure and ship design. At this stage of the KEI program, the committee views funding for a sea-based platform option as premature.

The committee recommends $436.3 million, a decrease of $75.0 million for system interceptor. The committee authorizes no funding for sea-based options in block 2012 until 30 days after the Department of Defense has submitted a report to the congressional defense committees that contains a Navy-approved plan for future force structure and existing ship and/or future ship design requirements to support operational deployment of the sea-based interceptors envisioned for block 2012.

The committee understands that the boost phase defense element is the least mature of the elements within the layered defense. Given the importance of intercepting a ballistic missile in the boost phase, the committee believes that the Department should be open to considering additional options for boost phase defense. The committee notes the speed with which United States and coalition forces have established air superiority in recent military operations. The committee is further encouraged by the successful operational demonstration of long duration unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) such as Global Hawk and the employment of the Predator UAV to remotely engage ground targets.

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 launched from tactical aircraft to intercept missiles in boost phase ascent. The committee believes that tactical aircraft or UAVs may offer an alternate launch platform for air intercept missiles for boost phase defense.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63886C for assessments and demonstrations related to the use of tactical aircraft or UAVs as platforms from which to interdict threat ballistic missiles in their boost phase using "hit-to-kill" technologies. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide all required test equipment and logistical support including aircraft and range support to facilitate this demonstration.

*Technology*

The budget request contained $204.3 million in PE 63175C for ballistic missile defense technology.

The committee is aware of the requirement for missile defense command and control elements to transmit large amounts of data to interceptors. The committee recognizes that high density optical networks can provide this capability for defense satellite systems.

The committee recommends $208.3 million in PE 63175C, an increase of $4.0 million for research into massively parallel optical interconnects.

*Terminal defense segment*

The budget request contained $937.7 million in PE 63881C for the ballistic missile defense terminal defense segment.

The committee notes that the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) program was negatively impacted by the boost motor propellant explosion in 2003. As a result of the explosion, a number of block 2004 program activities were deferred. The committee is particularly concerned with the deferral of risk reduction activities and schedule delays.

The committee recommends $984.7 million in PE 63881C, an increase of $47.0 million to reduce program risks and to prevent schedule delays in the THAAD program.

*Business management modernization program*

The budget request contained $94.8 million in PE 65016D8Z for research, development, testing and evaluation for the business management modernization program (BMMP), a Department-wide initiative to transform business processes while standardizing and integrating information systems using common, network centric processes and portfolio management.

The committee supports such business transformation initiatives that would enable interoperability among financial, accounting, human resources, logistics, acquisition, information technology infrastructure, and strategic planning and budgeting systems. In addition, the committee believes the business enterprise architecture, once implemented and controlled, will be a good start towards achieving this goal. However, the committee has serious concerns that the final cost of this program will amount to almost $1.0 billion by fiscal year 2009. Additionally, the committee is also concerned that the enterprise architecture is still incomplete at the present time. Furthermore, the Department has yet to devise a strategy to monitor the progress of this program or measure the program's development. It remains unclear whether this program will meet the Department's 2007 deadline for providing a clean financial audit opinion.

The committee notes that the Department's inability to control its business information technology investments has serious implications, including the continuous spending of billions of dollars on service-specific or non-interoperable system solutions that do not address longstanding business problems.

Additionally, the committee has serious concerns that this program lacks adequate accountability and management oversight to manage the Department's business system investments of roughly $5.0 billion in the fiscal year 2005 budget request. The committee

believes it is critical that the Department gain more effective control and accountability over its business systems funding and insists on a clear direction and an overarching architecture before funding at the level suggested in the budget request is approved.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $45.8 million for PE 65016D8Z for business management modernization, a decrease of $49.0 million.

*Chemical/biological defense research, development, test and evaluation program*

The budget request contained a total of $559.9 million for chemical/biological defense research, development, test, and evaluation, including $36.8 million in PE 61384BP for basic research, $104.4 million in PE 62384BP for applied research, $117.3 million in PE 63384BP for advanced technology development, $104.2 million in PE 63884BP for advanced component development and prototypes, $152.4 million in PE 64384BP for system development and demonstration, $42.7 million in PE 65384BP for RDT&E management support, and $2.2 million in PE 67384BP for operational systems development. The budget request also contained $147.5 million in PE 62383E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) biological warfare 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 the continuation of two chemical and biological defense research and development initiatives established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), one in the applied research category and one in the advanced technology development category, and the establishment of a third initiative in chemical and biological defense basic research, that would 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. During its review of the fiscal year 2005 budget request the committee received proposals for establishment of a number of projects that the committee recommends be considered for possible funding under the appropriate initiative.

*Accelerating the research, development, and acquisition of medical countermeasures against biological warfare agents*

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107), Congress directed the Secretary of Defense to accelerate the Department's efforts to develop medical countermeasures (licensed by the Food and Drug Administration) against biological warfare agents. In addition, Congress directed the Sec-

retary to contract with the Institute of Medicine and the National Research Council (IOM/NRC) for a study of the review and approval process for new medical countermeasures in order to identify new approaches to accelerate that process and to identify methods for ensuring that new countermeasures would be safe and effective.

IOM/NRC report "Giving Full Measure to Countermeasures—Addressing Problems in the DOD Program to Develop Medical Countermeasures against Biological Warfare Agents–2004," raises a number of issues concerning the current efforts of the Department of Defense chemical and biological defense program to produce medical biodefense countermeasures.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review and evaluate the IOM/NRC report and to report the results of that review to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2004. The Secretary's report shall contain an analysis of the recommendations made in the IOM/NRC report and the actions planned by the Department with respect to each of the recommendations.

Elsewhere in this report the committee has directed the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on the actions taken to implement the authorities granted in Title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–186). The Act provides the authority for the Secretary to establish an enhanced biomedical countermeasures program within the Department to protect members of the Armed Forces from attack with chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear (CBRN) agents. The committee has also recommended a provision (section 1005) that would remove funding restrictions on the development of medical countermeasures against biological warfare threats and enable the Department to respond more effectively to the increased threat that could be posed by rapid advances in biotechnology.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees, with the submission of the fiscal year 2006 defense budget request, the Department's strategic plan detailing its response to recommendations contained in the IOM/NRC report: the implementation of the additional authorities granted in Title XVI for accelerated research, development; the procurement of advanced biomedical countermeasures; and the repeal of funding restrictions on the development of countermeasures against biological warfare threats. This plan should provide the basis for the development by the Secretary of Defense of a strategic plan for the rapid development of biomedical countermeasures for protection of members of the Armed Forces against current and future biological agent threats.

*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) Multi-purpose biodefense immunoarray.

The committee recommends $51.8 million in PE 61384BP, an increase of $15.0 million for the chemical/biological defense basic research initiative.

*Chemical/biological defense applied research initiative*

The committee recommends that the projects and technologies to be considered for funding under the applied research initiative include, but are not limited to the following:

(1) Adaptive infrared imaging spectroradiometer-wide area-detector;

(2) Air containment monitoring technology;

(3) Automated system for liquid phase detectors of toxic compounds;

(4) Genomic-based bioterrorism agent detection and countermeasures;

(5) Heat shock protein vaccine creation process;

(6) LHA–SAW biosensor prototype development;

(7) Low cost chemical-biological protective shelters;

(8) Membrane research for next generation chemical-biological protective suits;

(9) Mustard gas antidote (STIMAL);

(10) Rapid anti-body based biological countermeasures; and

(11) Rapid decontamination system for nerve agents.

The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 62384BP for the chemical/biological defense applied research initiative.

*Chemical/biological defense advanced technology development initiative*

The committee recommends that the projects and technologies to be considered for funding under the advanced technology development initiative include, but not be limited the following:

(1) Hand-held biological agent detection system;

(2) Immuno biological/chemical threat agent detector;

(3) Non-invasive vectored vaccine development; and

(4) Recombinant protein vaccines.

The committee recommends $152.3 million in PE 63384BP, an increase of $35.0 million for the chemical/biological defense advanced technology development initiative.

*Joint biological point detection system*

The budget request contained $152.4 million in PE 64384BP for chemical and biological defense system development and demonstration, including $8.6 million for joint biological point detection system (JBPDS) system development and demonstration.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64384BP for continued product improvement and enhancement of the JBPDS.

*Joint service lightweight standoff chemical agent detector*

The budget request contained $152.4 million in PE 64384BP for chemical and biological defense system development and demonstration, including $20.1 million for joint service lightweight standoff chemical agent detector (JSLSCAD) system development and demonstration.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 64384BP to continue development and evaluation of the JSLSCAD.

*Connectory for rapid identification of technology resources*

The budget request contained $27.5 million in PE 63712S for generic logistics research and development technology demonstrations, but included no funding for the connectory of rapid identification of technology sources for the Department of Defense. The connectory pilot would provide the Department with instant access to the industrial technology base, permitting rapid identification of promising sources of new, creative technical solutions for current combat and anti-terrorism problems.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63712S for connectory for rapid indentification of technology resources.

*Counter-terrorism technology support*

The combating terrorism technology support program develops technology and prototype equipment that address 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 antiterrorism, 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.

The committee notes and highly commends the contributions made by the Technical Support Working Group (TSWG) in the development, demonstration, and fielding of advanced technologies for the fight against terrorism. The committee encourages the TSWG to coordinate with counterpart activities within the government of the United Kingdom and the government of Israel to take advantage of the experience of their activities in the development and fielding of advanced technologies for force protection and for combating terrorism.

In title XV of this report, the committee has recommended an increase of $75.0 million for combating terrorism technology support. In addition, the committee directs that, of the funds provided in title II of this report for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, up to $25.0 million may be made available for the establishment of cooperative programs with the government of the United Kingdom and the government of Israel for the development of advanced technologies and prototype equipment for combating terrorism. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to give priority consideration to the experience of the government of Israel and the government of the United Kingdom in establishing such programs.

*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. 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. The committee encourages DARPA to continue to examine the "far side," and investigate concepts that may never come to fruition.

Nevertheless, DARPA remains a Defense Agency and must be closely attuned to real defense requirements. Furthermore, the pursuit of the more futuristic technologies on the "far side" must be tempered by the hard fact that we are a nation at war. Our commanders and troops in Iraq 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, however, that DARPA should 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 may well be "DARPA hard" problems that the Agency should be examining, rather than some of the more futuristic efforts in the DARPA program.

The committee recognizes that DARPA receives input from the military departments, Joint Staff, combatant commanders, and other defense agencies, as the agency leadership builds a program to address national-level problems, operational dominance, and exploitation of high-risk, high-payoff technologies. The committee commends the director of DARPA for his outreach program and operational liaison initiatives. The committee believes, however, that increased emphasis needs to be placed on liaison with the combatant commanders and directs the director of DARPA to establish continuing contact with engaged combatant commanders to determine how DARPA may assist in solving today's real world combat problems, while at the same time continuing promising research into long term creative technologies. In support of these liaison initiatives, the committee strongly recommends that additional military billets be assigned to DARPA and that military officers assigned to DARPA be given joint service credit at the completion of their tour of duty with the agency.

Although the committee is pleased with the overall progress in the defense science and technology program, the committee believes that increased priority must be given to the nearer-term requirements of the combatant commanders and U.S. armed forces in the field. Consequently, the committee makes a series of recommendations for general reductions in DARPA programs:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| 62301E—Computing systems and communications technology | (20.0) |
| 62702E—Tactical technology | (10.0) |
| 62712E—Materials and electronics technology | (10.0) |
| 63285E—Advanced aerospace systems | (20.0) |
| 63739E—Advanced electronics technology | (5.0) |

| | |
|---|---|
| 63760E—Command, control and communications systems | (20.0) |
| 63762E—Sensor and guidance technology | (25.0) |
| 63765E—Classified DARPA programs | (25.0) |
| 63766E—Network-centric warfare technology | (15.0) |

These recommendations are made without prejudice to the particular account identified.

*Defense science and technology funding*

The budget request contained $10.6 billion for the Department of Defense (DOD) science and technology program, including all defense-wide and military service funding for basic research, applied research, and advanced technology development. The request included $1.8 billion for the Army, $1.7 billion for the Navy, $1.9 billion for the Air Force, and $5.1 billion for Defense Agency science and technology, including $3.1 billion for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). The committee recommends $11.1 billion for the Department of Defense science and technology program, an increase of $874.0 million to the budget request. The committee's recommendation includes $2.1 billion for the Army, an increase of $304.8 million; $1.8 billion for the Navy, an increase of $ 201.7 million; $2.0 billion for the Air Force, an increase of $114.0 million; and $5.2 billion for Defense agency science and technology, an increase of $64.5 million (including $2.9 billion for DARPA, a decrease of $204.0 million). Elsewhere in this report the committee has recommended a provision (section 214) that would transfer funding for the joint experimentation program from the Navy to a Defense-wide account.

The committee regards defense science and technology investment 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. Adjusted for inflation, the fiscal year 2005 request represents an increase of about $200.0 million, but shows a decline from the fiscal year 2004 appropriation of $12.2 billion. The committee notes that the budget request at a level of 2.6 percent of the total DOD budget, does not meet the goal of 3 percent established by the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review. However, the committee received testimony from DOD witnesses during the committee hearing on the defense science and technology program that confirmed that the goal for science and technology funding remains 3 percent of the total DOD budget.

The committee notes that the military departments are responsible for approximately 51 percent of the defense science and technology budget (Army 17 percent, Navy 16 percent, and Air Force 18 percent) and Defense Agencies account for 49 percent, including 29 percent in DARPA. Defense agencies focus on science and technology specific to the particular agency or, in the case of DARPA, on national-level problems, operational dominance, and exploitation of high-risk, high-payoff technologies. The military departments' science and technology programs focus on the development and transition of more mature technologies into future weapons systems that are key to the ability of the individual military departments to achieve their transformation objectives.

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.

Despite the positive aspects of the Department'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.

*Expanding the role of small businesses in the defense acquisition process*

The committee subscribes to the view that small businesses are the nation's engine of technology innovation. The Department of Defense (DOD) spends significant sums annually on Phase I and Phase II Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) technology development. In many cases, however, successful results of the department's investment have not been transitioned into the mainstream of system acquisition programs.

The committee believes that our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines deserve to have the best tools possible as they wage the global war on terrorism. The committee notes the recent Navy-Marine Corps quick-response SBIR solicitation seeking immediate innovative technology approaches for protecting Marines from improvised explosive devices, rocket-propelled grenades, mortars, rockets, and missiles during combat. Broader participation by the nation's small business community is needed now to meet emergent DOD requirements in support of the global war on terrorism, as well as to improve the capability and lower the cost of weapon systems through application of advanced technologies developed by small businesses.

The committee strongly endorses the President's Executive Order 13329, Encouraging Innovation in Manufacturing, directing that SBIR awards involving manufacturing and manufacturing technology be given priority. This is an essential step in broadening the defense industrial base and creating new manufacturing capacity in the United States. In recent years Congress has clarified SBIR Phase III contracting authority and data rights provisions in an attempt to clear the way for the military services to transition promising Phase I and Phase II SBIR technology development efforts to the mainstream of defense acquisition. The committee is encouraged by the small cadre of DOD program managers who have effectively transitioned SBIR technology into their programs through award of Phase III contracts. The committee believes that strong

leadership from the Office of the Secretary of Defense is necessary in order to ensure that all the benefits from the Department's significant annual SBIR technology development investment are realized.

The committee recognizes that an essential element of acquisition reform is the continuing evolution of the acquisition culture in the Department by program managers who possess the insight and commitment to take advantage of small innovative businesses through Phase III transition of SBIR technology. The committee directs that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD (AT&L)) encourage DOD acquisition program managers and prime contractors to make significantly more SBIR Phase III contract awards than has been done in the past. The committee further directs the USD (AT&L) to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 31, 2005, to (1) provide information on DOD SBIR Phase III awards during the past three years; (2) describe what action the Office of the Secretary of Defense has taken to encourage DOD acquisition program managers to award SBIR Phase III contracts at a higher rate and to make award of SBIR Phase III contracts a priority within the Defense Acquisition system; and (3) identify specific Phase III transitions that have been conducted or are planned in fiscal year 2005.

*High-speed/hypersonic reusable demonstration*

The budget request contained $339.2 million in PE 62702E for tactical technology applied research, including $15.0 million for the high-speed/hypersonic reusable demonstration.

The committee supports the objectives of the high-speed/hypersonic reusable demonstration. However, because there are higher priority, near-term requirements associated with the global war on terrorism, the committee believes that the DARPA high-speed, hypersonic reusable demonstration should be deferred.

The committee recommends a decrease of $15.0 million in PE 62702E, and no funding for the high-speed/hypersonic reusable demonstration.

*Horizontal fusion*

The budget request contained $214.2 million in PE 35199D8Z for Net Centricity, which includes the horizontal fusion program, and $23.3 million for Washington Headquarters Services major equipment, which includes $10.5 million for horizontal fusion. The committee is aware that horizontal fusion reflects a significant shift in the Department of Defense's (DOD) approach to intelligence data. Currently intelligence analysts process and analyze data before delivering it to the field for use. The Department realized the more efficient way to provide timely intelligence to the warfighter is to post data quickly, allowing analysts in the field to do unit specific analysis. This philosophical shift necessitates significant changes in the systems that hold the information and form the basis of the DOD network.

However, the committee is concerned that the scale of the Department's undertaking is unprecedented, even compared to the commercial sector's use of metadata, which tags data with descriptive information and lists it in a central registry, to manage its applications. The committee is concerned that the scope of this pro-

gram to exploit data on this level without a systems architecture to define data and terms to ensure that the information is consistent for all users could compromise intelligence and cause technological failures. The committee believes the Department must set the rules, standards, protocols, and other parameters to determine who or what entity is ultimately responsible for the data, before the funding at the level proposed in the budget request can be productively expended.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $144.2 million in PE 35199D8Z for continued research, a reduction of $70.0 million, and $18.9 million for Washington Headquarters Services major equipment procurement, a reduction of $4.4 million for horizontal fusion.

*Implementation of defense biomedical countermeasures*

Title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2004 (Public Law 108–186) provides authority for the Secretary of Defense to establish an enhanced biomedical countermeasures program within the Department of Defense to protect members of the Armed Forces from attack with chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear (CBRN) agents. This title of Public Law 108–136 parallels H.R. 2122, the Project Bioshield Act of 2003, which was developed in response to the Bioshield initiative announced by the President in his State of the Union address to the Congress on January 20, 2004; passed in the House of Representatives; and introduced in the Senate. Title XVI addresses research and development, procurement, and emergency use of biomedical countermeasures.

Section 1601 requires the Secretary of Defense to establish a program to accelerate research and development of biological countermeasures to CBRN threats and provides authorities to speed research.

Section 1602 authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into an interagency agreement with the Secretaries of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services to provide for acquisition by the Secretary of Defense for use by the Armed Forces of biomedical countermeasures procured for the Strategic National Stockpile by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. Section 1602 also authorizes the Secretary of Defense to transfer those funds to the Secretary of Health and Human Services that are necessary to carry out such agreements and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to expend any such transferred funds to procure such countermeasures for use by the Armed Forces, or to replenish the stockpile.

Section 1603 establishes conditions under which the Secretary of Health and Human Services may authorize emergency use by the general public of certain drugs, devices, or biological products based on a determination by the Secretary of Defense that there is a military emergency involving a heightened risk to United States military forces of attack with specified CBRN agents. Section 1603 would also authorize the President to waive the right of service members to refuse the administration of such a biomedical countermeasure.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2004, on the actions taken to implement the authorities granted in title XVI of the Act.

*Man portable air defense system defense program*

The budget request included $14.1 million in PE 64618D8Z for systems development and demonstration (SDD) for a network-centric, portable, ground-based, counter-man portable air defense system (MANPADS).

SDD programs require validated requirements and 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. Further, the committee understands 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. Finally, the committee believes the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) should not be managing programs that are inherently within the purview of the military services.

If OSD, in its oversight role, believes that there is sufficient merit in the concept engendered in this request, it should mandate incorporation of the concept within one of the several counter-MANPADS programs resident within the military services and defense agencies as part of their research and development programs.

The committee recommends no funds in PE 64618D8Z for fiscal year 2005, a decrease of $14.1 million.

*Measures and signatures intelligence consortium*

The budget request contained no funds in PE 35884L for intelligence planning and review for the Measures and Signatures Intelligence (MASINT) Consortium.

The MASINT Consortium, led by the Defense Intelligence Agency, began in fiscal year 2003 by congressional directive to coordinate basic and applied science research as it relates to the Intelligence Community (IC) and the Department of Defense. The committee believes this is an IC requirement that encourages the advancement of basic and applied systems research within the MASINT discipline. Amplifying information on this issue may be found in the classified annex to this report.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 35884L for the MASINT Consortium.

*Medical free electron laser*

The budget request contained $9.7 million in PE 62227D8Z 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 $19.7 million in PE 62227D8Z, an increase of $10.0 million to continue the merit-based, peer-re-

viewed, competitively awarded program in medical free electron laser applied research.

*Multi-wavelength surface scanning biologics sensor*

The budget request contained $17.6 million in PE 63714D8Z for the advanced sensor applications program.

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 committee understands that successful demonstration of this technology for two dimensional fluorescence that spectrally resolve the target in both excitation and emission dimensions could provide the capability to detect and identify biological agents and a significant improvement in the scanning and screening of potentially contaminated locations. Congress appropriated $2.0 million in fiscal year 2004 to continue previously funded work on the technology and support evaluation of a laboratory test bed system with a wide range of simulated and target bacteria and pathogens and environmental backgrounds. The committee understands that the success of these efforts has motivated further testing of the laboratory test bed prototype to support the design and development of a second generation or "beta" system with significantly expanded capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63714D8Z to continue the program for development and demonstration of two-dimensional fluorescence spectral sensing instruments for the real-time detection and identification of pathogens.

*National Defense University technology pilot program*

The budget request contained $30.6 million in PE 65104D8Z for the Office of the Secretary of Defense technical studies, support, and analysis.

The committee notes that the National Defense University (NDU), supported by funding provided by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, has established a pilot research and analysis program focused on defense policy issues that have significant technology elements. The committee further notes that the objective of this 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 is interested to learn the results of NDU's proposed pilot programs for fiscal year 2005 which include the use of IT for stabilization efforts and reconstruction operations in Iraq, and homeland security.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $31.6 million for PE 65104D8Z, an increase of $1.0 million for the NDU technology pilot program.

*Nuclear weapons effects applied research*

The budget request contained $249.8 million in PE 62716BR for applied research in weapons of mass destruction defeat technology, including $67.8 million for applied research in weapons effects technology.

The committee continues to note that the budget for nuclear weapons effects applied research has declined dramatically since

the early 1990s and the decline in the budget has been accompanied by a decline in the capability for and expertise in analysis of nuclear weapons effects. The current program uses a combination of computer analysis, simulation and protection technology to address key issues regarding the survivability of critical U.S. systems in a potential nuclear environment, including missile defense interceptors, satellite electronics, and warfighting command, control, communications and intelligence (C3I) systems and facilities. The committee believes that the U.S. nuclear weapons effects analysis capability needs to be revitalized to address emerging 21st Century threats, such as the potential for terrorist use of radiological dispersion devices ("dirty bombs") or crude nuclear weapons in an urban environment; the potential effect of electromagnetic pulse generated by a nuclear weapon on C3I and other electronic systems; the potential use of small nuclear weapons for defeat of chemical or biological agents, or for defeat of hard and buried targets; and analysis of requirements for defense of critical assets.

The committee recommends $259.8 million in PE 62716BR, an increase of $10.0 million for nuclear weapons effects applied research.

*Operationally responsive satellite*

The budget request contained $19.6 million in PE 65799D8Z for Force Transformation Directorate, but contained no funds for operationally responsive satellites.

With the advent of operationally responsive launches, the committee believes research and development should begin on the use of satellites that would fit this new family of launch vehicles and address near-term warfighter requirements. These new satellites should provide critical capabilities from space in an affordable, reliable, and timely manner. This new perspective on satellite acquisition represents a truly transformational strategy and, as such, should be managed by the Secretary of Defense's new Office of Force Transformation.

The committee recommends $44.6 million in PE 65799D8Z, an increase of $25.0 million for the development of operationally responsive satellites.

*Smart machine platform initiative*

The budget request contained $11.0 million in PE 78011S for Industrial Preparedness, of which no funds were requested for the Smart Machine Platform Initiative.

The committee has been encouraged by the efforts of the machine tool industry to develop breakthrough technology for defense manufacturing applications by which the next generation of machine technology will provide the capability to monitor and modify a work plan during the production process. This smart machine technology would substantially reduce both the cost and time to develop defense products.

The committee recommends $23.2 million for PE 78011S, an increase of $12.2 million for the Smart Machine Platform Initiative.

*Space and missile defense command simulation center*

The budget request contained $186.7 million for the high performance computing modernization program, which includes the

Army Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) Simulation Center. The center is a mission critical computer facility established to provide supercomputer computational assets with high performance network and storage support for 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 (MDA), and the military services. The committee understands that the SMDC needs to upgrade its information technology systems to meet computational demands for simulation, testing, and evaluation of advanced interceptors and sensors. The committee believes the technology upgrades are important to the work the SMDC is presently conducting.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $192.7 million in PE 63755D8Z, an increase of $6.0 million for the SMDC.

*Special operations advanced technology development*

The budget request contained $48.8 million in PE 116402BB for special operations advanced technology development, but contained no funding for development of long term battery-free power sources, the advanced target identification capability for AC–130U gunships, the ANGELFIRE active protection system, and the surveillance augmentation vehicle-insertable on request (SAVIOR) system.

The committee is aware of the need for power sources that may be used to supply power to remote monitoring and surveillance sensors for long periods of duration. Furthermore, the committee understands that promising technology exists that may meet that military requirement by converting ambient light to power.

The advanced target identification system is a significant enhancement to the gunship radar and will enable the crew to make accurate and near instantaneous identification of friendly and enemy vehicles on the battlefield. To complete the project, funding is needed to fully integrate identification software with a family of ground and airborne systems.

ANGELFIRE is a promising integrated sensor and countermeasure 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 SAVIOR system also 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 $64.8 million for PE 1160402BB special operations advanced technology development, increases of $4.0 million to develop battery free power sources for sensors, $3.0 million for the advanced identification capability for AC–130 gunships, $6.0 million to develop the ANGELFIRE active protection system, and $3.0 million for development of the SAVIOR system.

*Special operations technology development*

The budget request contained $13.1 million in PE 116401BB for special operations technology development, but included no funding for shoulder fired smart round (SPIKE) urban warfare system de-

velopment. 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 $16.1 million in PE 116401BB, an increase of $3.0 million for SPIKE missile development.

*Stimulated isomer energy release*

The budget request contained $339.2 million in PE 62702E for tactical technology applied research, including $4.0 million for stimulated isomer energy release.

The committee is aware that the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency (DARPA) is funding research to investigate the feasibility of stimulating the release of energy stored in nuclear isomers. The committee understands that the DARPA-sponsored research is investigating two of the most difficult technical challenges in this program and that the research is being conducted in the national laboratories, the Department of Energy, the military service laboratories, and other facilities. Given the significant policy issues associated with any eventual use of an isomer weapon and given the inability of distinguished scientists to replicate the reported successful triggering experiment of 1998, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should not be engaged in this research. The proper agency to investigate the feasibility of this technology is the National Nuclear Security Administration and its national laboratory complex. The committee questions the utility of this research in any circumstances and is particularly skeptical of research into nuclear isomer production before triggering is shown to be possible.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to terminate this program, and recommends no funding for the stimulated isomer energy release in PE 62702E, a reduction of $4.0 million.

*Tasking, processing, exploitation, and dissemination of SYERS–2 data*

The budget request contained no funding in PE 35102BQ for defense imagery and mapping.

The committee is concerned that multi-spectral data from the SYERS–2 sensor is not being exploited by the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency (NGA).

The committee recommends $3.0 million in PE 35102BQ, an increase of $3.0 million to permit the NGA to fully process, exploit, and disseminate SYERS–2 data.

*Use of research and development funds to procure systems*

The committee has observed the increasing use of funds designated for research and development (R&D) purposes to acquire operational platforms. The fiscal 2005 budget proposal would take the practice to unprecedented levels, with three DD(X) and two LCS ships, three E–2C aircraft, and eleven VH-XX helicopters proposed for acquisition with R&D funds.

The use of R&D funds for prototypes and truly developmental items is both proper and prudent. This practice also makes sense when, following the completion of testing, a test asset still has use-

ful capability to bring to the operational fleet. However, it is difficult to believe that nearly half of the VH-XX fleet, for example, qualifies as prototypes or dedicated test assets. The fact that the platforms may occasionally be used for some testing purposes does not, in the committee's view, qualify them as research craft. Indeed, the committee would be surprised were the department actually proposing to regularly carry the President on prototype aircraft.

While the committee recognizes the increased flexibility of R&D funds in acquiring platforms, there is concern that placing acquisition programs in the R&D budget, particularly at their early, least stable stage, threatens other programs, particularly in science and technology. The R&D budget is a very small pool from which to fund acquisitions of large items like ships, and as procurements are must-pay bills, typical procurement cost-growth would put the rest of the R&D budget at risk.

The committee's action with regard to particular programs funded in R&D should therefore be seen not only as a reflection of the merits of those items, but also as an expression of concern over the rapidly expanding portion of the R&D budget being used for purposes other than R&D.

*Walrus*

The budget request contained $339.2 million in PE 62702E for tactical technology applied research, including $10.0 million for the Walrus program, and $361.0 million in PE 63285E for advanced aerospace systems advanced technology development, including $10.0 million for the Walrus program.

The committee notes that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) Walrus program would combine technologies for high-strength and low structural weight airframes, high efficiency propulsion systems; and heavy-lift cargo transport investigated in earlier DARPA programs. The Walrus program would develop and evaluate a very large "hybrid" airlift vehicle concept that is designed to fly through a combination of aerodynamics and gas buoyancy. The first phase of the program would include system studies and development of a notional objective vehicle and would be followed by a competitive second phase that would lead to the development, design, build, and initial flight test of an advanced technology demonstration air vehicle with air lift capability comparable to a C–130 aircraft. As envisioned, an objective vehicle would be capable of lifting over 500 tons across intercontinental distances.

The committee acknowledges the Department of Defense's objective of being able to deploy quickly to overseas theaters from the continental United States. Nevertheless, the committee is also aware of previous programs in the late 1980s and early 1990s that envisioned very large, long-endurance airship concepts for intertheater lift, which after some initial enthusiasm were not pursued because of the large costs associated with the development and production of such systems. The committee has also received no estimates of the potential development and production costs for the Walrus concept. Because there are higher priority, near-term requirements associated with the global war on terrorism, the com-

mittee believes that the work on the DARPA Walrus program should be deferred.

Accordingly, the committee recommends no funding for the Walrus program, a reduction of $10.0 million in PE 62702E and a reduction of $10.0 million in PE 63285E.

## OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

### Overview

The budget request contained $305.1 million for Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.

The committee recommends $305.1 million, no change to the budget request.

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

| PE Name | Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE** | | | | | |
| 0603941D8Z | 1 | Test & Evaluation Science & Technology | 16,295 | | | | 16,295 |
| 0604940D8Z | 2 | Central Test and Evaluation Investment Development (CTEIP) | 123,562 | | | | 123,562 |
| 0605118D8Z | 3 | Operational Test and Evaluation | 42,390 | | | | 42,390 |
| 0605131D8Z | 4 | Live Fire Testing | 10,209 | | | | 10,209 |
| 0605804D8Z | 5 | Development Test and Evaluation | 112,679 | | | | 112,679 |
| | | **TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE** | **305,135** | | | | **305,135** |

# LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

### Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would establish research, development, test and evaluation authorization levels for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005.

### Section 202—Amount for Defense Science and Technology

This section would establish defense science and technology authorization levels for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005.

## SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

### Section 211—Future Combat Systems Program Strategy

This section would limit authorization of appropriations for Future Combat Systems (FCS) in fiscal year 2005 to $2.2 billion until the following is submitted to Congress prior to the Milestone B update:

(1) An independent program cost estimate;

(2) A report on the maturity levels of critical technologies;

(3) A report on the status of the network and command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance components; and

(4) The key performance parameters.

This section would also require the Secretary of the Army to certify that the following requirements are applied to the Future Combat Systems program:

(1) At the design readiness review, 90 percent of engineering drawings will be releasable to manufacturing;

(2) Before production facilitization and long lead items are contracted for, the performance of the information network is demonstrated to be acceptable, including the contributions of complementary programs such as the Joint Tactical Radio System and the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical;

(3) Before the initial production decision, prototypes of each system demonstrate their collective ability to meet system of system requirements when integrated with the network.

FCS is a revolutionary system of systems that the Army is developing to equip its future forces. FCS consists of an information network that links a suite of 18 new smaller and lighter manned and unmanned ground vehicles, air vehicles, sensors, and munitions. The success of FCS depends on the ability of the network to collect, process, and deliver vast amounts of information such as imagery and communications and the performance of the individual systems themselves.

The committee supports the Army's transformation goals and the desired capabilities that the FCS program promises. However, the committee is greatly concerned about the Army's ability to deliver these capabilities within cost and schedule estimates. The Army has never managed any program of the size and complexity of FCS:

18 systems, 32 critical technology areas, 34 million lines of code, 129 trade studies, and 157 other necessary systems outside of the FCS program structure.

In its March 2004 report, the General Accounting Office indicated the FCS program has many of the same risk markers that have led to problems on other programs. These include:

(1) An extremely challenging and unforgiving requirement to outperform the current heavy force at a fraction of the weight and logistics footprint;

(2) Reliance on numerous advanced yet immature technologies to meet the requirement; and;

(3) A schedule that proceeds to production in an unprecedented 5½ years.

The committee is aware of the fiscal realities that make it difficult to fund simultaneously the development of transformational future military systems and the maintenance and sustainment of current military systems. FCS will field 15, brigade like, Units of Action by 2025. This will constitute about one-third of the active component of the Army. The Army does not have a plan and has not budgeted funds to sustain the current force through 2025. The committee believes that the current force must be provided with a sufficient sustainment and modernization budget such that this force remains capable, reliable, interoperable, and relevant until FCS can assume the majority of the responsibility for the Army's mission.

### Section 212—Collaborative Program for Research and Development of Vacuum Electronics Technologies

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a program for research and development in advanced vacuum electronics technology to meet Department of Defense (DOD) requirements for radio frequency electromagnetic systems. The program would be carried out collaboratively by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Army, and other appropriate elements of the Department of Defense. The provision would also increase the fiscal year 2005 budget request for vacuum technology research and development by a total of $15.0 million, an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62771N for vacuum electronics applied research and an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63771N for vacuum electronics advanced technology development.

The committee has long recognized the unique needs of the Department of Defense for high power vacuum electronics for radar and other electromagnetic systems, and has advocated increased funding for research and development in advanced vacuum electronics technology. The committee reports on H.R. 1402 (H. Rept. 106–162) and on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–436) noted the committee's support for a robust vacuum electronics research and development program in the Department of Defense and other federal agencies. The committee has reviewed the results of the Secretary of the Navy's report to Congress on the DOD vacuum electronics program and the Department's April 2001 Technology Area Review and Assessment (TARA) on creating a balanced tri-service investment strategy for RF vacuum electronics and solid-state power electronics technologies. In the committee report on H.R. 4546, the

committee endorsed the TARA views on the criticality of support for both vacuum electronics and solid-state power electronics technologies. The committee notes the TARA review's recommendations for increased funding in the tri-service vacuum electronics program and for establishment of a combined tri-service initiative to rapidly advance wide band gap semiconductor device technology to enable advanced military radar and other systems requiring power electronics in the mid-to-long term.

Section 212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) required the Secretary of Defense to establish a collaborative program for development of advanced radar systems, which has focused on developing the technology for high frequency and high power wide band gap semiconductors recommended in the TARA review. Section 212 of this Act would implement the TARA recommendation for the tri-service vacuum electronics program.

The committee expects the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), acting through the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, to ensure a balanced investment strategy for vacuum electronics and solid state power technologies that will meet DOD requirements for current and future systems that use radio frequency power electronics.

### Section 213—Annual Comptroller General Report on Joint Strike Fighter Program

This section would establish an annual review of the Joint Strike Fighter system development and demonstration (SDD) 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 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 on March 15, 2009.

### Section 214—Amounts for United States Joint Forces Command to be Derived Only from Defense-wide Amounts

This section would transfer funding for the joint warfare experimentation program and related Joint Forces Command programs from Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy to a Defense-wide account.

In 1998, the Secretary of Defense chartered the combatant commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command, as the executive agent for conducting joint warfighting concept development and experimentation within the Department of Defense. The committee believes that, as the Department's executive agent for joint warfighting concept development and experimentation, the command's budget for joint warfare experimentation and related programs should be independent of, and separate from the budgets of the military departments. The committee also notes that the precedent that has been established by the Department in maintaining the budgets for the Joint Staff and defense agencies separate from the budgets of the military departments. The committee also observes that main-

taining the budget for the joint warfare experimentation and transformation programs as a part of budget request for the Navy's science and technology program tends to create a false impression of funding levels for the latter.

The committee directs the transfer of funding for the Joint Forces Command joint experimentation, joint warfare experiments and joint warfare transformation programs from Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy to Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, as follows:

(1) $167.7 million for Joint Experimentation from Navy PE 32727N to Defense-wide PE 63xx1;

(2) $26,000 for Joint Warfare Experiments from Navy PE 63757N to Defense-wide PE 63xx2, and;

(3) $22.5 million for Joint Warfare Transformation Programs from Navy PE 64787N to Defense-wide PE 63xx3.

Section 215—Authority of Director of Defense Research and Engineering to Award Prizes for Advanced Technology Achievements

This section would amend the process by which the Secretary of Defense carries out a program to award cash prizes in recognition of outstanding achievements in basic, advanced, and applied research, technology development, and prototype development that have the potential for application to the performance of the military missions of the Department of Defense. The amendment would provide that the program would be carried out by the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, rather than through the Director, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

Section 216—Space Based Radar

This section would prohibit the Space Based Radar program from proceeding to Department of Defense acquisition milestone B. The program may not proceed until 30 days after meeting the requirement to notify the congressional defense committees and the intelligence committees of the completion of an independent cost estimate, a technology maturity and readiness assessment, and the system design concept.

Section 217—Mark–54 Torpedo Product Improvement Program

This section would provide $2.0 million of funds authorized in Navy, Research and Development for the Mark–54 Product Improvement Program.

SUBTITLE C—BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Section 221—Fielding of Ballistic Missile Defense Capabilities

This section would allow the Department of Defense to use research, development, test and evaluation funding to develop and field ballistic missile defense capabilities with funds appropriated in fiscal years 2005 and 2006.

The committee is concerned with the Department's plans to transition program elements of the ballistic missile defense program from the Missile Defense Agency to the military services. The committee notes that section 223(a) of the National Defense Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) requires the Secretary of Defense to submit with the annual budget request the potential date of availability of individual ballistic missile defense program elements for fielding, and the estimated date for the transfer of individual ballistic missile defense system elements from the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to the secretary of a military department. The committee expects that the fielding and acquisition strategy provided by the Department will assist the committee in considering future requests by the Department to use research, development, test and evaluation funds for the development and fielding of ballistic missile capabilities.

# TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

## OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $140.6 billion for operation and maintenance funds throughout the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee reviewed this request to evaluate whether readiness accounts are properly funded and managed for a peacetime environment. The committee conducted a focused review on joint training, logistics transformation, prepositioned assets, as well as the overall readiness of military units.

The committee believes the Secretary of Defense and DOD leadership recognize the importance of joint training and are taking appropriate action to implement the Joint National Training Capabilities program. DOD leadership also appears committed to improving logistics and providing total asset visibility of supplies and personnel to the combatant commanders. The committee will continue in its oversight role to evaluate whether various training exercises and logistics systems migrate toward a joint environment or whether military-unique training and stove-piped logistics systems continue to be the norm. The committee believes any program identified as joint, total, or global will face some level of resistance. The burden will be on the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to adopt and endorse programs that benefit the Department as a whole, rather than merely benefiting a particular service or agency.

The committee also believes the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments have a unique opportunity to replenish their prepositioned materials and equipment in a manner most beneficial to global security. Many lessons were learned as to the value of prepositioned equipment and how to manage such assets. The committee hopes DOD leadership takes advantage of these lessons and adjusts its prepositioning program accordingly.

Finally, the committee notes the challenge of evaluating a peacetime budget when the nation is at war. The budget request contained no additional funds to support the operating tempo for units deployed for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Title XV of this bill accordingly addresses this issue and the need for additional operational and maintenance funds.

## Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **APPROPRIATION SUMMARY** | | | | | |
| | **Department of the Army** | | | | | |
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY | 26,133,411 | (294,800) | 24,000 | (318,800) | 25,838,611 |
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE | 2,008,128 | (4,400) | 6,600 | (11,000) | 2,003,728 |
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD | 4,440,686 | (15,000) | 31,500 | (46,500) | 4,425,686 |
| | **Total Department of the Army** | **32,582,225** | **(314,200)** | **62,100** | **(376,300)** | **32,268,025** |
| | **Department of the Navy** | | | | | |
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY | 29,789,190 | (265,700) | 9,500 | (275,200) | 29,523,490 |
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS | 3,632,115 | 5,500 | 5,500 | | 3,637,615 |
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE | 1,240,038 | | | | 1,240,038 |
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE | 188,696 | | | | 188,696 |
| | PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND | | | | | |
| | **Total Department of the Navy** | **34,850,039** | **(260,200)** | **15,000** | **(275,200)** | **34,589,839** |
| | **Department of the Air Force** | | | | | |
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE | 28,471,260 | (1,327,694) | 164,300 | (1,491,994) | 27,143,566 |
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE | 2,239,790 | (13,000) | | (13,000) | 2,226,790 |
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD | 4,422,838 | 26,100 | 78,800 | (52,700) | 4,448,938 |
| | **Total Department of the Air Force** | **35,133,888** | **(1,314,594)** | **243,100** | **(1,557,694)** | **33,819,294** |
| | **Defense-Wide** | | | | | |
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE | **17,494,076** | **(176,670)** | **118,330** | **(295,000)** | **17,317,406** |
| | **Transfer Accounts, Miscellaneous, and Other** | | | | | |
| | TRANSFER ACCOUNTS | 1,305,336 | | | | 1,305,336 |
| | MISCELLANEOUS | 509,025 | 25,000 | 50,000 | (25,000) | 534,025 |
| | **Total Miscellaneous** | **1,814,361** | **25,000** | **50,000** | **(25,000)** | **1,839,361** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:** | **121,874,589** | **(2,040,664)** | **488,530** | **(2,529,194)** | **119,833,925** |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| **DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM** | | | | | |
| OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE | 17,203,369 | 171,175 | 334,675 | (163,500) | 17,374,544 |
| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION | 72,407 | | | | 72,407 |
| PROCUREMENT | 364,635 | | | | 364,635 |
| TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM | 17,640,411 | 171,175 | 334,675 | (163,500) | 17,811,586 |
| **CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS PROGRAM** | | | | | |
| OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE | | 1,138,801 | 1,138,801 | | 1,138,801 |
| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION | | 154,209 | 154,209 | | 154,209 |
| PROCUREMENT | | 78,980 | 78,980 | | 78,980 |
| TOTAL, CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS PROGRAM | | 1,371,990 | 1,371,990 | | 1,371,990 |
| **DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG PROGRAMS** | 852,697 | | | | 852,697 |
| **OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL** | | | | | |
| OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE | 242,362 | (51,000) | | | 191,362 |
| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION | 2,100 | | | | 2,100 |
| PROCUREMENT | 100 | | | | 100 |
| TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL | 244,562 | (51,000) | | | 193,562 |
| TOTAL OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS | 18,737,670 | 1,492,165 | 1,706,665 | (163,500) | 20,229,835 |
| **REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS** | | | | | |
| Defense Working Capital Funds | 510,886 | (138,000) | | (138,000) | 372,886 |
| Defense Working Capital Funds - DeCA | 1,175,000 | | | | 1,175,000 |
| National Defense Sealift Fund | 1,269,252 | (50,000) | | (50,000) | 1,219,252 |
| National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund | | | | | |
| Armed Forces Retirement Home | 61,195 | | | | 61,195 |
| TOTAL, REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS | 3,016,333 | (188,000) | | (188,000) | 2,828,333 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Army** | | | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| | **LAND FORCES** | **4,152,294** | **(29,000)** | | **(29,000)** | **4,123,294** |
| 010 | DIVISIONS | 1,520,706 | | | | 1,520,706 |
| 020 | CORPS COMBAT FORCES | 472,692 | | | | 472,692 |
| 030 | CORPS SUPPORT FORCES | 445,344 | | | | 445,344 |
| 040 | ECHELON ABOVE CORPS SUPPORT FORCES | 515,730 | (19,000) | | | 496,730 |
| | Unjustified growth in contract logistics support and sustainment | | | | (10,000) | |
| | Network Enterprise Technology Command | | | | (9,000) | |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,197,822 | (10,000) | | | 1,187,822 |
| | Unjustified growth in combat training centers | | | | (10,000) | |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS** | **3,355,819** | **2,500** | **6,500** | **(4,000)** | **3,358,319** |
| 060 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,787,147 | 6,500 | | | 1,793,647 |
| | Hydration on the move | | | 3,000 | | |
| | Vehicle batteries | | | 2,500 | | |
| | Military Skills Engagement | | | 1,000 | | |
| 070 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 537,567 | (4,000) | | | 533,567 |
| | Tactical exploitation system | | | | (4,000) | |
| 080 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 1,031,105 | | | | 1,031,105 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | **8,970,368** | **(25,200)** | | **(25,200)** | **8,945,168** |
| 090 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 5,609,973 | (25,200) | | | 5,584,773 |
| | Visual Information Support | | | | (13,000) | |
| | Installation Management Activity | | | | (10,000) | |
| | DCSIM and DOIM Staff Operations | | | | (2,200) | |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 100 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 1,956,128 | | | | 1,956,128 |
| 110 | MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 251,474 | | | | 251,474 |
| 120 | UNIFIED COMMANDS | 94,850 | | | | 94,850 |
| 130 | MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES | 1,057,943 | | | | 1,057,943 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01** | **16,478,481** | **(51,700)** | **6,500** | **(58,200)** | **16,426,781** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | | | |
| | **MOBILITY OPERATIONS** | **461,999** | | | | **461,999** |
| 140 | STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION | 327,345 | | | | 327,345 |
| 150 | ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS | 126,163 | | | | 126,163 |
| 160 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 8,491 | | | | 8,491 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 02** | **461,999** | | | | **461,999** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | | | |
| | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | **404,589** | | | | **404,589** |
| 180 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 107,554 | | | | 107,554 |
| 190 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 20,766 | | | | 20,766 |
| 200 | ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING | 41,961 | | | | 41,961 |
| 210 | SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS | 234,308 | | | | 234,308 |
| | **BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING** | **1,803,314** | **(12,000)** | **3,000** | **(15,000)** | **1,791,314** |
| 240 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 506,557 | 3,000 | | | 509,557 |
| | Satellite communications for learning (SCOLA) | | | 3,000 | | |
| 250 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 575,406 | | | | 575,406 |
| 260 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 102,832 | | | | 102,832 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 270 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 618,519 | (15,000) | | | 603,519 |
| | Unjustified growth in training support | | | | (15,000) | |
| | **RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING** | **1,137,008** | **(14,000)** | | **(14,000)** | **1,123,008** |
| 300 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 461,157 | (14,000) | | | 447,157 |
| | Recruiting Information Support System | | | | (4,000) | |
| | MEPCOM Management Information Reporting System | | | | (10,000) | |
| 310 | EXAMINING | 131,206 | | | | 131,206 |
| 320 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 296,311 | | | | 296,311 |
| 330 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 111,003 | | | | 111,003 |
| 340 | JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS | 137,331 | | | | 137,331 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03** | **3,344,911** | **(26,000)** | **3,000** | **(29,000)** | **3,318,911** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| | **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | **883,510** | | | | **883,510** |
| 360 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 883,510 | | | | 883,510 |
| | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | **1,857,257** | | | | **1,857,257** |
| 370 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 570,923 | | | | 570,923 |
| 380 | CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES | 490,261 | | | | 490,261 |
| 390 | LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 439,466 | | | | 439,466 |
| 400 | AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT | 356,607 | | | | 356,607 |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | **2,797,113** | **(82,800)** | **14,500** | **(97,300)** | **2,714,313** |
| 410 | ADMINISTRATION | 702,719 | (19,500) | | | 683,219 |
| | Unjustified growth in headquarters management | | | | (19,500) | |
| 420 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 610,866 | (63,300) | | | 547,566 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Personnel Transformation | | | | (13,000) | |
| | Army Knowledge Enterprise Architecture | | | | (4,000) | |
| | Management Headquarters Information Management | | | | (13,000) | |
| | Defense Civilian Personnel Data System - sustainment | | | | (2,200) | |
| | Logistics Modernization Program | | | | (2,700) | |
| | Logistic Post Production Software Support | | | | (3,500) | |
| | Army Personnel Electronic Records Management System | | | | (7,000) | |
| | Army Human Resources Command Core Automation Support | | | | (20,000) | |
| | Information Technology Agency | | | | (12,400) | |
| | Training Instrumentation for Air and Missile Defense Units | | | 5,000 | | |
| | National Guard's Enterprise Resource Planning Program | | | 3,500 | | |
| | National Guard's Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network | | | 6,000 | | |
| 430 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 267,365 | | | | 267,365 |
| | Excessive growth in civilian personnel operations | | | | | |
| 440 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 191,686 | | | | 191,686 |
| 450 | OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT | 848,391 | | | | 848,391 |
| 460 | ARMY CLAIMS | 115,453 | | | | 115,453 |
| 470 | REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT | 60,633 | | | | 60,633 |
| | **SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS** | **310,140** | | | | **310,140** |
| 500 | SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS | 250,026 | | | | 250,026 |
| 510 | MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS | 60,114 | | | | 60,114 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04** | **5,848,020** | **(82,800)** | **14,500** | **(97,300)** | **5,765,220** |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | | | |
| | Excessive unobligated balances | | (52,300) | | (52,300) | (52,300) |
| | Civilian pay overstatement | | (82,000) | | (82,000) | (82,000) |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army** | **26,133,411** | **(294,800)** | **24,000** | **(318,800)** | **25,838,611** |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | | | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | **5,809,016** | **(55,500)** | | **(55,500)** | **5,753,516** |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 3,002,769 | | | | 3,002,769 |
| 020 | FLEET AIR TRAINING | 1,066,452 | | | | 1,066,452 |
| 030 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 66,565 | | | | 66,565 |
| 040 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 111,146 | | | | 111,146 |
| 050 | AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 498,508 | (40,000) | | | 458,508 |
| | Unjustified growth for technical publications | | | | (25,000) | |
| | Navy Air Logistics Data Analysis | | | | (15,000) | |
| 060 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 995,596 | (15,500) | | | 980,096 |
| | Navy Converged Enterprise Resource Planning Program | | | | (15,500) | |
| 070 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 67,980 | | | | 67,980 |
| | **SHIP OPERATIONS** | **8,251,431** | **(11,000)** | **4,000** | **(15,000)** | **8,240,431** |
| 070 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 2,604,963 | (15,000) | | | 2,589,963 |
| | Fleet response plan efficiencies | | | | (15,000) | |
| 080 | SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING | 622,119 | | | | 622,119 |
| 090 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | | | | | |
| 100 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 3,910,439 | 4,000 | | | 3,914,439 |
| | Stainless steel sanitary spaces | | | 4,000 | | |
| 110 | SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,113,910 | | | | 1,113,910 |
| | **COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT** | **2,607,192** | **(40,000)** | | **(40,000)** | **2,567,192** |
| 120 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 379,929 | | | | 379,929 |
| 130 | ELECTRONIC WARFARE | 16,946 | | | | 16,946 |
| 140 | SPACE SYSTEMS & SURVEILLANCE | 136,231 | | | | 136,231 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 150 | WARFARE TACTICS | 266,032 | | | | 266,032 |
| 160 | OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY & OCEANOGRAPHY | 256,003 | | | | 256,003 |
| 170 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 1,362,179 | (40,000) | | | 1,322,179 |
| | Unjustified growth for JFCOM and PACOM | | | | (40,000) | |
| 180 | EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 186,658 | | | | 186,658 |
| 190 | DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 3,214 | | | | 3,214 |
| | **WEAPONS SUPPORT** | **1,484,494** | **2,000** | **2,000** | | **1,486,494** |
| 200 | CRUISE MISSILE | 155,731 | | | | 155,731 |
| 210 | FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE | 830,393 | | | | 830,393 |
| 220 | IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 51,043 | | | | 51,043 |
| 230 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 447,327 | 2,000 | | | 449,327 |
| | NULKA - electronic decoy maintenance | | | 2,000 | | |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | **4,525,713** | **(27,000)** | | **(27,000)** | **4,498,713** |
| 250 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 1,330,363 | | | | 1,330,363 |
| 260 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 3,195,350 | (27,000) | | | 3,168,350 |
| | Navy / USMC Base Level Communications | | | | (27,000) | |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01** | **22,677,846** | **(131,500)** | **6,000** | **(137,500)** | **22,546,346** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | | | |
| | **READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES** | **548,199** | | | | **548,199** |
| 270 | SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE | 548,199 | | | | 548,199 |
| | **ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS** | **220,012** | | | | **220,012** |
| 280 | AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 7,619 | | | | 7,619 |
| 290 | SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 212,393 | | | | 212,393 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS** | **44,827** | | | | **44,827** |
| 300 | FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM | 26,119 | | | | 26,119 |
| 310 | INDUSTRIAL READINESS | 1,523 | | | | 1,523 |
| 320 | COAST GUARD SUPPORT | 17,185 | | | | 17,185 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 02** | **813,038** | | | | **813,038** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | | | |
| | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | **230,887** | | | | **230,887** |
| 330 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 120,835 | | | | 120,835 |
| 340 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 7,716 | | | | 7,716 |
| 350 | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS | 102,336 | | | | 102,336 |
| | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | **1,210,219** | | | | **1,210,219** |
| 360 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 434,374 | | | | 434,374 |
| 370 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 420,829 | | | | 420,829 |
| 380 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 116,770 | | | | 116,770 |
| 390 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 238,246 | | | | 238,246 |
| | **RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION** | **536,490** | **(10,000)** | **2,000** | **(12,000)** | **526,490** |
| 400 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 282,526 | (10,000) | | | 272,526 |
| | Naval Sea Cadets | | | 2,000 | | |
| | *Other Navy Military Personnel and Readiness* | | | | (12,000) | |
| 410 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 146,508 | | | | 146,508 |
| 420 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 67,556 | | | | 67,556 |
| 430 | JUNIOR ROTC | 39,900 | | | | 39,900 |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03** | **1,977,596** | **(10,000)** | **2,000** | **(12,000)** | **1,967,596** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | **2,009,611** | **(16,000)** | | **(16,000)** | **1,993,611** |
| 460 | ADMINISTRATION | 773,940 | | | | 773,940 |
| 470 | EXTERNAL RELATIONS | 3,893 | | | | 3,893 |
| 480 | CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT | 110,614 | | | | 110,614 |
| 490 | MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT | 198,465 | | | | 198,465 |
| 500 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 317,284 | | | | 317,284 |
| 510 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 605,415 | (16,000) | | | 589,415 |
| | Other Navy Military Personnel and Readiness | | | | (16,000) | |
| 520 | MEDICAL ACTIVITIES | | | | | |
| | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT** | **1,750,848** | **1,500** | **1,500** | | **1,752,348** |
| 530 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 189,634 | | | | 189,634 |
| 540 | ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| 550 | PLANNING, ENGINEERING & DESIGN | 252,972 | | | | 252,972 |
| 560 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 840,666 | | | | 840,666 |
| 570 | AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT | | | | | |
| 580 | HULL, MECHANICAL & ELECTRICAL SUPPORT | 55,505 | | | | 55,505 |
| 590 | COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS | 51,683 | | | | 51,683 |
| 600 | SPACE & ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS | 70,166 | | | | 70,166 |
| 610 | NAVAL CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE | 290,222 | 1,500 | | | 291,722 |
| | Office of Naval Intelligence - small ship registry | | | 1,500 | | |
| | **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | **549,648** | | | | **549,648** |
| 620 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 549,648 | | | | 549,648 |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS** | 10,603 | | | | 10,603 |
| 630 | INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS & AGENCIES | 10,603 | | | | 10,603 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04** | **4,320,710** | **(14,500)** | **1,500** | **(16,000)** | **4,306,210** |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | | | |
| | Excessive unobligated balances | | (97,700) | | (97,700) | (97,700) |
| | Civilian pay overstatement | | (12,000) | | (12,000) | (12,000) |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | **29,789,190** | **(265,700)** | **9,500** | **(275,200)** | **29,523,490** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | | | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| | **EXPEDITIONARY FORCES** | 1,103,292 | 5,500 | 5,500 | | 1,108,792 |
| 010 | OPERATIONAL FORCES | 633,914 | 5,500 | | | 639,414 |
| | Hydration on the move | | | 1,000 | | |
| | Vehicle batteries | | | 2,500 | | |
| | Tent lighting system | | | 2,000 | | |
| 020 | FIELD LOGISTICS | 367,293 | | | | 367,293 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 102,085 | | | | 102,085 |
| | **USMC PREPOSITIONING** | 79,891 | | | | 79,891 |
| 040 | MARITIME PREPOSITIONING | 72,128 | | | | 72,128 |
| 050 | NORWAY PREPOSITIONING | 7,763 | | | | 7,763 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | 1,477,807 | | | | 1,477,807 |
| 060 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 451,012 | | | | 451,012 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 070 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 1,026,795 | | | | 1,026,795 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01** | **2,660,990** | **5,500** | **5,500** | | **1,188,683** |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | | | |
| | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | **10,890** | | | | **10,890** |
| 080 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 10,539 | | | | 10,539 |
| 090 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 351 | | | | 351 |
| | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | **188,542** | | | | **188,542** |
| 100 | SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING | 45,155 | | | | 45,155 |
| 110 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 174 | | | | 174 |
| 120 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 8,972 | | | | 8,972 |
| 130 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 134,241 | | | | 134,241 |
| | **RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION** | **161,594** | | | | **161,594** |
| 140 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 113,988 | | | | 113,988 |
| 150 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 34,336 | | | | 34,336 |
| 160 | JUNIOR ROTC | 13,270 | | | | 13,270 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | **231,132** | | | | **231,132** |
| 170 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 68,553 | | | | 68,553 |
| 180 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 162,579 | | | | 162,579 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03** | **592,158** | | | | **592,158** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | **357,079** | | | | **357,079** |
| 190 | SPECIAL SUPPORT | 274,508 | | | | 274,508 |
| 200 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 37,300 | | | | 37,300 |
| 210 | ADMINISTRATION | 45,271 | | | | 45,271 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | 21,888 | | | | 21,888 |
| 230 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 3,191 | | | | 3,191 |
| 240 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 18,697 | | | | 18,697 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04** | **378,967** | | | | **357,079** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | **3,632,115** | **5,500** | **5,500** | | **3,637,615** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | | | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | 11,644,303 | 47,616 | 164,300 | (116,684) | 11,691,919 |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 3,275,334 | 155,300 | | | 3,430,634 |
| | B-1A Lancer Bomber support | | | 157,400 | | |
| | KC-767 Tanker support | | | 3,500 | | |
| | Hydration on the move | | | 2,000 | | |
| | Joint crew protection masks | | | 1,400 | | |
| | Combat Air Systems Activities, 480th Intel Squadron | | | | (9,000) | |
| 020 | PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS | 331,333 | | | | 331,333 |
| 030 | COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES | 346,322 | | | | 346,322 |
| 040 | AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING | 1,274,599 | | | | 1,274,599 |
| 060 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 1,318,159 | | | | 1,318,159 |
| 050 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 2,085,761 | (39,300) | | | 2,046,461 |
| | Depot maintenance program realignment to Air National Guard | | | | (39,300) | |
| 080 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 1,017,301 | | | | 1,017,301 |
| 070 | BASE SUPPORT | 1,995,494 | (68,384) | | | 1,927,110 |
| | Unjustified growth for foreign national indirect hires | | | | (10,484) | |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Air Combat Command | | | | (8,000) | |
| | Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Pacific | | | | (9,000) | |
| | Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Europe | | | | (10,000) | |
| | Engineering & Installation, Air Combat Command | | | | (5,600) | |
| | Engineering & Installation, Space Command | | | | (4,000) | |
| | Engineering & Installation, Air Mobility Command | | | | (6,300) | |
| | Engineering & Installation, Pacific | | | | (5,000) | |
| | Engineering & Installation, Europe | | | | (10,000) | |
| | **COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS** | **2,587,468** | **(30,212)** | | **(30,212)** | **2,557,256** |
| 090 | GLOBAL C3I & EARLY WARNING | 1,147,163 | | | | 1,147,163 |
| 100 | NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT | 204,543 | | | | 204,543 |
| 110 | OTHER COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT PROGRAMS | 622,524 | (30,212) | | | 592,312 |
| | Unjustified growth for service support to NORTHCOM | | | | (26,212) | |
| | Combatant Commanders Intelligence Capabilities | | | | (4,000) | |
| 120 | JCS EXERCISES | 32,756 | | | | 32,756 |
| 130 | MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 240,380 | | | | 240,380 |
| 140 | TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE AND SPECIAL ACTIVITIES | 340,102 | | | | 340,102 |
| | **SPACE OPERATIONS** | **1,708,527** | | | | **1,708,527** |
| 150 | LAUNCH FACILITIES | 343,565 | | | | 343,565 |
| 160 | LAUNCH VEHICLES | 100,135 | | | | 100,135 |
| 170 | SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 237,995 | | | | 237,995 |
| 180 | SATELLITE SYSTEMS | 68,655 | | | | 68,655 |
| 190 | OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS | 258,376 | | | | 258,376 |
| 210 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 171,469 | | | | 171,469 |
| 200 | BASE SUPPORT | 528,332 | | | | 528,332 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01** | **15,940,298** | **17,404** | **164,300** | **(146,896)** | **15,957,702** |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | | | |
| | **MOBILITY OPERATIONS** | 3,291,759 | (39,500) | | (39,500) | 3,252,259 |
| 220 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS | 1,919,987 | | | | 1,919,987 |
| 230 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I | 51,824 | | | | 51,824 |
| 240 | MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS | 170,623 | | | | 170,623 |
| 260 | PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA | | | | | |
| 250 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 410,679 | (39,500) | | | 371,179 |
| | Depot maintenance program realignment to Air National Guard | | | | (39,500) | |
| 280 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 200,928 | | | | 200,928 |
| 270 | BASE SUPPORT | 537,718 | | | | 537,718 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 02** | **3,291,759** | **(39,500)** | | **(39,500)** | **3,252,259** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | | | |
| | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | 321,872 | | | | 321,872 |
| 290 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 73,788 | | | | 73,788 |
| 300 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 6,034 | | | | 6,034 |
| 310 | RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) | 84,381 | | | | 84,381 |
| 330 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION (AC/ | 85,892 | | | | 85,892 |
| 320 | BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY) | 71,777 | | | | 71,777 |
| | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | 2,168,417 | | | | 2,168,417 |
| 340 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 336,818 | | | | 336,818 |
| 350 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 775,819 | | | | 775,819 |
| 360 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 158,967 | | | | 158,967 |
| 370 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 108,450 | | | | 108,450 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 380 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 12,914 | | | | 12,914 |
| 390 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION | 190,592 | | | | 190,592 |
| 100 | BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING) | 584,857 | | | | 584,857 |
| | **RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION** | **514,625** | | | | **514,625** |
| 410 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 143,369 | | | | 143,369 |
| 420 | EXAMINING | 3,281 | | | | 3,281 |
| 430 | OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 159,129 | | | | 159,129 |
| 440 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 158,738 | | | | 158,738 |
| 450 | JUNIOR ROTC | 50,108 | | | | 50,108 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03** | **3,004,914** | | | | **3,004,914** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | **2,925,282** | | | | **2,925,282** |
| 460 | LOGISTICS OPERATIONS | 883,478 | | | | 883,478 |
| 470 | TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 432,323 | | | | 432,323 |
| 480 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 171,501 | | | | 171,501 |
| 490 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 105,158 | | | | 105,158 |
| 500 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 260,580 | | | | 260,580 |
| 510 | BASE SUPPORT | 1,072,242 | | | | 1,072,242 |
| | **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **2,258,693** | **(68,700)** | | **(68,700)** | **2,189,993** |
| 520 | ADMINISTRATION | 299,617 | | | | 299,617 |
| 530 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 377,574 | (28,800) | | | 348,774 |
| | Combat Information Transport System | | | | (6,400) | |
| | Military Personnel Data Systems | | | | (2,400) | |
| | Pentagon Communications Agency | | | | (20,000) | |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 540 | PERSONNEL PROGRAMS | 262,281 | (9,500) | | | 252,781 |
| | Central civilian career permanent change station program | | | | (9,500) | |
| 550 | RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES | 129,437 | | | | 129,437 |
| 560 | ARMS CONTROL | 41,645 | | | | 41,645 |
| 570 | OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | 728,942 | | | | 728,942 |
| 580 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 39,457 | | | | 39,457 |
| 590 | CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION | 21,722 | | | | 21,722 |
| 610 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 12,848 | | | | 12,848 |
| 600 | BASE SUPPORT | 345,170 | (30,400) | | | 314,770 |
| | Unjustified growth | | | | (30,400) | |
| | **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | **1,024,129** | | | | **1,024,129** |
| 630 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 1,024,129 | | | | 1,024,129 |
| | **SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS** | **26,185** | | | | **26,185** |
| 640 | INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT | 26,185 | | | | 26,185 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04** | **6,234,289** | **(68,700)** | | **(68,700)** | **6,165,589** |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | | | |
| | Civilian separation incentives | | (40,798) | | (40,798) | (40,798) |
| | Working Capital Fund, Transportation | | (967,200) | | (967,200) | (967,200) |
| | Working Capital Fund, Supply Management | | (150,000) | | (150,000) | (150,000) |
| | Excessive unobligated balances | | (49,400) | | (49,400) | (49,400) |
| | Civilian pay overstatement | | (29,500) | | (29,500) | (29,500) |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | **28,471,260** | **(1,327,694)** | **164,300** | **(1,491,994)** | **27,143,566** |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide** | | | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| 010 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 243,062 | (38,900) | | | 204,162 |
| | Unjustified growth for military air and sea lift cargo | | | | (27,100) | |
| | Unjustified growth for joint exercises | | | | (11,800) | |
| 020 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 1,992,613 | 1,000 | | | 1,993,613 |
| | Hydration on the move | | | 1,000 | | |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:** | **2,235,675** | **(37,900)** | **1,000** | **(38,900)** | **2,197,775** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION** | | | | | |
| 030 | DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY | 40,599 | | | | 40,599 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:** | **40,599** | | | | **40,599** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | | | |
| 040 | AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE | 14,050 | | | | 14,050 |
| 050 | OTHER PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| 060 | DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY | 103,532 | | | | 103,532 |
| 070 | DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 5,296 | | | | 5,296 |
| 080 | DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | 5,968 | | | | 5,968 |
| 090 | DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY | 56,067 | 10,000 | | | 66,067 |
| | Joint Advertising and Market Research | | | 10,000 | | |
| 100 | DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE | | | | | |
| 110 | DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE | 7,343 | | | | 7,343 |
| 120 | NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY | 90,263 | 4,600 | | | 94,863 |
| | Continuing Education | | | 2,000 | | |
| | Joint Forces Staff College Infrastructure | | | 2,600 | | |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 130 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 96,244 | | | | 96,244 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03:** | **378,763** | **14,600** | **14,600** | | **393,363** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| 140 | AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE | 110,528 | | | | 110,528 |
| 150 | CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS | 101,389 | | | | 101,389 |
| 160 | DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 368,119 | | | | 368,119 |
| 200 | DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY | 25,484 | | | | 25,484 |
| 210 | DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY | 265,379 | 19,000 | | | 284,379 |
| | Commercial technologies for maintenance activities | | | 15,000 | | |
| | Rapid frequency identification technology | | | 4,000 | | |
| 220 | DEFENSE POW / MISSING PERSONS OFFICE | 15,964 | | | | 15,964 |
| 230 | DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION | 20,456 | 1,000 | | | 21,456 |
| | Program increase | | | 1,000 | | |
| 240 | DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | 319,483 | 1,500 | | | 320,983 |
| | Program increase | | | 1,500 | | |
| 250 | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY | 1,761,852 | 57,200 | | | 1,819,052 |
| | DOD Supplemental Impact Aid | | | 50,000 | | |
| | Joint Counterintelligence Training Academy | | | 7,200 | | |
| 260 | DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY | 318,940 | | | | 318,940 |
| 270 | DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY | 1,029,592 | | | | 1,029,592 |
| 280 | DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE | 4,310 | | | | 4,310 |
| 290 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY | 1,090,558 | | | | 1,090,558 |
| 300 | DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY | 83,922 | | | | 83,922 |
| 310 | DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE | 277,100 | (50,000) | | | 227,100 |
| | Program reduction to prevent transition to working capital fund | | | | (50,000) | |
| 320 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 278,884 | | | | 278,884 |
| 340 | OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT | 44,756 | | | | 44,756 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 350 | OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE | 805,813 | (112,570) | | | 693,243 |
| | FEHB premiums for mobilized federal employees | | | 10,000 | | |
| | USD(I) | | | | (20,000) | |
| | Capitol cost sharing | | | | (27,300) | |
| | Environment readiness | | | | (10,000) | |
| | Public affairs | | | | (11,500) | |
| | Secretary's analytical agenda | | | | (7,000) | |
| | Unjustified growth | | | | (20,000) | |
| | Persistent Stratospheric Vehicles | | | 4,230 | | |
| | DJCC - Research Technology Protection | | | 4,800 | | |
| | Counterintelligence Law Enforcement Watch Center | | | 4,000 | | |
| | Paralyzed Veterans Association | | | 1,000 | | |
| | Chief Information Officer Programs | | | | (12,000) | |
| | Comptroller Business Management Modernization Program | | | | (25,400) | |
| | Horizontal Fusion | | | | (3,400) | |
| 360 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 142,457 | | | | 142,457 |
| 370 | WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES | 447,166 | (10,000) | | | 437,166 |
| | BRAC Commission | | | | (10,000) | |
| 380 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 7,326,887 | | | | 7,326,887 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:** | **14,839,039** | **(93,870)** | **102,730** | **(196,600)** | **14,745,169** |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | | | |
| | Excessive unobligated balances | | (59,500) | | (59,500) | (59,500) |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide** | **17,494,076** | **(176,670)** | **118,330** | **(295,000)** | **17,317,406** |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | | | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| | **LAND FORCES** | **970,213** | | | | **970,213** |
| 010 | DIVISION FORCES | 7,640 | | | | 7,640 |
| 020 | CORPS COMBAT FORCES | 34,607 | | | | 34,607 |
| 030 | CORPS SUPPORT FORCES | 318,411 | | | | 318,411 |
| 040 | ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES | 150,421 | | | | 150,421 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 459,134 | | | | 459,134 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS** | **290,225** | | | | **290,225** |
| 060 | FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 153,475 | | | | 153,475 |
| 070 | LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS | 65,202 | | | | 65,202 |
| 080 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 71,548 | | | | 71,548 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | **587,880** | **6,600** | **6,600** | | **594,480** |
| 090 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 379,112 | 5,600 | | | 384,712 |
| | Family Support Programs | | | 5,600 | | |
| 100 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 201,141 | | | | 201,141 |
| 110 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 7,627 | | | | 7,627 |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | | | |
| | Tuition Assistance | | 1,000 | 1,000 | | 1,000 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:** | **1,848,318** | **6,600** | **6,600** | | **1,854,918** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **159,810** | | | | **159,810** |
| 120 | ADMINISTRATION | 52,180 | | | | 52,180 |
| 130 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 9,116 | | | | 9,116 |
| 140 | PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION | 8,201 | | | | 8,201 |
| 150 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 90,313 | | | | 90,313 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:** | **159,810** | | | | **159,810** |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | | | |
| | Military Technician Mobilization Underexecution | | (11,000) | | (11,000) | (11,000) |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | **2,008,128** | (4,400) | **6,600** | (11,000) | **2,003,728** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | | | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| | **RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS** | **633,603** | | | | **633,603** |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 483,526 | | | | 483,526 |
| 030 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 16,494 | | | | 16,494 |
| 040 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 1,592 | | | | 1,592 |
| 050 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 131,607 | | | | 131,607 |
| 060 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 384 | | | | 384 |
| | **RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS** | **156,041** | | | | **156,041** |
| 070 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 59,127 | | | | 59,127 |
| 080 | SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING | 531 | | | | 531 |
| 090 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | | | | | |
| 100 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 92,787 | | | | 92,787 |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 110 | SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 3,596 | | | | 3,596 |
| | **RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT** | **224,589** | | | | **224,589** |
| 110 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 6,732 | | | | 6,732 |
| 120 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 224,589 | | | | 224,589 |
| | **RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT** | **5,548** | | | | **5,548** |
| 130 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 5,548 | | | | 5,548 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | **182,273** | | | | **182,273** |
| 140 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 73,410 | | | | 73,410 |
| 150 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 108,863 | | | | 108,863 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:** | **1,208,786** | | | | **1,208,786** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| | **ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **31,252** | | | | **31,252** |
| 160 | ADMINISTRATION | 6,930 | | | | 6,930 |
| 170 | CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT | | | | | |
| 180 | MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT | 8,797 | | | | 8,797 |
| 190 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 3,347 | | | | 3,347 |
| 200 | COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS | 5,667 | | | | 5,667 |
| 210 | OTHER SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT | 6,511 | | | | 6,511 |
| | **CANCELLED ACCOUNTS** | | | | | |
| 220 | CANCELLED ACCOUNTS | | | | | |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:** | **31,252** | | | | **31,252** |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | **1,240,038** | | | | **1,240,038** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | | | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| | **MISSION FORCES** | **156,112** | | | | **156,112** |
| 010 | OPERATING FORCES | 72,940 | | | | 72,940 |
| 020 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 12,132 | | | | 12,132 |
| 030 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | | | | | |
| 040 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 25,544 | | | | 25,544 |
| 050 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | | | | | |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | **45,496** | | | | |
| 060 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 12,126 | | | | 12,126 |
| 070 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 33,370 | | | | 33,370 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:** | **156,112** | | | | **156,112** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| | **ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **32,584** | | | | **32,584** |
| 080 | SPECIAL SUPPORT | 8,948 | | | | 8,948 |
| 090 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 580 | | | | 580 |
| 100 | ADMINISTRATION | 10,407 | | | | 10,407 |
| 110 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | | | | | |
| 120 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 8,013 | | | | 8,013 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | **4,636** | | | | |
| 130 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 4,636 | | | | 4,636 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:** | **32,584** | | | | **32,584** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | **188,696** | | | | **188,696** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve** | | | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | **2,132,168** | | | | **2,132,168** |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 1,329,717 | | | | 1,329,717 |
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 74,077 | | | | 74,077 |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 410,893 | | | | 410,893 |
| 050 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 53,056 | | | | 53,056 |
| 040 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 264,425 | | | | 264,425 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:** | **2,132,168** | | | | **2,132,168** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| | **ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **107,622** | | | | **107,622** |
| 060 | ADMINISTRATION | 60,270 | | | | 60,270 |
| 080 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 14,516 | | | | 14,516 |
| 070 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 25,485 | | | | 25,485 |
| 090 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 6,707 | | | | 6,707 |
| 100 | AUDIOVISUAL | 644 | | | | 644 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:** | **107,622** | | | | **107,622** |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | | | |
| | Military Technician Mobilization Underexecution | | (13,000) | | (13,000) | (13,000) |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve** | **2,239,790** | **(13,000)** | | **(13,000)** | **2,226,790** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | | | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| | **LAND FORCES** | **2,157,247** | | | | **2,157,247** |
| 010 | DIVISIONS | 558,168 | | | | 558,168 |
| 020 | CORPS COMBAT FORCES | 629,062 | | | | 629,062 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 030 | CORPS SUPPORT FORCES | 333,393 | | | | 333,393 |
| 040 | ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES | 615,838 | | | | 615,838 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 20,786 | | | | 20,786 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS** | **553,644** | **1,000** | **1,000** | | **554,644** |
| 060 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 180,163 | 1,000 | | | 181,163 |
| | Hydration on the move | | | 1,000 | | |
| 070 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 142,914 | | | | 142,914 |
| 080 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 230,567 | | | | 230,567 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | **1,471,595** | **30,000** | **30,000** | | **1,501,595** |
| 090 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 577,028 | 30,000 | | | 607,028 |
| | Family Assistance Centers | | | 30,000 | | |
| 100 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 384,044 | | | | 384,044 |
| 110 | MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 451,167 | | | | 451,167 |
| 120 | MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES | 59,356 | | | | 59,356 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:** | **4,182,486** | **31,000** | **31,000** | | **4,213,486** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | **258,200** | | | | **258,200** |
| 130 | ADMINISTRATION | 110,669 | | | | 110,669 |
| 140 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 26,341 | | | | 26,341 |
| 150 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 35,376 | | | | 35,376 |
| 160 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 85,814 | | | | 85,814 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:** | **258,200** | | | | **258,200** |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | | | |
| | Tuition Assistance | | 500 | 500 | | 500 |
| | Excessive unobligated balances | | (14,500) | | (14,500) | (14,500) |
| | Military Technician Mobilization Underexecution | | (32,000) | | (32,000) | (32,000) |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | **4,440,686** | **(15,000)** | **31,500** | **(46,500)** | **4,425,686** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | | | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | **4,385,950** | **78,800** | **78,800** | | **4,464,750** |
| 010 | AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS | 2,685,471 | | | | 2,685,471 |
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 362,114 | | | | 362,114 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 676,647 | 78,800 | | | 755,447 |
| | Depot maintenance program realignment from Air Force | | | 78,800 | | |
| 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 230,642 | | | | 230,642 |
| 050 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 431,076 | | | | 431,076 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:** | **4,385,950** | **78,800** | **78,800** | | **4,464,750** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **36,888** | | | | **36,888** |
| 060 | ADMINISTRATION | 27,490 | | | | 27,490 |
| 070 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 9,398 | | | | 9,398 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:** | **36,888** | | | | **36,888** |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | | | |
| | Military Technician Mobilization Underexecution | | (19,000) | | (19,000) | (19,000) |
| | Excessive unobligated balances | | (33,700) | | (33,700) | (33,700) |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | **4,422,838** | **26,100** | **78,800** | **(52,700)** | **4,448,938** |
| | **TRANSFER ACCOUNTS** | | | | | |
| 010 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY | 400,948 | | | | 400,948 |
| 020 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY | 266,820 | | | | 266,820 |
| 030 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE | 397,368 | | | | 397,368 |
| 040 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE | 23,684 | | | | 23,684 |
| 050 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES | 216,516 | | | | 216,516 |
| | **TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS** | **1,305,336** | | | | **1,305,336** |
| | **MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS** | | | | | |
| 060 | U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES | 10,825 | | | | 10,825 |
| 070 | SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS | | | | | |
| 080 | OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND | 30,000 | (25,000) | | (25,000) | 5,000 |
| 190 | OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS | 59,000 | | | | 59,000 |
| 200 | PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND | | | | | |
| | Defense Industrial Base Capabilities Fund | | 50,000 | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| 220 | FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION | 409,200 | | | | 409,200 |
| | **TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS** | **509,025** | **25,000** | **50,000** | **(25,000)** | **534,025** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:** | **121,874,589** | **(2,040,664)** | **488,530** | **(2,529,194)** | **119,833,925** |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS** | | | | | |
| **DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM** | | | | | |
| OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE | 17,203,369 | 171,175 | 334,675 | (163,500) | 17,374,544 |
| Information Technology Reduction | | | | (50,000) | |
| Earlier TRICARE Eligibility for RC Families and Members | | | 113,000 | | |
| Waiver of TRICARE Deductibles for RC Families | | | 2,000 | | |
| Protection against Balance Billing for Mobilized Reservists | | | 500 | | |
| Enrollment of Certain Young Children in Dental Plan | | | 500 | | |
| Improved Transition Assistance Program | | | 170,000 | | |
| TRICARE Coverage of Certain Ready Reservists | | | 30,000 | | |
| Additional TRICARE Prime Remote Beneficiaries | | | 1,000 | | |
| Cooperative Education for Sexual Health Decision Making | | | 175 | | |
| Sub-Acute Care Transition Program | | | 500 | | |
| Marshall Islands Diabetes Program | | | 2,000 | | |
| Landstuhl Medical Center | | | 10,000 | | |
| DOD Cooperative Health Care Program | | | 5,000 | | |
| GAO Estimate Annual DHP Unobligated Funds | | | | (113,500) | |
| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION | 72,407 | | | | 72,407 |
| PROCUREMENT | 364,635 | | | | 364,635 |
| **TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM** | **17,640,411** | **171,175** | **334,675** | **(163,500)** | **17,811,586** |
| **CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS PROGRAM** | | | | | |
| OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE | | 1,138,801 | 1,138,801 | | 1,138,801 |
| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION | | 154,209 | 154,209 | | 154,209 |
| PROCUREMENT | | 78,980 | 78,980 | | 78,980 |
| **TOTAL, CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS PROGRAM** | | 1,371,990 | 1,371,990 | | **1,371,990** |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG PROGRAMS** | **852,697** | | | | 852,697 |
| **OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL** | | | | | |
| OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE | 242,362 | (51,000) | | | 191,362 |
| Mid Range Financial Improvement Program | | | | (51,000) | |
| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION | 2,100 | | | | 2,100 |
| PROCUREMENT | 100 | | | | 100 |
| **TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL** | **244,562** | **(51,000)** | | **(51,000)** | **193,562** |
| **TOTAL, OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS** | **18,737,670** | **1,492,165** | **1,706,665** | **(214,500)** | **20,229,835** |
| **REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS** | | | | | |
| Defense Working Capital Funds | 510,886 | (138,000) | | (138,000) | 372,886 |
| ARMY | 184,260 | (67,000) | | | 117,260 |
| Industrial mobilization capacity | | | | (67,000) | |
| NAVY | 65,326 | (59,000) | | | 6,326 |
| Aviation spare engine procurement | | | | (59,000) | |
| AIR FORCE | 81,300 | (12,000) | | | 69,300 |
| Perishable medical and dental readiness material | | | | (12,000) | |
| DEFENSE-WIDE | 180,000 | | | | 180,000 |
| Defense Working Capital Funds - DeCA | 1,175,000 | | | | 1,175,000 |
| National Defense Sealift Fund | 1,269,252 | (50,000) | | (50,000) | 1,219,252 |
| National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund | | | | | |
| Armed Forces Retirement Home | 61,195 | | | | 61,195 |
| **TOTAL, REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS** | **3,016,333** | **(188,000)** | | **(188,000)** | **2,828,333** |

# ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

## BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS—READINESS

The committee recommends the following adjustments to the fiscal year 2005 budget request:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of the Army Adjustments: | |
| BA–1 Hydration on the Move | +3.0 |
| BA–1 Military Skills Engagement Training Simulator (Laser Shot Software) | +1.0 |
| BA–1 Vehicle Batteries | +2.5 |
| BA–1 Tactical Exploitation System | (4.0) |
| BA–1 Contractor Logistic Support—unjustified growth | (10.0) |
| BA–1 Combat Training Centers—unjustified growth | (10.0) |
| BA–3 Satellite Communications for Learning Project (SCOLA) | +3.0 |
| BA–3 Training Support—unjustified growth | (15.0) |
| BA–4 Administration—unjustified growth | (19.5) |
| Unobligated Balances | (52.3) |
| Civilian Pay Overstatement | (82.0) |
| Army Reserve—Family Assistance Centers | +5.6 |
| Army National Guard—Hydration on the Move | +1.0 |
| Army National Guard—Family Support Programs | +30.0 |
| Army National Guard—Unobligated Balances | (14.5) |
| Department of the Navy Adjustments: | |
| BA–1 Stainless Steel Sanitary Spaces | +4.0 |
| BA–1 NULKA Electronic Decoy Cartridge | +2.0 |
| BA–1 Technical Publications | (25.0) |
| BA–1 Fleet Response Plan Efficiencies | (15.0) |
| BA–1 Combatant Commanders Program-unjustified growth | (40.0) |
| BA–4 Small Ship Registry | +1.5 |
| Unobligated Balances | (97.7) |
| Civilian Pay Overstatement | (12.0) |
| United States Marine Corps Adjustments: | |
| BA–1 Hydration on the Move | +1.0 |
| BA–1 Vehicle Batteries | +2.5 |
| BA–1 Tent Lighting System | +2.0 |
| Department of the Air Force Adjustments: | |
| BA–1 B–1A Lancer Bombers | +157.4 |
| BA–1 Hydration on the Move | +2.0 |
| BA–1 Joint Crew Protection Mask | +1.4 |
| BA–1 KC–767 Tankers | +3.5 |
| BA–1 Combat Air Systems Activities | (9.0) |
| BA–1 Foreign Nat'l Indirect Hires—unjustified growth | (10.5) |

| | |
|---|---|
| BA–1 NORTHCOM—unjustified growth | (26.2) |
| BA–1 Combatant Commander Intel Capabilities | (4.0) |
| BA–4 Personnel Programs | (9.5) |
| BA–4 Base Support-unjustified growth | (30.4) |
| Civilian Separation Incentives | (40.8) |
| Unobligated Balances | (49.4) |
| Civilian Pay Overstatement | (29.5) |
| Depot Maintenance Realignment to ANG | (78.8) |
| Air National Guard Depot Maintenance Realignment | +78.8 |
| Air National Guard Unobligated Balances | (33.7) |
| Defense-wide Activities Adjustments: | |
| Joint Chiefs of Staff—unjustified growth | (38.9) |
| Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities | +15.0 |
| Rapid Frequency Identification Technology | +4.0 |
| Hydration on the Move | +1.0 |
| Defense Technology Security Administration | +1.0 |
| Defense Threat Reduction Agency | +8.7 |
| Washington Headquarters Services—BRAC Commission | (10.0) |
| Office of Secretary of Defense—FEHB | +10.0 |
| Office of Secretary of Defense—Persistent Stratospheric Vehicles | +4.2 |
| Office of Secretary of Defense—Research Technology Protection | +4.8 |
| Office of Secretary of Defense—Counterintelligence Law Enforcement Watch Center | +4.0 |
| Office of Secretary of Defense—Paralyzed Veterans Association | +1.0 |
| Office of Secretary of Defense—unjustified growth | (95.8) |
| Defense Security Service | (50.0) |
| Unobligated Balances | (59.5) |

## Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities

The committee continues to support the Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities (CTMA) program. The Department of Defense (DOD) created the CTMA program in 1998 as the only program designed to bring the most modern and advanced manufacturing processes used by commercial industries to the DOD maintenance depots and organic maintenance activities. It is the committee's understanding that depot commanders support the economic efficiencies this program can provide.

Therefore, the committee recommends the addition of $15.0 million for the Defense Logistics Agency to continue the CTMA program. The committee believes the addition of these funds will allow depot-level activities to continue the successful participation in

manufacturing technology demonstration projects in collaboration with more than 150 of the leading U.S. manufacturers.

### Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan

The budget request contained $51.0 million for the Department of Defense, Office of Inspector General, to implement the Mid-Range Improvement Plan. The committee understands the goal of this plan is for the Department of Defense to obtain clean and auditable financial statements in fiscal year 2007. To date, the committee has not received any information estimating the cost of this plan in future fiscal years. As addressed elsewhere in this report, the committee cannot support the plan until additional information is provided, and thus recommends a decrease of $51.0 million to the Department of Defense, Office of Inspector General.

### Paralyzed Veterans of America

The committee supports programs sponsored by the Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) designated for servicemen and women returning from Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Programs such as the PVA Outdoor Sports Heritage Fund encourage and assist soldiers to get out of the hospitals and engage in outdoor activities. Accordingly, the committee recommends $1.0 million for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the PVA Outdoor Sports Heritage Fund to continue this worthwhile effort.

### Spare Engines

The budget request contained no funds to purchase Navy spare aviation engines. Instead, the Secretary of the Navy intends to purchase these engines with obligation authority within the Department of Defense working capital fund. In the past, engines were purchased with appropriated aviation procurement funds. The committee believes it is inappropriate to fund spare aviation engines within the working capital fund. The proposed mechanism would delay using appropriated funds to purchase these engines. The committee notes that section 8041 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–87) states, "[T]he fiscal year 2005 budget request shall be . . . submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in the procurement appropriation account in this act shall be budgeted for the proposed fiscal year 2005 procurement appropriation and not in the . . . Department of Defense Working Capital Funds." Therefore, the committee recommends a transfer of $59.0 million from the defense working capital fund to the Department of the Navy's aviation procurement account.

### Working Capital Funds

Working capital funds serve a vital role in providing financial transaction flexibility for working capital fund activities and its customers. When working capital activities achieve a surplus in the annual operating result, consideration should be given to adjusting customer rates. Working capital activities that do not adjust rates are not appropriately returning surplus funds to customers. In ad-

dition, the committee is aware that many working capital fund activities have cash in excess of the Department of Defense rules. The committee, therefore, recommends the following reductions.

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Air Force Working Capital Fund, Supply Management | (150.0) |
| Air Force Working Capital Fund, Transportation | (917.2) |

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ISSUES

### Overview

The committee strongly believes information technology (IT) is a critical enabler for the Department of Defense (DOD) to meet and defeat both conventional and asymmetric threats in 21st Century warfare. The committee supports the Department's goal to have joint, network-centric, distributed forces to provide rapid reaction for any situation. However, the Department is far from achieving that objective.

While the Department has implemented and expanded the Global Information Grid's (GIG) potential capabilities, which will be an enormous enhancement in supporting our military forces, the committee remains concerned that warfighters may not be able to utilize these capabilities if individual service architectures, investments, and service specific systems limit interoperability. The crux of the issue is DOD execution, enforcement and evolution of its systems architecture to allow warfighters to capitalize on IT investments that use command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, reconnaissance, surveillance systems (C4ISR) which are enabled through the GIG.

The committee supports the Department's design and implementation of an enterprise architecture to build and support a fully functioning network that every serviceman or woman can access and exploit. Such a network is intended to resolve the interoperability issues that currently plague the military services.

The committee is concerned that the Department has not maintained adequate oversight and scrutiny over its business systems investments to ensure funds are spent on joint solutions that would provide the best value. While the Department is presently taking several actions to improve the situation, the committee is concerned that it has not put into place the organizational structure and process controls to properly align business systems investments with the business enterprise architecture. Therefore, the various military services and defense agencies have continued to make their own investment decisions, each following different criteria by designing and procuring its own business IT systems. This lack of an institutionalized investment strategy has contributed to the Department's current complex, error-prone, non-integrated IT systems environment.

The committee proposes legislation that would increase the level of scrutiny and responsibility exercised by the business domain owners, and recommends a series of reductions in apparently redundant or legacy IT programs and those that lack proper justification to explain growth from last year's budget request.

## Information Technology Specific Reductions

The Department of the Defense budget request for information technology (IT) includes both IT and national security systems (NSS). While the committee supports network centric operations and warfare initiatives that support military missions, as well as operational and organizational changes that have the net effect of supporting our warfighters, the committee remains concerned about the Department's lack of control and management oversight of the development and investments in business IT systems. The committee is also concerned that the Department has created joint IT systems whose program offices lack authority to devise, implement, and enforce systems architectures; control expenditures; or execute programs according to schedule and performance standards. The committee believes the Department needs to better manage and oversee many of the IT and NSS systems to prevent the proliferation of service-centric systems that do not interoperate with one another. Therefore, the committee recommends adjustments in the following programs:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of the Army Adjustments: | |
| Training Instrumentation for Air and Missile defense (AMD Units | +5.0 |
| Army National Guard Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Program | +3.5 |
| Army National Guard Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network (NDFON) | +6.0 |
| Deputy Chief of Staff for Information Management and Director of Information Management (DCSIM/DOIM) Staff Operations | (2.2) |
| Installation Management Activity | (10.0) |
| Network Enterprise Technology Command (EAC Support) | (9.0) |
| Visual Information Support | (13.0) |
| MEPCOM Management Information Reporting System | (10.0) |
| Recruiting Information Support System | (4.0) |
| Army Human Resources Command Core Automation Support | (20.0) |
| Army Knowledge Enterprise Architecture | (4.0) |
| Army Personnel Electronic Records Management System | (7.0) |
| Defense Civilian Personnel Data System-Sustainment | (2.2) |
| Information Technology Agency | (12.4) |
| Logistics Modernization Program | (2.7) |
| Logistic Post Production Software Support | (3.5) |
| Management Headquarters Information Management | (13.0) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Personnel Transformation | (13.0) |
| Department of the Navy Adjustments: | |
| Navy Air Logistics Data Analysis | (15.0) |
| Navy Converged Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Program | (15.5) |
| Navy/USMC Base Level Communications | (27.0) |
| Other Navy Military Personnel and Readiness (Training and Recruiting) | (12.0) |
| Other Navy Military Personnel and Readiness (Admin and Servicewide Activities) | (16.0) |
| Department of the Air Force Adjustments: | |
| Air Force Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Air Combat Command | (8.0) |
| Air Force Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Pacific | (9.0) |
| Air Force Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Europe | (10.0) |
| Air Force Engineering and Installations, Air Combat Command | (5.6) |
| Air Force Engineering and Installations, Space Command | (4.0) |
| Air Force Engineering and Installations, Air Mobility Command | (6.3) |
| Air Force Engineering and Installations, Pacific | (5.0) |
| Air Force Engineering and Installations, Europe | (10.0) |
| Air Force Combat Information Transport System | (6.4) |
| Air Force Military Personnel Data System | (2.4) |
| Air Force Pentagon Communications Agency | (20.0) |
| Defense-wide Activities Adjustments: | |
| Chief Information Officer Programs, OSD | (12.0) |
| Comptroller Business Management Modernization Program | (25.4) |
| Health Program | (50.0) |
| Horizontal Fusion | (3.4) |

*Enterprise Resource Planning Program—Army National Guard*

The budget contained no funding for the Army National Guard enterprise resource planning program (ERP) which would identify the business processes in the Army National Guard and compare them to the Army ERP programs.

The committee believes this may be a valuable study and could benefit the Army National Guard to determine how it may leverage existing Army and other Department of Defense's initiatives, to include the Business Management Modernization Program (BMMP). Such ERP would also allow the Army National Guard to do collabo-

rative planning between national headquarters and the various state guard bureaus.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $3.5 million for the Army National Guard enterprise resource planning program, and directs the Chief, Army National Guard to use the BMMP and the defense business enterprise architecture as the baseline and standards for this program's development and integration.

*Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network*

The budget request contained no funding for the Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network (NDFON) for the Army National Guard.

This program will provide a dedicated high-speed, high-bandwidth fiber optic network backbone to service National Guard communications operations. NDFON will be a secure, reliable, and survivable network capable of supporting current and projected communications requirements. The committee notes that this program has the capability to provide the National Guard armories with a robust communications backbone to provide rapid, coordinated response to potential incidents. The committee understands that NDFON will comply with the Global Information Grid's architecture to maximize communications, networking, and collaboration between the armories and the Department of Defense.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in operation and maintenance for the Army National Guard to complete engineering studies for the NDFON program.

Navy Marine Corps Intranet

The budget request contained $1.6 billion for the Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI). The committee notes that over 300,000 users are now supported by this program. The program is providing support and connectivity to hundreds of deployed troops in the Iraqi war zone.

The committee notes that the focus of NMCI has changed from deploying systems to achieving efficient steady-state operations, as shown by the Department of the Navy and its contractor conducting negotiations to improve the execution of the $7.0 billion NMCI contract for all users. The contract presently supports a larger number of legacy systems for longer periods of time than envisioned when first awarded. The committee is aware the Navy may have underestimated the number of software applications in its inventory, initially estimating that it had only 5,000 applications, when the real number may be as high as 67,000. Additionally, the committee notes that the Navy has not practiced due diligence to identify and turn off these legacy applications and their associated computer networks. The committee is concerned because to date, only two legacy networks whose functionality is intended to migrate to the NMCI have been terminated. The committee understands the Navy operates other information technology systems that were never intended to operate in the NMCI environment.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to complete the migration or terminate all legacy networks and applications whose functionality is intended to migrate to the NMCI environment by September 30, 2005. If this transition is not completed by such date, the Secretary of the Navy will provide a report

as to how the Department of the Navy plans to fund these legacy systems beyond September 30, 2005. The committee believes the contractor should not be held responsible to support those legacy networks and applications the Secretary of Navy does not migrate to the NMCI environment by this date.

## OTHER MATTERS

### Core Logistics Capability

Under section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, the Department of Defense must maintain a core logistics capability. The committee understands that until recently, the Department of the Navy considered the maintenance and repair of subsystems to aviation mission essential weapon systems as a core logistics capability and thus performed at a public depot. The committee is concerned that the practice referred to above has been cancelled, yet a new policy is not in place. Thus, the committee directs the Secretary of Navy to continue with the older practice used to identify core logistics capability, until the Secretary notifies the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee of the new policy.

### Fire Emergency and Services Program

The Department of Defense, Inspector General, cited in its report, "DoD Fire and Emergency Services Program," D–2003–121, that staffing and apparatus shortfalls could adversely impact firefighter safety and installation missions. The committee is concerned that fire houses, personnel, and other fire suppression resources at military bases may be below minimal safety standards. The committee believes it is imperative that military base commanders operate fire departments at or above National Fire Protection Association standards as they apply to staffing, equipment and other readiness capabilities, and fulfill all of the Inspector General's recommendations.

### Jinapsan Beach Properties in Guam

The committee is concerned with a long-standing, unresolved issue regarding public access to Jinapsan Beach, Guam. This area of land is privately owned and accessible only through Department of Air Force or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service owned land. In response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the Air Force closed the public road through Andersen Air Base to Jinapsan Beach. The Department then initiated an environmental impact statement (EIS) to evaluate three alternative access routes. The EIS is still not complete. The Department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are in disagreement over the timing and circumstances of the EIS. The committee urges the parties to resolve this dispute and encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to employ the services of an outside organization conversant with these issues in order to expedite completion of the EIS and determine a permanent alternative route of access to privately-owned properties at Jinapsan Beach.

## Moving Household Goods—Families First

The Department of Defense spends more than $1,700.0 million annually on moving military families. The committee believes that the Department has long experienced problems with moving household goods. In November 2002, the Secretary of Defense submitted to various congressional committees three initiatives to improve the moving household goods program, which would add an additional 13 percent over current program costs. The Comptroller General reviewed this report and concluded that all three initiatives offer solutions to several long standing problems and should be implemented (U.S. General Accounting Office, "Monitoring Costs and Benefits Needed While Implementing a New Program for Moving Household Goods," April 2003). The Comptroller General raised a concern, however, on whether the three initiatives could be implemented within the proposed 13 percent cost increase. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary to reevaluate its cost estimate, to quantify the risk or likelihood of achieving its goals within 13 percent cost projection, and to develop the range of possible cost increases associated with the risk, by December 1, 2004. The committee also directs the Comptroller General to review and report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, by February 2, 2005, whether the Secretary has adequately performed the committee's directed task.

## New Mexico Training Range Initiative

The Committee is pleased with the Department of Air Force's progress towards the establishment of the New Mexico Training Range Initiative (NMTRI), including Melrose Range, Sumner Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace and the Pecos and Taiban Military Operations Areas. It is the committee's understanding that the Air Force is projected to complete an environmental impact statement (EIS) by September 2005. The Committee encourages the Air Force and all other parties involved to continue to pursue September 2005 as the final deadline for the completed EIS with regards to the NMTRI at Melrose Range.

## Tents

There are 36 major types of tents used in the military services. The Director, Defense Logistics Agency, is responsible for purchasing these tents, primarily from small businesses. There is, however, no regular or consistent requirement for additional or new tents. Thus, the small businesses that make up a significant portion of this industrial base have difficulty meeting surge requirements. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2005, on what actions the Secretary can take to promote a more consistent requirement for tents or to assist the small business industrial base in meeting surge requirements.

# LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

### Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize $119.8 billion in operation and maintenance funding for the military departments and defense-wide activities.

### Section 302—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize $2.8 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 $20.2 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.

### Section 304—Reimbursement of Members of the Armed Forces Who Purchased Protective Body Armor during Shortage of Defense Stocks of Body Armor

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse soldiers who purchased protective body armor for use while deployed in connection with Operation Noble Eagle, Operation Enduring Freedom, or Operation Iraqi Freedom, if the soldier did not receive the protective body armor before engaging in such operations where such body armor might be necessary. Reimbursement would be available to soldiers who purchased the body armor between September 1, 2001, and December 31, 2003.

## SUBTITLE B—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

### Section 311—Report Regarding Encroachment Issues Affecting Utah Test and Training Range, Utah

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, within one year of enactment of this Act, on the current and anticipated encroachments on the use and utility of the special use airspace of the Utah Test and Training Range (UTTR), including encroachments initiated by other executive agencies. The report would include recommendations the Secretary considers appropriate, including legislation that would address encroachment-related concerns.

## SUBTITLE C—WORKPLACE AND DEPOT ISSUES

### Section 321—Simplification of Annual Reporting Requirements Concerning Funds Expended for Depot Maintenance and Repair Workloads

This section would amend section 2466(d) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report on the percentage of funds expended or expected to be expended for depot maintenance and repair workloads in the public and private sectors. This report would cover prior, current, and budget years in which data is more reliable. The Comptroller General recommended such a change in its September 15, 2003, audit report, "Depot Maintenance: DOD's 50–50 Reporting Should be Streamlined," (GAO–03–1023).

### Section 322—Repeal of Annual Reporting Requirement Concerning Management of Depot Employees

This section would repeal section 2472(b) of title 10, United States Code, which currently requires the Secretary of Defense to report annually to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services the number of Department of Defense employees employed and expected to be employed during that fiscal year to perform depot level maintenance and repair of materiel. The committee agrees to repeal this annual report and understands that the Secretary shall readily provide such data upon request.

### Section 323—Public-Private Competition for Work Performed by Civilian Employees of Department of Defense

This section would amend section 2461(b) of title 10, United States Code, to ensure the Secretary of Defense formally compares the cost of civilian employee performance with the costs of contractor performance before converting a function performed by 10 or more civilians. This section would also require the Secretary to conduct a formal comparison before modifying, reorganizing, dividing, or changing any function within the Department of Defense. Finally, this section would authorize the Secretary to waive the requirement of a formal comparison when there is a written determination that national security interests are so compelling as to preclude a comparison. The waiver would be required to be published within the Federal Register.

### Section 324—Public-Private Competition Pilot Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a two-year pilot program under which 10 percent of all functions that are considered new are competed pursuant to Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 (A–76). In those instances where the winning party is a small business or a contractor whose employees are represented by a private labor union, the Department of Defense shall not receive credit towards compliance with the 10 percent requirement. This section would also require the Secretary to conduct A–76 competitions to determine whether work currently performed by a contractor should be performed by government em-

ployees. The Secretary shall conduct such studies so that the number of contractor employee studies are approximately 10 percent of the number of government employees studied. The Secretary does have authority to waive these requirements when national security interests are so compelling as to preclude compliance. This waiver would be required to be published in the Federal Register. This section would also require the Department of Defense, Inspector General, to report to Congress on the result of the pilot program.

### Section 325—Sense of Congress on Equitable Legal Standing for Civilian Employees

This section would express the sense of Congress that Department of Defense civilian employees should receive legal standing to challenge a public-private competition before the General Accounting Office or the United States Court of Federal Claims.

### Section 326—Competitive Sourcing Reporting Requirement

This section would require the Department of Defense, Inspector General, to submit a report to Congress addressing whether the Department of Defense employs a sufficient workforce to conduct public-private competitions and whether the Secretary of Defense has implemented a tracking system to asses the cost and quality of service contractors. The system shall be made available to the public and updated quarterly. The tracking system shall include the cost to conduct a study under Office and Management and Budget Circular A–76; the cost of employee performance before the study began; the cost of the most efficient organization; the anticipated cost of contractor performance; the cost for the performance of the function by the contractor; a description of the quality control process used to monitor contract performance with an assessment whether contractor achieved, exceeded, or failed to achieve the quality control standards.

## SUBTITLE D—INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

### Section 331—Preparation of Department of Defense Plan for Transition to Internet Protocol Version 6

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a transition plan to evaluate how the Department of Defense's (DOD) information technology (IT) systems may be impacted by the Department's decision to transition from the current protocols to Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6). The committee is well aware that this decision affects every piece of network equipment that is used by DOD's Global Information Grid (GIG). While the committee is not a proponent of any particular protocol, the committee seeks to ensure that IPv6 will provide, at a minimum, the same capabilities that are available today. Therefore, the committee has raised concerns about the possible implications of the Department's decision to move to this protocol, including quality of service issues and the use of best commercial practices to adopt this protocol. This section would also direct the Secretary to use the Naval Research Lab, in conjunction with the United States Strategic Command, to conduct and manage the tests required in this section.

Section 332—Defense Business Enterprise Architecture, System Accountability, and Conditions for Obligation of Funds for Defense Business System Modernization

This section would repeal section 1004 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), that requires the development and implementation of a defense business enterprise architecture, and requires obligations over $1.0 million for defense business system modernization initiatives to be certified as consistent with that enterprise architecture. This section would, instead, establish accountability for defense business systems by assigning defense domains, or designated Department of Defense (DOD) officials, the authority and responsibility for their business systems, including the establishment of domain-specific investment review processes. In addition, this section would improve transparency in defense business systems investments by requiring the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual budget that identifies such systems, the funds devoted to them, and the officials responsible for such systems. This section would also charge the domain owners for implementing and evolving their portion of the single DOD business enterprise architecture. The committee is concerned that the Department continues to invest billions of dollars in systems that fail to provide integrated business systems, timely and reliable information, and other important financial and business information for the daily operations. The committee believes the explicit assignment of management for the business enterprise architecture and definitive domain accountability, authority, and control is necessary to effectively achieve integrated business operations and systems to support the warfighter.

Section 333—Establishment of Joint Program Office to Improve Interoperability of Battlefield Management Command and Control Systems

This section would establish a joint program office to manage the Department of Defense's myriad of battlefield management command and control systems to provide a common operational picture of the battlefield for all users. The committee understands that the Department has struggled for many years to develop and field command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems that interoperate effectively across all of the military services. A primary reason for this struggle is that the military services and other defense agencies plan and acquire systems to meet their own operational requirements, and not necessarily joint warfighting concepts.

The committee notes that the Department recently drafted a Joint Battle Management Command and Control Roadmap that is intended to lead to a more integrated, interoperable set of command and control and battlespace awareness capabilities for joint force commanders to use in military operations. The committee understands that initially the United States Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) was given oversight and directive authority for the Family of Interoperable Operational Pictures (FIOP), which will eventually integrate air, ground, maritime, and possibly space into one common operational picture.

Unfortunately, JFCOM estimates that it will take up to two years to develop a joint architecture, by which time, several hundred million dollars will have been spent on the single integrated air picture program, while the other supporting systems that the FIOP is intended to integrate will also be in various stages of development under the funding and direction of the military services.

Furthermore, while JFCOM has authority to direct the FIOP development efforts, the actual program implementation will be done by the military services under separate program offices. The committee is deeply troubled by the lack of joint responsibility over program implementation that may jeopardize the possibility of achieving standardization and integration among these systems, and is concerned that funding for the various programs is the responsibility of the military services.

## SUBTITLE E—READINESS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

### Section 341—Annual Report on Department of Defense Operation and Financial Support for Military Museums

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to include in the annual budget justification materials a complete inventory of military museums operated with funds appropriated to the Department of Defense (DOD) or the military services. For each museum, this section would require the Secretary to provide:

(1) A description of the museum facility;

(2) Funds requested to operate, maintain, and repair the museum facility;

(3) The number of DOD civilian personnel and uniformed service members employed or assigned to the museum;

(4) A list of non-museum functions performed at the facility;

(5) Justification for continued DOD funding; and

(6) Funds received from organizations other than the Department to operate, maintain, and repair the museum.

The committee recognizes that museums provide and preserve important records, perspectives, and relics of military history. Due to the large number of museums supported with appropriated funds, however, the committee believes it is important for Congress to have greater visibility over the cost and mission of these museums. The committee notes that the Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard operate 122 museums; and the Army has requested $25.0 million to operate its museums in fiscal year 2005.

### Section 342—Report on Department of Defense Programs for Prepositioning of Material and Equipment

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to evaluate and report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2005, the Department of Defense's strategic objectives for the military department's preposition programs. In recent operations, the United States dictated the time of the engagement and the tempo of operations, which allowed proper planning and measured decisions on how to deliver combat equipment, combat support and sustainment equipment. The committee believes if the timing of a future engagement is not within the control of U.S. forces, the

value of an effective prepositioned strategy could be the difference in dictating the initial stages of a conflict.

Presently, a majority of the prepositioned stocks are in use. The committee does not believe that restocking the existing preposition configuration will meet the Secretary's stated goal of deploying to a distant theatre in ten days, defeating an enemy within thirty days, and being ready for an additional conflict within another thirty days. The current strategy also fails to incorporate concepts of joint doctrine. The Department has a unique opportunity to reassess and reconfigure these programs in the context of the new deployment goals.

## SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 351—Extension of the Arsenal Support Program Initiative

This section would amend Section 343 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to extend the Arsenal Support Initiative Program through fiscal year 2008. This section would also require the Secretary to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2007, the benefits of the program, the extent to which the program met its goals, and whether the program should be made permanent.

### Section 352—Limitation on Preparation or Implementation of Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from obligating operation and maintenance funds to implement the Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan until the Secretary provides information to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services an explanation of how the operation and maintenance funds are to be utilized in fiscal year 2005 and the estimated cost for this plan in future fiscal years.

### Section 353—Procurement of Follow-On Contracts for the Operation of Five Champion-Class T–5 Tank Vessels

This section would require the Secretary of Navy to limit the next competition for the operation and maintenance of the five champion class T–5 fuel tankers to a United States corporation, partnership, or association, as defined in section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (42 App. U.S.C. 802). The committee strongly supports the Secretary of the Navy's intent to receive the best value using negotiated competitions.

### Section 354—Sense of Congress on America's National World War I Museum

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Liberty Memorial Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, is recognized as "America's National World War I Museum."

# TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

## ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Study of High Demand Low Density Military Units and Personnel

Both the active and reserve components are undergoing various transformation initiatives in order to provide lighter, more lethal forces to meet the national security challenges of the 21st century. The global war on terrorism has compelled the services to begin efforts to divest structure and forces from the Cold War era and to develop and establish forces that are more responsive to current requirements. In this new environment, the armed forces have found certain units and personnel are experiencing extraordinary levels of deployment and utilization. These so called high demand-low density units and personnel include, for example, military police, civil affairs, intelligence, psychological operations, and linguists. The committee directs the Comptroller General to determine the extent of the reliance on these active and reserve component high demand low density units and personnel to meet new national security requirements, and to identify the effectiveness of the efforts by the armed forces to reduce or eliminate reliance on high-demand-low density units and specialties. Furthermore, the Comptroller General will assess whether additional units and resources beyond current levels are necessary to meet current and future demands. The Comptroller General should report the findings and recommendations of the assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2005.

## 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, 2005.

| Service | FY 2004 authorized and floor | FY 2005 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Request | Committee recommendation | FY 2005 request | FY 2004 authorized |
| Army | 482,400 | 482,400 | 482,400 | 0 | 0 |
| Navy | 373,800 | 365,900 | 365,900 | 0 | −7,900 |
| USMC | 175,000 | 175,000 | 175,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Air Force | 359,300 | 359,700 | 359,700 | 0 | 400 |
| DOD | 1,390,500 | 1,383,000 | 1,383,000 | 0 | −7,500 |

In addition to the fiscal year 2005 end strengths authorized by this section for the Army and the Marine Corps, sections 1531 and 1532 increase Army and Marine Corps end strengths by 10,000 and 3,000 respectively.

## Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would establish new minimum active duty end strengths for the Navy and the Air Force as of September 30, 2005. These changes in minimum strengths reflect the committee recommendations shown in section 401.

## Section 403—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 2005 to provide operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by sections 401 or 412.

| Service | FY 2005 committee recommendation |
|---|---|
| Army National Guard | 10,300 |
| Army Reserve | 5,000 |
| Naval Reserve | 6,200 |
| Marine Corps Reserve | 2,500 |
| Air National Guard | 10,100 |
| Air Force Reserve | 3,600 |
| DOD Total | 37,700 |

## Section 404—Accounting and Management of Reserve Component Personnel Performing Active Duty or Full-Time National Guard Duty for Operational Support

This section would establish the requirement for an annual congressional authorization of the maximum number of reserve component personnel to be on active duty or full-time national guard duty providing operational support. The committee makes this recommendation to provide a new, comprehensive approach for managing and accounting for reserve component members on active duty in support of operational missions. The section would eliminate the current 180-day strength accounting metric that requires all reservists on active duty beyond that limit to count against active component end strengths. In its place, the section would authorize reserve component members who are voluntarily on active duty to serve for up to three years, or a cumulative three years over a four-year period, before counting against active end strengths. The section would also exempt reserve component personnel authorized by this section from certain officer and enlisted grade limits. The committee believes that such flexibility will encourage the use of volunteers both during normal peacetime operations, as well as during times of national emergency. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to evaluate programs whose reserve component personnel are exempt from counting against any statutory manpower authorizations and report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by June 1, 2005, the Secretary's recommendations

for including these personnel within such statutory manpower authorizations.

## 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, 2005:

| Service | FY 2004 authorized | FY 2005 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Request | Committee recommendation | FY 2005 request | FY 2004 authorized |
| Army National Guard | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Army Reserve | 205,000 | 205,000 | 205,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Naval Reserve | 85,900 | 83,400 | 83,400 | 0 | −2,500 |
| Marine Corps Reserve | 39,600 | 39,600 | 39,600 | 0 | 0 |
| Air National Guard | 107,030 | 106,800 | 106,800 | 0 | −230 |
| Air Force Reserve | 75,800 | 76,100 | 76,100 | 0 | 300 |
| DOD Total | 863,330 | 860,900 | 860,900 | 0 | −2,430 |
| 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, 2005:

| Service | FY 2004 authorized | FY 2005 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Request | Committee recommendation | FY 2005 request | FY 2004 authorized |
| Army National Guard | 25,599 | 26,476 | 26,476 | 0 | 877 |
| Army Reserve | 14,374 | 14,970 | 14,970 | 0 | 596 |
| Naval Reserve | 14,384 | 14,152 | 14,152 | 0 | −232 |
| Marine Corps Reserve | 2,261 | 2,261 | 2,261 | 0 | 0 |
| Air National Guard | 12,191 | 12,225 | 12,225 | 0 | 34 |
| Air Force Reserve | 1,660 | 1,900 | 1,900 | 0 | 240 |
| DOD Total | 70,469 | 71,984 | 71,984 | 0 | 1,515 |

The committee's recommendation would provide for a 2.1 percent growth in the strength of these full-time reservists above the levels authorized in fiscal year 2004.

### 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, 2005:

| Service | FY 2004 authorized (floor) | FY 2005 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Request | Committee recommendation (floor) | FY 2005 request | FY 2004 authorized |
| Army National Guard | 24,589 | 25,076 | 25,076 | 0 | 487 |
| Army Reserve | 6,949 | 7,299 | 7,299 | 0 | 350 |
| Air National Guard | 22,806 | 22,956 | 22,956 | 0 | 150 |

| Service | FY 2004 authorized (floor) | FY 2005 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Request | Committee recommendation (floor) | FY 2005 request | FY 2004 authorized |
| Air Force Reserve | 9,991 | 9,954 | 9,954 | 0 | −37 |
| DOD Total | 64,335 | 65,285 | 65,285 | 0 | 950 |

The committee's recommendation would provide for a 1.5 percent growth in the strength of military technicians above the levels authorized in fiscal year 2004.

### Section 414—Fiscal Year 2005 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, 2005.

## SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

### Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize $1,046.5 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 dollars) |
|---|---|
| 617: Reform Critical Skills Retention Bonuses | 5,000,000 |
| 615: Reform Enlistment and Reenlistment Bonuses | 15,000,000 |
| 616: Revised Foreign Language Proficiency Pay | 2,000,000 |
| 619: Authorize Lateral Skills Training Bonus for Reserves | 3,000,000 |
| 618: Authorize Officer Accession Bonus for Reserves | 5,000,000 |
| 605: Reserve Income Replacement Plan | 60,000,000 |
| 620: Hazardous Duty Incentive Pay Military Firefighters | 9,630,000 |
| 631: Expansion of Travel for Survivors to Attend Burials | 2,000,000 |
| 632: Enhanced Family Member Travel to Visit Wounded | 3,000,000 |
| 551: College First Delayed Enlistment Program | 5,000,000 |
| 526: Continue Loan Repayments Following Commissioning | 1,000,000 |
| 525: Educational Assistance for Officers Commissioned from Military Junior Colleges | 1,500,000 |
| GAO estimate FY 2005 Active Component unexpended funds | −230,000,000 |
| GAO Army Guard Underexecution due to Mobilization | −20,000,000 |
| GAO Naval Reserve Underexecution due to Mobilization | −15,000,000 |
| Army Rotational Travel | −1,500,000 |
| Air Force General Officer Personal Money Allowance | −9,630,000 |

### Section 422—Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $61,195.00 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2005.

# TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

## OVERVIEW

The committee recommends changes in this title to address not only matters of long-term military personnel policy reform, but also present near-term policy and process solutions to issues highlighted as a result of the global war on terrorism. For example, that war

has required the mobilization of hundreds of thousands of reserve component members using an inefficient Cold War-era system that imposed undue stress on reserve component personnel and their families. The committee's recommendations would take substantial steps toward reforming that mobilization process. The committee is also recommending a series of reforms in the management of general and flag officers to permit these highly qualified officers increased opportunity for service in critical positions. To better recognize the service by military personnel in Afghanistan and Iraq, the committee would recommend the establishment of separate service medals. To facilitate recruiting and participation in the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps, the committee recommends several measures to improve access to college and university campuses.

The committee recommendations also include reforms for both joint officer management and joint professional military education. The committee's Report of the Panel on Military Education of the One Hundredth Congress, dated April 21, 1989, laid the foundation for joint officer development. That report, commonly known as the Skelton Report after the panel chairman, Rep. Ike Skelton, was the product of extensive study, and provided the analytical and philosophical foundation upon which to base both joint officer management policies and joint professional military education requirements. Since that time, the results of that study have enabled the Department of Defense to progress from operations in which the effort was to simply deconflict the services in the execution of their separate missions to the point today where recent combat experience demonstrates that the services have generally achieved integration in the execution of joint operations.

Much of what the Skelton Report identified as requirements for joint officer management and joint professional military education clearly remains relevant today. However, the committee also understands that as the nature of warfare evolves so that future operations become more complex and joint at lower levels than before, the framework for developing persons skilled in joint matters must also evolve. Thus, while the committee's recommendations contained in this title are first steps in the construction of that evolving framework, much more analysis is required before any additional changes are enacted.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Civilianization or Contracting Out of Military Chaplain Positions

The committee is disturbed to learn that the military services are considering replacing military chaplains with civilian or contractor personnel. The committee believes that the implementation of such conversions would significantly undermine the ability of the military services to provide not only for the religious needs of uniformed personnel, but also for their families at home and overseas. The work of military chaplains is multifaceted. Regardless of the uniform they wear, chaplains share a common bond with their fellow soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and coast guardsman in the field. Regardless of their religion, they are brothers in arms. Military chaplains provide more than spiritual guidance. They are counselors and confidants to those who have witnessed first hand the horrors of war. Beyond this, military chaplains provide credible

support and guidance to the families enduring the stress of deployments, and they comfort those who mourn the loss of loved ones. For these reasons, the committee does not believe that civilian or contract chaplains could adequately or effectively replace military chaplains. Therefore, the committee urges each of the secretaries of the military services to abstain from implementing any recommendations to civilianize or contract out military chaplain positions.

### Curricula for Post-conflict Resolution

The committee recognizes the important work that Department of Defense educational institutions have done in promoting interagency training for post-conflict operations. The committee recommends that curricula for joint training of military and civilian personnel continue to be developed and that the Department explore the utility of establishing a center for post-conflict reconstruction operations to pursue the following mission: (1) train key interagency personnel in assessment, strategy development, planning and coordination for post- conflict reconstruction; (2) develop and certify a cadre of post-conflict reconstruction experts who could be called to participate in future operations at both the headquarters and field levels; (3) provide pre-deployment training to interagency personnel tapped for specific operations; (4) develop a cadre of rapidly deployable training packages for use in the field; and, (5) conduct after-action reviews of real-world operations to capture lessons learned, best practices and tools and designing mechanisms to feed them back into training and education programs.

### Federal Voting Assistance Program

The committee is very concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) is not fully committed to securing the right to vote for the men and women in uniform serving our nation around the globe. Following the many absentee voting problems experienced by military members during the national election in 2000, Congress included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) that expanded and improved the policies and procedures supporting the DOD-administered Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) and DOD mail systems that carry voting materials between state and local voting officials and the service members.

Reports from the United States General Accounting Office (GAO)(GAO–04–484) and the Inspector General of the Department of Defense (DOD IG)(D–2004–065, March 31, 2005) clearly demonstrate that the Department is not allocating the resources and management attention necessary to make the mail systems and the FVAP operate effectively. The GAO found that many of the problems from the Persian Gulf War of 1991 were repeated during Operation Iraqi Freedom because the United States Central Command's plan for postal service contained flawed assumptions, was not adequately resourced, and was not fully implemented. The DOD IG found that of the voting assistance programs at 10 installations visited, 3 were partially effective and 7 were ineffective. Additionally, 58 percent of the respondents to a questionnaire did not know who their unit voting officer was.

The committee believes that immediate command emphasis is required at all levels to ensure that mail systems are improved and the FVAP is fully implemented in time to protect the voting rights of service members during the national election in November 2004. Accordingly, the Secretary of Defense shall submit report's to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on August 1, 2004 and October 1, 2004 on his actions to ensure that DOD mail systems and the FVAP are operating effectively in support of absentee voting for service members and his perspective regarding the status of military voting on that date.

In addition to improving the military postal system for the purposes of supporting military absentee voters, the committee sees another, equally important, purpose in supporting the morale of our deployed troops and their families. Mail destined for deployed members of the armed forces that is delayed for long periods of time, or not delivered at all, negatively affects the morale of our deployed forces and their families at home. The Department of Defense should improve the military mail systems so that they comply with the Department's own wartime standards for 1st class mail delivery.

### Joint Advertising and Market Research

The committee believes that the Department of Defense 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 Department'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 could soon be challenged by a range of factors. For that reason, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to the budget request for the Department's joint advertising and market research effort.

### Meeting Department of Defense Requirements for Personnel with Foreign Language and Regional Expertise

The committee notes that recent operational requirements with Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, as well as the global war on terrorism, place more emphasis on the need for foreign language and regional expertise among military personnel. The committee is concerned that the education and training provided to officers both before commissioning and throughout their careers may not adequately prepare military leaders with the skills needed for these and similar future operations. The committee is also interested in the degree to which officers with regional expertise and language ability are promoted and utilized within the force. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of these matters, including current practices for education and training in language and regional studies, numbers who are so trained, types of languages and areas studied, and comparative promotion rates. The study should also provide recommendations for the enhancement of language and regional stud-

ies within the officer population. The committee directs the Secretary to submit this report by March 31, 2005 to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

The committee is also aware of the Department's efforts to transform its overall capability in foreign language and regional expertise. However, given the variety of required languages and extensive number of locations where DOD military and civilian personnel are operating and may operate, as well as the importance of these language and regional capabilities to overall defense strategy, this transformation will require a robust and sustained effort. The committee therefore directs the Secretary to establish a Defense Language Office within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to ensure a strategic focus on meeting present and future requirements for language and regional expertise among military personnel and civilian employees of the Department. This office should establish and oversee policy regarding the development, management, and utilization of civilian employees as well as members of the armed forces; monitor the promotion, accession and retention of individuals with these critical skills; explore innovative concepts to expand capabilities; and establish policies to identify, track, and maximize the use to meet requirements for language and regional expertise.

### National Program for Citizen Soldier Support

The committee believes that the increasing reliance on the National Guard and reserves that has occurred during the global war on terrorism requires the Secretary of Defense to take extraordinary measures to ensure that there is an effective support structure for reserve component personnel, their families and employers. The committee commends the Secretary for the broad efforts already underway to provide such support. The committee believes that the effectiveness of these support efforts could be enhanced and refined by incorporating the capabilities of university and community based organizations. The committee understands that the North Carolina based National Program for Citizen-Soldier Support is developing a comprehensive program that could prove useful to the Department of Defense in extending the reach and effectiveness of existing military-sponsored support agencies. The committee directs the Secretary to closely examine the National Program for Citizen-Soldier Support and others like it to determine how they might be integrated into the Department's ongoing efforts.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER MATTERS

#### Section 501—Length of Service for Service Chiefs

This section would authorize the President to extend the term of an officer serving as the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or the Commandant of the Marine Corps for a period of up to two-years beyond the initial four-year appointment. In time of war or national emergency, the President would be able to extend the term of office for such additional periods as the President determines necessary.

However, the section would limit the total period of an officer's term as a service chief to eight years under any circumstance. Under current law, the chief of a military service is appointed for a four-year term and may only be reappointed during wartime or national emergency for up to four additional years.

Section 502—Repeal of Requirement that Deputy Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs of Naval Operations Be Selected from Officers in the Line of the Navy

This section would require that candidates for selection as deputy chiefs and assistant chiefs of naval operations be chosen from the officers of the Navy on active duty. Current law specifies that candidates for deputy chiefs and assistant chiefs of naval operations be chosen only from among officers in the line of the Navy on active duty.

Section 503—Increase in Age Limit for Deferral of Mandatory Retirement for Up to 10 Senior General and Flag Officers

This section would increase from 64 to 66 the mandatory retirement age for senior general and flag officers whom the President had previously retained on active duty beyond the statutory limits on either time in grade or age. Under current law, not more than ten deferments of the mandatory retirement of three- and four-star general and flag officers may be in effect at any one time.

Section 504—Increased Flexibility for Voluntary Retirement for Military Officers

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments greater flexibility in determining the grade in which active duty and reserve officers may be retired. Specifically, the section would:

(1) Require officers serving in grades above colonel, or captain in the Navy, to serve a minimum of one year time-in-grade before being allowed to retire in that grade;

(2) Replace the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to notify Congress that officers have performed satisfactorily in grades above major general, or rear admiral (upper half) in the Navy, before being allowed to retire in those grades with an authority for the secretary of the military department concerned to approve retirement of officers in those grades with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense.

Section 505—Repeal of Requirement that No More than 50 Percent of Active Duty General and Flag Officers be in Grades Above Brigadier General and Rear Admiral (Lower Half)

This section would repeal the limitation that no more than 50 percent of general and flag officers in a military service on active duty can be in grades above one-star, that is above brigadier general and rear admiral (lower half). There is no explicit statutory limitation on the numbers of two-star general and flag officers on active duty, and this section would not change either the total numbers of general or flag officers allowed on active duty or the statutory limits on the numbers of general and flag officers serving

on active duty in three- and four-star grades. Therefore, the effect of the proposed repeal would be to permit each of the military services some additional flexibility in managing the distribution of one- and two-star general and flag officers.

Section 506—Revision to Terms for Assistants to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for National Guard and Reserve Matters

The section would authorize the assistants to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for national guard and reserve matters to serve an initial term of four years. Under current law, the initial term is two years.

Section 507—Succession for Position of Chief, National Guard Bureau

This section would establish a chain of succession when there is a vacancy in the office of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or in the event that the chief is unable to perform the duties of the office. In such cases, the most senior ranking officer of the Army National Guard or of the Air National Guard on duty with the National Guard Bureau would serve as acting chief.

Section 508—Title of Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau Changed to Director of the Joint Staff of the National Guard Bureau

This section would change the title of the Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau to better reflect the duties of the position now that the staff of the National Guard Bureau has been reorganized as a joint organization.

Section 509—Two-Year Extension of Authority to Waive Requirement that Reserve Chiefs and National Guard Directors Have Significant Joint Duty Experience

This section would extend for two years, until December 31, 2006, the authority of the Secretary of Defense to waive the requirement that the chiefs of the reserves and the directors of the Army and Air National Guard must have significant joint duty experience to be eligible for appointment.

The requirement for officers to have significant joint duty experience as a condition of service in these most senior of reserve component general and flag officer positions was established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). In recognition of the challenge that reserve component officers face in getting joint duty experience, the public law provided the Secretary temporary three-year authority to waive the requirement. That waiver authority was extended in 2000, with the expectation that the Department and the military services would make a concerted effort to develop a system for ensuring reserve officers obtained the requisite joint experience. The committee, therefore, was disappointed when the budget request for fiscal year 2005 sought to make permanent the Secretary's waiver authority.

The committee believes that a concerted effort must be made to develop a system to provide significant joint duty experience to those officers who will be candidates for the senior military leader-

ship positions of the reserve components. For that reason, this section would also require that the Secretary develop a plan to ensure that officers selected after December 31, 2006, to be the chiefs of the reserves and the directors of the Army and Air National Guard, have significant joint duty experience.

### Section 510—Repeal of Distribution Requirements for Naval Reserve Flag Officers

This section would repeal the prescribed distribution of the 48 flag officers authorized for the Naval Reserve, thereby permitting greater flexibility for the Department of the Navy to adapt its reserve flag officer inventory to meet current requirements. Current law mandates the allocation of these flag officers among the line, Medical Department Staff Corps, Chaplain Corps and Judge Advocate General's Corps.

## SUBTITLE B—OTHER OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY MATTERS

### Section 511—Transition of the Active-Duty List Officer Force to All Regular Status

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to commission all new officer accessions as regular officers and transition all officers on the active-duty list to regular status.

### Section 512—Mandatory Retention on Active duty to Qualify for Retired Pay

This section would clarify that section 12686 of title 10, United States Code, does not require that reservists serving on active duty with over 18 years of reserve service be retained on active duty for the purpose of qualifying the member for reserve retirement.

### Section 513—Distribution in Grade of Marine Corps Reserve Officers in an Active Status in Grades Below Brigadier General

This section would correct a technical discrepancy in the grade table for the Marine Corps Reserve that has inappropriately limited the number of officers authorized in each grade below brigadier general.

### Section 514—Tuition Assistance for Officers

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to waive for reserve component officers the two-year active duty service obligation required as a condition for receipt of tuition assistance while on active duty. This section would also repeal the limit on the amount of tuition assistance that the Secretary of the Army was authorized to pay officers of the selected reserve who are pursuing a baccalaureate degree. At present, the Secretary is limited to paying for such officers not more than 75 percent of the charges of an educational institution.

## SUBTITLE C—RESERVE COMPONENT MATTERS

### Section 521—Revision to Statutory Purpose of the Reserve Components

This section would clarify that the purpose of the reserve components is to provide trained units and qualified persons not just as the result of involuntary mobilizations but whenever more units and persons are needed than are in the active components. The revision recommended by this section more accurately reflects recent and future employment of the reserve components.

### Section 522—Improved Access to Reserve Component Members for Enhanced Training

This section would authorize units and members of the reserve components to be involuntarily mobilized for the purposes of training. Current law prohibits mobilizations for training, reflecting a Cold War construct that assumed, in the face of predictable threats, that there would be an extended period available for training reserve units and individuals prior to deployment. The global war on terrorism has pointed out the need to repeal the prohibition in order to increase the readiness of the reserve component units, shorten time between mobilization and deployment and provide for a more orderly, predictable and effective mobilization process that reduces stress on individuals, families and employers. To that end, the section would authorize units and individuals to be ordered to active duty to conduct required training. However, the section would require that the time spent in such training be counted against the mobilization time limits that are established in law.

### Section 523—Status Under Disability Retirement System for Reserve Members Released from Active Duty Due to Inability to Perform within 30 Days of Call to Active Duty

This section would clarify that mobilized reserve members may be separated when they are identified within 30 days as being unable to serve the full period for which they were mobilized due to preexisting medical conditions that were not aggravated while on active duty. Such member would be considered as serving under an order to active duty for a period of 30 days or less.

### Section 524—Federal Civil Service Military Leave for Reserve and National Guard Civilian Technicians

This section would eliminate the restriction on the use of military leave specified in section 6323 of title 5, United States Code, during a war or national emergency declared by the President and would authorize reserve component members who are federal employees to participate in a leave status in operations outside the United States.

### Section 525—Expanded Educational Assistance Authority for Officers Commissioned Through ROTC Program at Military Junior College

This section would allow commissioned officers who graduate from a military junior college to receive additional financial assist-

ance to complete their baccalaureate degree requirements. Individuals who participate in this program would be attached to a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit in order to ensure that they maintain their military training, bearing and education as they complete their post-secondary education.

Section 526—Effect of Appointment or Commission as Officer on Eligibility for Selected Reserve Education Loan Repayment Program for Enlisted Members

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to continue to repay educational loans for enlisted members in a reserve component after they are commissioned as officers if the members continue to serve the period specified in the original loan repayment agreement.

Section 527—Number of Starbase Academies in a State

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense, based on criteria he would prescribe, to permit a state to have more than two Starbase academies.

Section 528—Comptroller General Assessment of Integration of Active and Reserve Components of the Navy

This section would require the Comptroller General to review the Navy's implementation plans for the integration of the service's active and reserve components. The Comptroller General shall submit a report of the results of that assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2005.

Section 529—Operational Activities Conducted by the National Guard Under Authority of Title 32

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide funds to the governor of a state to employ national guard units and personnel to conduct operational activities that the Secretary determines to be in the national interest. This section would also establish a process by which the governor of a state may request funding from the Secretary for the operational activities of that state's national guard. The committee makes these recommendations in order to provide the Secretary with clear authority to more effectively incorporate national guard units and personnel into the planning and implementation of homeland security and other operational missions.

Section 530—Army Program for Assignment of Active Component Advisers to Units of the Selected Reserve

This section would reduce from 5,000 to 3,500 the minimum number of Army active component advisers that are required to be assigned to support the training and readiness of selected reserve units of the Army. The committee understands that the Chief of Staff of the Army requested this reduction in order to provide active component officers and non- commissioned officers as cadre for the new brigade units of action that the Army is creating. The committee supports that initiative. However, the committee is con-

cerned that such a reduction of active component support could have both short- and long-term negative effects on the training and readiness of combat and key support elements of the Army reserve components. The committee is also concerned that the Army has neither fully assessed those effects, nor developed a plan to address them. For that reason, this section would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from making any reductions in the numbers of active component advisors until the Secretary reports to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, by March 31, 2005, on the impact of the reduction and his plan to remediate any negative impact on training and readiness.

## SUBTITLE D—JOINT OFFICER MANAGEMENT

### Section 531—Strategic Plan to Link Joint Officer Development to Overall Missions and Goals of Department Of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, with the advice of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to develop a strategic plan linking future requirements for military personnel trained and educated in joint matters to the resources required to develop those persons, in terms of manpower, formal education and practical experience and other requirements. Additionally, the strategic plan would identify the method or methods the Secretary will use to fulfill those requirements.

Over the past several years, the committee has received multiple proposals from the Department of Defense to change significant aspects of joint officer management and joint military professional education enacted as a result of the Report of the Panel on Military Education from the One Hundredth Congress. The committee has consistently rejected these proposals because they were not offered in a coherent, comprehensive context—a context that presented the Department's overall vision for joint management and education. The strategic plan required by this section would provide the framework within which to consider what, if any, future changes to joint officer management and joint professional military education, are required.

The strategic plan would consist of two phases. Phase I would focus on what has been traditionally referred to as "joint officers." This section would require the Secretary to submit phase I of the strategic plan to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2006. However, the committee believes that the requirement for persons trained and educated in joint matters is not confined to just the active component officer ranks. Therefore, phase II would address the roles that reserve component officers, non-commissioned officers, and civilians play in future joint matters, identify the resources required to develop them, and clarify the methods used by the Department as they integrate and manage persons trained and educated in joint matters. The section would require the Secretary to submit a report of his proposal for phase II to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2007.

### Section 532—Joint Requirements for Promotion to Flag or General Officer Grade

This section would extend from September 30, 2007, to September 30, 2008, the date after which an officer must be selected for the joint specialty before promotion to the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half). The committee is aware of the difficulties some services may have in meeting this requirement but believes with close management each service will be able to comply with the extended implementation date. Furthermore, the committee believes that secretaries of the military departments must be more proactive in properly managing officers early in their careers to ensure that they receive the opportunities for joint professional military education at points that align them properly for consideration for promotion, without the use of waivers, to grades that have a joint education or service requirement.

This section would also eliminate the requirement that an officer serve in a joint assignment at least 180 days prior to the convening of a promotion board for appointment to the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half).

### Section 533—Clarification of Tours of Duty Qualifying as a Joint Duty Assignment

This section would modify the definition regarding the term "tour of duty" to allow officers to continue accumulating joint credit if they serve consecutive joint duty assignments, even if those assignments are not within the same organization.

### Section 534—Reserve Joint Special Officer Qualifications

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to award the joint specialty officer designation to reserve officers who have met the prescribed requirements for such designation. The section would also require that reserve officers be included in Department of Defense management policies, procedures and practices for joint specialty officers.

This section would exclude reserve officers who have or have been nominated for the joint specialty from being counted for against the joint officer promotion policy objectives.

## SUBTITLE E—PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION

### Section 541—Improvement to Professional Military Education in the Department of Defense

This section would establish a chapter in title 10, United States Code, that combines new and existing sections of law related to professional military education. This new title contains eight sections, sections 2151 through 2158. Section 2151 would define the terms "joint professional military education," "intermediate level service schools," and "senior level service schools". Section 2152, 2153 and 2154 would modify slightly and codify the Statement of Congressional Policy related to professional military education contained in section 1123 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (P.L. 101–189; 103 Stat. 1556). The committee believes these provisions have a permanence and con-

tinuing importance that warrant codification. Section 2155 would require that the secretaries of the military departments use a written examination as a portion of the evaluation criteria in selecting officers for full-time attendance at intermediate level service colleges. This section would also provide that an officer selected by his service to attend an intermediate level service college would be eligible for attendance at all intermediate level service colleges. It is not the committee's intent to standardize school selection criteria across the services but to encourage the introduction of intellectual rigor in that selection process. Selection criteria based solely on a junior officer's record of duty performance at the tactical level in a single service environment or simply as a random result of the service assignment process is not a sufficient basis to identify those officers who have the best potential to grasp the complex intellectual concepts of joint matters and to ultimately excel in a joint operational environment. Additionally, the committee believes that one of the fundamental pillars of joint professional military education is an officer's personal continuing education program when not assigned to a formal school environment. The committee believes that a written entrance examination requirement for matriculation at the intermediate level service schools would provide a focus for such a continuing education program so that officers will prepare themselves for further formal education, well in advance of the actual school selection process. Section 2156 would require that after September 30, 2009, an officer must have completed joint professional military education phase I before attending phase II. This section would also prescribe phase II curriculum. Additionally, it would prescribe student and faculty ratios when phase II is taught at a senior level service school. It is the committee's intent to preserve the unique character of each of the senior level service schools while providing a mix of services represented in the student bodies and faculty that enables the cross-service acculturation that is such a key component of joint officer education. The committee understands that current Department of Defense policy sets the ratios of military department representation in the student bodies and faculty at the Joint Forces Staff College and the Colleges of the National Defense University at approximately 30 percent for each military department. The committee believes this ratio is appropriate at those institutions and should not change. Section 2157 would require that the length of the principal course of instruction at each intermediate and senior level service school be not less than 10 months, and provide the Secretary of Defense with a waiver for that requirement. The section would also require that the length of the principal course of instruction at the Joint Force Staff College, which is now required to be 12 weeks, can not be less than 10 weeks. Section 2158 would require that the Secretary include in his annual report to Congress the number of officers who have received joint professional military education phase II, but who were not selected for promotion. This section would also require the Secretary to report the number of officer students and faculty assigned from each service to a joint professional military educational institution. Finally, this would make conforming adjustments in the existing law.

### Section 542—Ribbons to Recognize Completion of Joint Professional Military Education

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to award a military decoration to persons who have successfully completed joint professional military education phase I and to subsequently award a device to affix to that ribbon when a person has successfully completed joint professional military education phase II. These awards would be retroactive for any person who has completed either phase I or phase II since the sequenced approach to joint professional military education was enacted in 1989.

The committee considers joint professional military education to be a vital contributing aspect to the excellence the Department of Defense has historically demonstrated. This education becomes even more important as the nature of modern warfare becomes more complex. The committee believes that an officer becomes fully competent in joint matters when joint professional military education is appropriately combined with practical joint operational experience. Officers who complete certain routine operational assignments are awarded service ribbons to signify successful completion of that assignment. With the establishment of this decoration, the status of completion of joint professional military education would be elevated to a level on par with those operational assignments.

### Section 543—Increase in Number of Private-Sector Civilians Who May Be Enrolled for Instruction at National Defense University

This section would increase the maximum number of eligible private sector employees who work in organizations relevant to national security to receive instruction at the National Defense University from 10 to 20.

### Section 544—Requirement for Completion of Phase I Joint Professional Military Education before Promotion to Colonel or Navy Captain

This section would require, with certain exceptions, that after September 30, 2007, officers on the active duty list complete joint professional military education phase I or phase II prior to being appointed to the grade of colonel or Navy captain.

## SUBTITLE F—OTHER EDUCATION AND TRAINING MATTERS

### Section 551—College First Delayed Enlistment Program

This section would permanently authorize the College First demonstration project originally authorized for the Army in section 573 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) and would extend the authority to implement the program to all the secretaries of the military departments. Under the College First program, entry on active duty for new recruits would be delayed for up to 30 months to allow the recruits the opportunity to pursue higher education, vocational, or technical training courses. During the delayed entry period, the recruits would be paid a subsistence allowance and the secretaries would have the option to pay an additional stipend that may not exceed $225.

Section 552—Standardization of Authority to Confer Degrees on Graduates of Community College of the Air Force with Authority for Other Schools of Air University

This section would shift the authority for conferring associate degrees on graduates of the Community College of the Air Force from the commander of the Air Education and Training Command to the commander of Air University. Such a shift would ensure that only the commander of Air University is responsible for conferring all degrees, thus addressing a concern that arose during the accreditation of Air University programs.

Section 553—Change in Titles of Heads of the Naval Postgraduate School

This section would change the title of the head of the Naval Postgraduate School from Superintendent of the Naval Postgraduate School to President of the Naval Postgraduate School. The section would also establish a new civilian position of Provost and Academic Dean, and revise the procedures to fill the position.

Section 554—Increase from Two Years to Three Years in Period for which Educational Leave of Absence May Be Authorized

This section would expand the authority for service members to take educational leave from two years to three years.

Section 555—Correction to Disparate Treatment of Disabilities Sustained During Accession Training

This section would provide the capability to effectively respond to injury and illness sustained during accession training by authorizing military academy cadets and midshipmen to be disability retired and Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets and midshipmen to receive medical and dental care appropriate for the treatment of the injury, illness, or disease incurred until the disability cannot be materially improved.

Section 556—Prayer at Military Service Academy Activities

This section would authorize the superintendent of a service academy to establish a policy with respect to the offering of a voluntary, nondenominational prayer at an authorized activity of the academy.

Section 557—Revision to Conditions on Service of Officers as Service Academy Superintendents

This section would repeal the requirement that the superintendents of the military service academies retire upon completion of their assignments. The committee makes this recommendation to permit the secretaries of the military departments flexibility with regard to future utilization of talented senior officers. However, the committee is concerned that tenure of officers assigned as superintendents be of sufficient length to permit those officers to make significant contributions in the oversight and management of these premier educational institutions. Therefore, this section would require that an officer serve at least a three-year tour as super-

intendent, and that if the officer is reassigned before that period, then the secretary of the military department concerned would be required to notify the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services of the reasons for the curtailed assignment.

### Section 558—Codification of Prohibition on Imposition of Certain Charges and Fees at Service Academies

This section would add to title 10 of the United States Code, a provision of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337). That provision prohibited the imposition of charges for tuition, room or board at the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, the United States Coast Guard Academy, and the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

### Section 559—Qualifications of the Dean of the Faculty of United States Air Force Academy

This section would require that a person selected to be the dean of faculty at the Air Force Academy, who is not an officer on active duty, must be either a retired or former officer of the armed forces. Furthermore, the section would prohibit the appointment or assignment of a person to be the dean of faculty unless that person held the highest academic degree in that person's academic field.

## SUBTITLE G—MEDALS AND DECORATIONS AND SPECIAL PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

### Section 561—Separate Military Campaign Medals to Recognize Service in Operation Enduring Freedom and Service in Operation Iraqi Freedom

This section would require the President to establish separate campaign medals to recognize the service of members during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

### Section 562—Eligibility of All Uniformed Services Personnel for National Defense Service Medal

This section would require the President to authorize the award of the National Defense Service Medal to members of the uniformed services.

### Section 563—Authority to Appoint Brigadier General Charles E. Yeager, United States Air Force (retired), to the Grade of Major General on the Retired List

This section would authorize the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Brigadier General Charles E. Yeager to the grade of major general on the retired list of the Air Force.

### Section 564—Posthumous Commission of William Mitchell in the Grade of Major General in the Army

This section would authorize the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to issue a posthumous commission

as major general, United States Army, in the name of the late William Mitchell, formerly a colonel, United States Army, who resigned his commission on February 1, 1925.

## SUBTITLE H—MILITARY JUSTICE MATTERS

### Section 571—Review on How Sexual Offenses Are Covered by Uniformed Code of Military Justice

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a proposal for changes regarding sexual offenses in the Uniformed Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) and the rationale for the changes to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2005. Recent congressional and Department of Defense focus on the problem of sexual assault in the military services suggest that it is necessary to examine how sexual offenses are treated in the UCMJ, primarily Article 120. Congress strongly encourages the Department to closely align the statutory language of sexual assault law under the UCMJ with federal law under sections 2241 through 2247 of title 18, United States Code.

### Section 572—Service Time Not Lost When Confined in Connection with Trial if Confinement Excused as Unavoidable

This section would require the military departments to waive lost time when a service member is acquitted or released without trial, or has his conviction set-aside on legal grounds (as distinguished from clemency) or reversed based upon appeal. Existing law does not give the military departments any discretion to consider a service member's confinement if the member is acquitted or if there is another resolution of the case favorable to the member qualifying for service credit. Existing law requires service members to make up time lost for any period of confinement by civilian or military authorities.

### Section 573—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.

## SUBTITLE I—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT MATTERS

### Section 581—Three-Year Extension of Limitation on Reductions of Personnel of Agencies Responsible for Review and Correction of Military Records

This section would extend through September 30, 2008, the prohibition precluding the secretaries of the military departments from reducing the number of military and civilian personnel assigned to duty within the boards until 90 days after the secretary of the military department concerned submits a report that describes the proposed reduction, provides the rationale for the reduc-

tion, and specifies the number of personnel that will be assigned to the board after the reduction is complete.

### Section 582—Staffing and Funding for Defense Prisoner of War/ Missing Personnel Office

This section would establish specific permanent minimum levels of military and civil personnel assigned to the Defense Prisoner of War Missing Personnel Office (DPMO). It would also require, should the actual assigned strength drop below the minimum levels, that the Secretary of Defense report publicly to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services his plan to restore the manning levels to at least the required minimums. The committee believes such action is necessary because the DPMO, which performs a critical range of missions for the nation and the missing personnel of past and future wars, has not had the full support of the Department of Defense with regard to the adequacy of DPMO manning or funding. For example, the September 2001 committee report on H.R. 2586 (H. Rept. 107–194), noting that DPMO manning had been reduced by 40 percent since its creation, directed the Secretary to increase DPMO resources in the fiscal year 2003 budget request. When the Secretary did not heed that direction and the committee learned that the Department was considering a further personnel reduction of 15 percent, committee action in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) led to the enactment of a prohibition any reduction of DPMO funding and personnel below the levels requested in the 2003 budget. Notwithstanding this statutory prohibition, the department's fiscal year 2005 budget request for DPMO proposed a 59 percent reduction in military spaces (from 46 to 19) and the repeal of the minimum funding requirement. The committee urges the Secretary to end any further efforts to reduce manning and resources in DPMO and to commit the department to ensuring that the DPMO is fully able to carry out the entire range of missions assigned to it.

### Section 583—Permanent ID Cards for Retiree Dependents Age 70 and Older

This section would require the service secretaries concerned to issue permanent identification cards to dependents of military retirees and survivors of military retirees eligible for benefits for periods after the dependent or survivor attains age 70.

### Section 584—Authority to Provide Civilian Clothing to Members Traveling in Connection with Medical Evacuation

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to furnish members who have been medically evacuated civilian clothing at a cost not exceed $250 or to reimburse the member for the purchase of civilian clothing in an amount not to exceed $250.

Section 585—Authority to Accept Donation of Frequent Flyer Miles, Credits, and Tickets to Facilitate Rest and Recuperation Travel of Deployed Members of the Armed Forces and Their Families

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to accept the donation of frequent flyer miles, credits, and tickets for the purpose of facilitating the travel of members of the armed forces who are deployed away from their permanent duty station and are granted, during such deployment, rest and recuperation leave and certain other forms of leave and the travel of family members to be reunited with such a member.

Section 586—Limitation on Amendment or Cancellation of Department of Defense Directive Relating to Reasonable Access to Military Installations for Certain Personal Commercial Solicitation

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from canceling or amending Department of Defense (DOD) directive 1344.7, Personal Commercial Solicitation on DOD Installations, for a period of one year after the United States General Accounting Office reports to Congress on the findings of an ongoing review of the financial allotment system and the treatment of insurance agents by military finance offices and local managers and commanders on DOD installations.

Section 587—Annual Identification of Reasons for Discharges from the Armed Services During Preceding Fiscal Years

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to report annually to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services detailed information regarding of the numbers of persons discharged from each of the military services in the preceding fiscal year. Information required to be included in the report would include the numbers and types of discharges, as well as the identification of the occupational specialties and reenlistment eligibility of discharged service members.

Section 588—Authority for Federal Recognition of National Guard Commissioned Officers Appointed from Former Coast Guard Personnel

This section would make current and former officers and enlisted members of the Coast Guard, as well graduates of the United States Coast Guard Academy, eligible for federal recognition after becoming commissioned officers of the national guard.

Section 589—Study of Blended Wing Concept for the Air Force

This section would required the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report on matters related to that service's current implementation of and future plans for blended wings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2005. Blended wings are operational units whose membership is comprised of personnel from more than one component—active, national guard, or reserve. The report would also require the Secretary to provide the criteria used to determine what units become blended units.

Section 590—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 Department of Education to certain local educational agencies heavily impacted by dependents of military personnel. The adjustment, limited to school year 2004–2005, 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 J—OTHER MATTERS

Section 591—Employment Preferences for Spouses of Certain Department of Defense Civilian Employees Subject to Relocation Agreements

This section would expand the employment preference for spouses of Department of Defense (DOD) civilian employees who have been assigned under a mandatory mobility agreement or similar mandatory mobility program. The employment preference would include DOD appropriated and nonappropriated fund civilian positions. This authority would place spouses of civilian employees in an equivalent position to spouses of military members who already receive employment preferences.

Section 592—Repeal of Requirement to Conduct Electronic Voting Demonstration Project for the Federal Election to be Held in November 2004

This section would repeal the requirement in section 1604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) for the Secretary of Defense to conduct a demonstration project to permit absentee uniformed service voters to cast their ballots through an electronic voting system. The committee regrets that the Deputy Secretary of Defense believed he had no option but to terminate the electronic voting demonstration project, but the committee understands that the decision was necessary to avoid any risk that the demonstration project would threaten the integrity of the election process.

Section 593—Examination of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces by the Defense Task Force Established to Examine Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to expand the mission of the Task Force on Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies that was established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). Under the name of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services, the task force would examine matters related to sexual assault in the military. This section would re-

quire that the task force report findings and recommendations to the Secretary of Defense, and the secretaries of the military departments within 12 months of the initial meeting of the task force. Within 90 days of receiving the task force report, the Secretary of Defense would be required to provide the report, together with his evaluation of the report, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. At the same time, the Secretary of Defense would also be required to provide to those committees an assessment of the effectiveness of the corrective actions being taken by the Department of Defense and military services as a result of various investigations and reviews into matters involving sexual assault.

Section 594—Renewal of Pilot Program for Treating GED and Home School Diploma Recipients as High School Graduates for Determinations of Eligibility for Enlistment

This section would reestablish the pilot program originally authorized by section 571 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261). The program would permit participants in a National Guard Youth Challenge Program who receive a general education development certificate and those who complete their high school requirements through a home schooling program to enlist in the armed forces as if they had received a high school diploma.

Section 595—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. The committee makes this recommendation in connection with it continuing strong support of the need to help local school districts with significant concentrations of military students.

Section 596—Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Recruiter Access at Institutions of Higher Education

This section would require that military recruiters be given access to campuses and students at institutions of higher education that is at least equal in quality and scope to the access provided to any other employer. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to obtain an annual verification from colleges and universities who already support the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program that they will continue to do so in the upcoming academic year. The section would also add two additional defense-related funding sources, the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Nuclear Security Administration of the Department of Energy, and would restore the funds of the Department of Transportation to the list of covered funds that potentially could be terminated if an institution is determined to prevent recruiter access or maintains anti-ROTC policies.

### Section 597—Reports on Transformation Milestones

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a number of reports to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on different aspects of transformational efforts underway in the Department. One report would provide information on the efforts to convert military to civilian positions, and a series of annual reports in fiscal years 2005 through 2007 would provide information on the conversion of military positions to other higher priority military positions. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to examine the feasibility of implementing: (1) a system to embed within the military on a temporary basis persons with civilian skills that are of high value to the military, and (2) a personnel system that expands the capability of the armed forces to rapidly access, from other than the reserve components, civilian volunteers with skills needed by the armed forces. Finally, the section would also require the Secretary of the Army to report annually on the status of efforts to transform the Army from a division-oriented system to a brigade oriented one.

# TITLE VI—COMPENSATIONS AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

## OVERVIEW

The committee continues to support the strong and flexible compensation and benefit programs needed to recruit and retain a quality force in a wartime environment. Accordingly, the committee recommends authorization of an enhanced across-the-board pay raise of 3.5 percent, restructured compensation programs for reserve forces to ensure equity with active duty members, and continued emphasis on pay and allowances for the warfighters.

The committee remains committed to protecting military exchange and commissary benefits. Accordingly, the committee would include a series of provisions to define and expand the commissary benefit and protect military communities from unnecessary store closures.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Combat-Related Special Compensation

The committee continues to receive complaints from combat-disabled retirees and the organizations representing them that the processing time for Combat-Related Special Compensation applications is excessive. The committee is aware that the expanded criteria enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) are now generating thousands of additional applicants that will increase demands on the processing systems.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to examine the processing systems used by the military departments and consider methods for expediting the time required to review applications. The committee suggests that the Secretary consider consolidating the organizations currently evaluating applications into a

more efficient central processing organization with increased personnel and fiscal resources.

### Commissary Funding After Closure of a Store

The committee remains committed to preserving the commissary benefit for military members and their families and improving services whenever possible. Accordingly, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to ensure that funding made available as a result of the closure of a commissary, whether closed as a result of a base realignment or closure action or other cause, be reallocated to the Defense Commissary Agency to support improved commissary operations at other locations.

### Consolidation of the Military Exchanges

The committee remains concerned that the ongoing effort to evaluate the utility of consolidating the military exchanges is ill-advised and, if not managed carefully, will cause an erosion of the exchange benefit. The committee considers the military exchanges an important quality of life benefit that is pivotal to the welfare of military communities around the world. The committee understands that the cost of consolidation will likely exceed $300.0 million and that prior consolidation studies have concluded that such costs present too great a risk to the dividend paid by the exchanges to morale, welfare and recreation programs.

Accordingly, the committee insists that any proposal to consolidate military exchanges include a strong business case that resolves all concerns about the fiscal implications of consolidation. The committee intends to reject any proposal that does not include a strong business case.

The committee is also concerned about reports that the perspectives of all the stakeholders are not being fully considered during the evaluation process. The committee would view the failure of the Unified Exchange Task Force to consider the views and concerns of all participants as a major flaw that will taint any proposal.

### Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida, Combined Commissary and Exchange Store

The committee is concerned that the Secretary of Defense continues to consider the closure of the combined commissary and exchange store at Homestead Air Reserve Base (ARB), Florida. The committee believes that closing the store would be a significant loss to the service members, retirees, and their families that reside in the Homestead ARB military community and throughout southern Florida. The committee is aware that there are force structure changes being considered for Homestead ARB that would significantly change the patron population that would use the store. The committee strongly encourages the Secretary to delay the decision to close the store until such time as any potential increase in the military population at Homestead ARB can be confirmed and measured. Assuming that current force projections are fulfilled, the committee also recommends that the Secretary consider opening a full service commissary at Homestead ARB as soon as the active duty population at the base increases beyond the minimum standard required under Department of Defense policy.

# LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

### Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 2005

This section would increase basic pay for members of the armed forces by 3.5 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 5.5 percent to 5.1 percent.

### Section 602—Authority to Provide Family Separation Basic Allowance for Housing

The section would authorize the service secretary concerned the discretion to decline to pay family separation housing allowances when the member's circumstances do not justify such payments.

### Section 603—Geographic Basis for Basic Allowance for Housing during Short Changes of Station for Professional Military Education or Training

This section would authorize service members who attend professional military education or training lasting 12 months or less to elect to leave their families at their previous duty station and receive basic allowance for housing based on the area where their dependents reside.

### Section 604——Immediate Lump-Sum Reimbursement for Unusual Nonrecurring Expenses Incurred by Members Serving Outside Continental United States

This section would authorize the service secretary concerned to pay service members serving outside the continental United States for certain unusual nonrecurring expenses.

### Section 605—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 12 continuous months of service on active duty or 18 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.

### Section 606—Authority for Certain Members Deployed in Combat Zones to Receive Limited Advances on Their Future Base Pay

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to pay service members assigned to locations where they would receive imminent danger pay for 12 or more months up to 3 months of basic pay in advance upon the request of the member.

## SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

### Section 611—One-Year Extension of Bonus and Special Pay Authorities

This section would extend the authority for the following bonus and special pay authorities to December 31, 2005:

(1) Nurse officer candidate accession program;
(2) Aviation officer retention bonus;
(3) Accession bonus for registered nurses;
(4) Incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists;
(5) Accession bonus for dental officers;
(6) Accession bonus for pharmacy officers;
(7) Reenlistment bonus for active and reserve members;
(8) Enlistment bonus for active and reserve members;
(9) Special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending the period of active service;
(10) Nuclear career accession bonus;
(11) Nuclear career annual incentive bonus;
(12) Retention bonus for members with critical skills or other criteria; and
(13) Accession or affiliation bonus for new officers in critical skills.

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, 2006.

### Section 612—Reduction in Required Service Commitment to Receive Accession Bonus for Registered Nurses

This section would reduce the service commitment required for the nurse accession bonus from four to three years of service.

### Section 613—Increase in Maximum Monthly Rate Authorized for Hardship Duty Pay

This section would increase the maximum amount of hardship duty pay payable from $300 to $750 per month. The committee believes this increase provides the Secretary of Defense needed flexibility to ensure that service members receive appropriate compensation regardless of where they are required to serve during the global war on terrorism.

### Section 614—Termination of Assignment Incentive Pay for Members Placed on Terminal Leave

This section would require termination of assignment incentive pay when the member is placed on terminal leave and will not be returning to the assignment location.

### Section 615—Consolidation of Reenlistment and Enlistment Bonus Authorities for Regular and Reserve Components

This section would allow reserve component members to be paid enlistment and reenlistment bonuses using the same authority used to pay active duty members. The provision would also extend eligibility for the reenlistment bonus through 17 years of service and grant the flexibility to use the reenlistment bonus during war and national emergency to address unit specific retention problems without regard to critical skill eligibility requirements. The committee intends that this authority be used to pay a bonus to former members of the armed forces to reenlist for service in a reserve component.

### Section 616—Revision of Authority to Provide Foreign Language Proficiency Pay

This section would authorize the service secretary concerned to pay an annual bonus of up to $12,000 to members of the uniformed services who maintain proficiency in a foreign language.

### Section 617—Eligibility of Reserve Component Members for Critical Skills Retention Bonus and Expansion of Authority to Provide Bonus

This section would allow reserve component members to be paid retention bonuses using the same authority used to pay active duty members. The provision would also clarify that enlisted personnel on indefinite enlistments are eligible to receive bonuses and that bonuses may be paid based on criteria other than service in a critical skill as determined by the Secretary of Defense. The committee intends that this authority be used to pay bonuses, if required, to service members who agree to serve in an active status in any category of the ready reserve, affiliate with reserve component units, accept assignments to high priority reserve units, and continue to serve in critically short wartime health specialties.

### Section 618—Eligibility of New Reserve Component Officers for Accession or Affiliation Bonus for Officers in Critical Skills

This section would allow reserve component officers to be paid an accession or affiliation bonus using the same authority used to pay active duty officers.

### Section 619–Eligibility of Reserve Component Members for Incentive Bonus for Conversion to Military Occupational Specialty to Ease Personnel Shortage

This section would allow reserve component members to be paid bonuses for converting to critical occupational specialties using the same authority used to pay active duty members.

### Section 620—Availability of Hazardous Duty Incentive Pay for Military Firefighters

This section would establish a new hazardous duty incentive pay of $150 per month for members of the uniformed services who regularly perform duty as a member of a firefighting crew.

## SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

### Section 631—Expansion of Travel and Transportation Allowances to Assist Survivors of a Deceased Member to Attend Burial Ceremony of the Member

This section would clarify that family members are authorized to travel at government expense to the burial site of a member who dies while on active duty or inactive duty and that the member's parents are always eligible to travel at government expense to attend the burial ceremony.

### Section 632—Transportation of Family Members Incident to the Serious Illness or Injury of Members of the Uniformed Services

This section would expand the number and categories of family members and other people that would be entitled to transportation at government expense and would authorize such persons to receive a per diem or be reimbursed for travel expenses.

### Section 633—Reimbursement of Members for Certain Lodging Costs Incurred in Connection with Student Dependent Travel

This section would authorize the service secretary concerned to reimburse a service member for lodging costs incurred by a dependent child traveling between the child's school and the member's overseas duty station when the lodging expenses are incurred for reasons beyond the control of the dependent child.

## SUBTITLE D—SURVIVORS BENEFITS

### Section 641—Computation of Benefits Under Survivor Benefit Plan for Surviving Spouses Over Age 62

This section would eliminate the social security offset under the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) and increase the annuities paid to survivors of military retirees who are 62 or older from 35 percent of retired pay to the percentages indicated for the following fiscal years:

(1) For months after September 2005 and before April 2006, 40 percent;

(2) For months after March 2006 and before April 2007, 45 percent;

(3) For months after March 2007 and before April 2008, 50 percent; and

(4) For months after March 2008, 55 percent.

This section would also make corresponding adjustments to the SBP supplemental annuity program and would require SBP annuities to be recalculated during October 2005, April 2006, April 2007, and April 2008 to ensure that beneficiaries receive the appropriate amount of annuity.

### Section 642—Open Enrollment Period for Survivor Benefit Plan Commencing October 1, 2005

This section would authorize an open season for retired members to participate in the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) or increase the level of their participation if they were previously participating below the maximum allowed level. The open season would begin October 1, 2005 and continue for two years.

### Section 643—Source of Funds for Survivor Benefit Plan Annuities for Department of Defense Beneficiaries Over Age 62

This section would clarify that the payments into the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund in support of the changes made in section 642 would be calculated by the Secretary of Defense and paid by the Secretary of the Treasury.

## SUBTITLE E—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS

### Section 651—Consolidation and Reorganization of Legislative Provisions Regarding Defense Commissary System and Exchanges and other Morale, Welfare, and Recreational Activities

This section would consolidate a wide range of sections from title 10, United States Code and other laws concerning commissaries, exchanges, and other morale, welfare, and recreation activities. The provision would also:

(1) Define the commissary benefit and require the Secretary of Defense to operate a commissary system;

(2) Specify the criteria for establishment of commissaries, determination of the size of commissaries, and the closure of commissaries, to include direction to consider the welfare of reserve patrons in the same manner as active duty patrons are considered when assessing the need to close a commissary;

(3) Require the Secretary to submit to Congress written notice of the reasons supporting the closure of a commissary, to include the impact of the proposed closure on the quality of life of the patrons and the welfare of the military community, and wait 90 days before taking action to close the store;

(4) Clarify the categories of the merchandize that shall be sold in commissaries, to include the addition of telephone cards, greeting cards, and film and one-time use cameras and a list of general merchandise items that shall continue to be sold in commissaries on a limited basis unless space or other considerations prevent the sale of the items;

(5) 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, 2009; and

(6) Specify that the priority in selecting Commissary Operating Board members should be given to people with skills and experience useful to the operating of commissaries and that the board chairman shall be a career military officer or career member of the Senior Executive Service.

Section 652—Consistent State Treatment of Department of Defense Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefits Program

This section would clarify that the Department of Defense Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefit Program is a federal health benefit program not subject to state, local, and territorial or other laws taxes, and health plan mandates. The provision would provide the same status to this single, uniform program that had existed previously for the separate programs that had been operated by the military departments prior to consolidation.

Section 653—Cooperation and Assistance for Qualified Scouting Organizations Serving Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Civilian Employees Overseas

This section would require that professional staff supporting both the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in overseas areas be made nonappropriated fund employees of the United States and would clarify that appropriated funds may be used to pay the costs of the employees. The committee believes that this action is required to confirm the status of scouting professionals in overseas areas and resolve any uncertainty regarding their treatment and access to support services in foreign countries.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 661—Repeal of Requirement that Members Entitled to Basic Allowance for Subsistence Pay Subsistence Charges while Hospitalized

This section would repeal the requirement for officers and certain enlisted members to pay subsistence charges when they are hospitalized.

Section 662—Clarification of Education Loans Qualifying for Education Loan Repayment Program for Reserve Component Health Professions Officers

This section would clarify that college loans involving both a basic professional qualifying degree and graduate education would qualify for repayment under section 16302 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 663—Survey and Analysis of Effect of Extended and Frequent Mobilization of Reservists for Active Duty Service on Reservist Income

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a detailed study of the loss of income by mobilized reservists who have served on active duty in support of a contingency operation following September 11, 2001. The provision would require the Secretary to survey a minimum of 50 percent of such reservists, collect demographic data on the surveyed members, identify members in critical skills, identify members who believe that replacing lost income would affect their retention decision, identify members who experience reduced income levels while on active duty, determine the amount of lost income in each case, and analyze the data. The

provision would require the Secretary to report his findings and recommendations to address the problem of reduced income for mobilized reservists to Congress and the Comptroller General by January 31, 2006. The provision would require the Comptroller General to review the report of the Secretary and report his findings to Congress by March 31, 2006.

The committee believes that accurate information regarding the loss of income by mobilized reservists is an important prerequisite to establishing a lasting solution to the problem. The committee is particularly interested in the data as it relates to military occupational specialty because that analysis is expected to reveal important insight regarding high demand skills that would benefit from specific financial incentives and force balancing initiatives.

# TITLE VII—HEALTHCARE MATTERS

## OVERVIEW

The committee continues to be concerned about growing stress on the Defense Health Program which partly results from the strain faced by the civilian health care systems in the nation. In the face of the growing cost of health care in general, the military health system must provide for medical readiness and force health protection for our men and women in uniform and ensure health care services to all other beneficiaries. As the nation fights the global war on terrorism, the Department of Defense will transition from complex existing TRICARE contracts to challenging new and very different TRICARE contracts. No other healthcare system has ever faced a similar experience. In light of the many challenges faced by the military health system, the committee continues to believe that the Defense Health Program must be fully funded.

The committee remains strongly committed to ensuring that the force health protection and the medical readiness of our service members have the highest priority. Accordingly, the committee recommends legislation to ensure the deployability of active and reserve component service members and their protection from health threats during military operations. In addition, several provisions would assist family members of activated reservists to transition in and out of the military health system.

Finally, the committee is steadfast in its view that the transition to the new TRICARE contracts must not disrupt beneficiary health care, and that it optimizes military treatment facilities while preserving access to high quality health care. The committee is pleased by the TRICARE transformation efforts and spirit of cooperation by the various military and private sector health care entities. However, the committee remains concerned that some of the contracts carved out from the major managed care support contracts, such as those for patient appointment services, nurse triage and health information line, and resource sharing, may leave the transition process at risk for disruption of health care delivery and increased beneficiary dissatisfaction. The committee expects to be kept informed by the Department of Defense and the military services on the ongoing efforts to develop and implement the carved out contracts.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Collection of Perinatal Information

The committee strongly supports the goal of the TRICARE Family-Centered Care program, which the Department of Defense established in August 2003, to improve and enhance family-friendly care in the military health system. One aspect of the Family-Centered Care program was the importance of providing high quality perinatal care to pregnant service members and dependents. In order to ensure high quality care the committee supports the use of the National Perinatal Information Center that specializes in the collection of obstetric and neonatal data necessary to determine quality measures. The committee urges the Department to continue its efforts to measure quality perinatal care so that pregnant service members and dependents continue to receive high quality perinatal care in the military health care system.

### Coordination of TRICARE and Medicare Benefits and Provider Payments

Recent changes to the Medicare program enacted by Congress may have created administrative and benefit disparities between Medicare and TRICARE for Medicare-eligible military beneficiaries. Such disparities cause complex problems for beneficiaries and may result in complications and inconsistencies that may deter health care providers from participation and acceptance of military beneficiaries. They also pose added costs to TRICARE contractors as a result of having to administer multiple sets of adjudication rules and respond to increased complaints and appeals from providers and beneficiaries. The committee believes that elimination of such disparities wherever possible is important to promoting provider participation and improving access to a consistent benefit for TRICARE beneficiaries.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study to identify disparities between benefits and administration methodologies within the Medicare and TRICARE programs. The study should also include an assessment of the impact of such disparities on program effectiveness, provider participation, and beneficiary understanding; a summary of actions taken to reduce those disparities; identification of the rationale for any differences that the Secretary deems necessary; and recommendations for legislative or other action needed to reduce such disparities. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report by March 31, 2005, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

### Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Test Review

The Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) required the Comptroller General to evaluate the efforts of the Secretary of Defense to disclose to the Department of Veterans Affairs all Department of Defense (DOD) records and information on Project 112. Such disclosure was to facilitate the provision of benefits by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to members of the armed forces who participated in that

project. The Comptroller General's review of DOD efforts recommends that the Department:

(1) Determine the feasibility of addressing unresolved issues associated with Project 112, and the appropriateness of and responsibility for reporting new information;

(2) Finalize and implement a plan for identifying DOD projects and tests conducted outside Project 112;

(3) Designate a single point of contact for providing information related to tests and potential exposures in and outside Project 112.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to implement these recommendations and submit a report on the status of the implementation by March 1, 2005, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

### Landstuhl Regional Medical Center Alteration

The committee notes that Landstuhl Regional Medical Center (LRMC) serves as the primary medical treatment center for casualties of United States operations within Europe, Southwest Asia and the Middle East. With the increased need to accommodate casualties from the global war on terrorism, LRMC requires climate control in certain patient facilities. The committee recommends $10.0 million for the purpose of providing an air conditioning system in patient care areas at LRMC.

### Military-Civilian Education Programs Related to Sexual Health Decision-Making

The committee is aware of collaborative military-civilian education programs related to sexual health decision-making that demonstrates benefits through the reduction of unintended pregnancies and sexually transmitted infections among military personnel. The committee's support for such collaborative programs was demonstrated in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–772), which directed the Secretary of Defense to examine such programs and consider their use by the services. A military-civilian demonstration project was set up in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as a collaborative effort to encourage sexual integrity and reduce sexually transmitted infections and unplanned pregnancies in the military. As a continued measure of support for those efforts and to further encourage the Secretary to examine the progress of the military-civilian demonstration project, the committee recommends $0.2 million for the purposes of continuing the demonstration project and to encourage program expansion of sexual integrity training to other military installations.

### Nurse Triage and Health Information Line Services

The committee is deeply committed to ensuring a smooth transition from the current TRICARE contracts to the new TRICARE contracts. In particular, the committee is concerned that there are no transition plans for nurse triage and health care information line services that were eliminated from the new TRICARE contracts. The committee believes that the elimination of this service from the regional contracts may have a significant impact on bene-

ficiary access to quality health care services. While the elimination of the nurse triage and health information line from the managed care support contracts may be prudent, the committee questions whether a return to an ad hoc, localized approach to providing triage and delivering health information will degrade uniformity and beneficiary satisfaction, and reduce the economies of scale and efficiencies across the military health system. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services with a comprehensive plan for ensuring a smooth transition for nurse triage and health information line services by December 31, 2004. The plan shall include a detailed explanation of the Department of Defense proposal to fulfill nurse triage and health information line services, specifically addressing: (1) the elements of the plan; (2) the timeline and current status for implementation; (3) an assessment of the military services' abilities to perform the services; (4) any gaps in fulfilling these services; (5) how the Department will ensure uniformity within and across regions; and (6) the estimated cost of providing these services, taking into consideration not only the direct cost of providing the service, but also the cost in terms of health outcomes, provision of needed care, avoidance of unnecessary care, and redirection of care to a more appropriate level.

### Reserve Component Requirement for Medical and Dental Readiness Accountability

The committee continues to be concerned about the medical and dental readiness of the reserve component. The number of reserve component soldiers activated for deployment with disqualifying medical and dental conditions highlights the greater need for medical personnel and operational commanders to strictly monitor the individual medical readiness of these personnel. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure the military departments have systematic processes for providing appropriate health examinations and assessments and a means for capturing health information. The Department of Defense and the military services should consider the recommendations of the Armed Forces Epidemiological Board in its report of September 17, 2003, and consider modeling their programs after the Air Force Preventive Health Assessment and Individual Medical Readiness Program. Equally important, the Department should incentivize commanders and hold them accountable for enforcing and monitoring medical and dental requirements to ensure the medical readiness.

### Resource Sharing Agreements

The committee is highly concerned about potential disruptions to providing quality patient care during the transition from the current TRICARE contracts to the new TRICARE contracts, especially as the carved out resource sharing programs evolve to new contractual agreements. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to take into account the use of all existing authorities to guarantee a smooth transition and to ensure that the new contracts: (1) are as cost effective as the current agreements, (2) provide for similar flexibility in staffing, and (3) provide uninterrupted

care for beneficiaries during the transition from existing to new contracts.

### State-of-the-Art Mobility Equipment

The committee is strongly committed to ensuring that those who are injured or become ill serving the nation receive the finest rehabilitation efforts to maximize independence and accessibility. To that end, the committee supports efforts to provide service members, especially those individuals with orthopedic and neurologic disorders, with the finest mobility equipment. This equipment would allow users to walk on all surfaces and would be all-terrain in nature, providing maximum mobility. Equipment should (1) minimize any additional damage to the body as found in many instances with standard equipment, (2) be lightweight, and (3) require minimal energy expenditure.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—ENHANCED HEALTH CARE BENEFITS FOR RESERVES

### Section 701—Demonstration Project for TRICARE Coverage for Ready Reserve Members

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a three-year demonstration project to provide TRICARE coverage for Ready Reserve members not on active duty who are ineligible for employer-sponsored health benefits. The purpose of the demonstration would be to determine whether such coverage enhances medical readiness, recruiting, and retention of reserve component members. The Secretary would be required to report by April 1, 2007 on the results of the demonstration project to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. The section would require the Comptroller General to provide both periodic and final independent evaluations and reports of the demonstration project to the same committees.

### Section 702—Comptroller General Report on the Cost and Feasibility of Providing Private Health Insurance Stipends for Members of the Ready Reserve

This section would require the Comptroller General to conduct a study of the cost and feasibility of providing a stipend to offset the cost of private health insurance to members of the reserves and their dependents, and to maintain continuity of health care for dependents when members are mobilized. The purpose of the study would be to examine recommendations for benefit amount; cost to the Department; potential effects on medical readiness, recruitment, and retention; participation rates; continuity of care; administrative and management considerations; and implications for employers.

### Section 703—Improvement of Medical Services for Activated Members of the Ready Reserve and Their Families

This section would make permanent the now temporary eligibility of dependents of reserve component members to obtain TRICARE health care benefits up to 90 days before the date on

which the member's period of active duty is to begin. The section would allow the Secretary of Defense to provide health care benefits to service members up to 90 days before the date on which the period of active duty is to begin. The current temporary authority for this health care benefit expires on December 31, 2004.

### Section 704—Modification of Waiver of Certain Deductibles Under TRICARE Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive deductible payments required by certain TRICARE programs for dependents of certain reserve component members who are called or ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days. This section would mitigate the financial hardship on activated reservists by allowing the TRICARE deductibles to be waived in cases where mobilized reservists had already paid deductibles for their civilian health care coverage.

### Section 705—Authority for Payment by United States of Additional Amounts Billed by Health Care Providers to Activated Reserve Members

This section would protect a dependent of a member of a reserve component who is ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days in support of a contingency operation from paying a health care provider any amount above the TRICARE maximum allowable cost, known as balance billing. In such cases, the Secretary of Defense would have authority to pay the balance billing amount.

### Section 706—Extension of Transitional Health Care Benefits After Separation from Active Duty

This section would make permanent the authority to provide Transition Assistance Medical Program (TAMP) benefits to service members and their dependents for up to 180 days following separation from active duty. Under current law, the authority to provide the 180-day TAMP benefits expires on December 31, 2004. The section also would require that the TAMP eligibility would cease prior to the 180–day limit if the beneficiaries acquire employer-provided health insurance. The section would limit the outlays associated with the TAMP benefits provided after January 1, 2005 to not more than $170.0 million.

## SUBTITLE B—OTHER BENEFITS IMPROVEMENTS

### Section 711—Coverage of Certain Young Children Under TRICARE Dental Program

This section would permit certain dependents of service members who die while serving on active duty or who die as a member of the Ready Reserve to enroll in the TRICARE Dental Program regardless of the dependent's dental plan enrollment status on the date of the service member's death. Many dependents, due to their young age, are not enrolled in the TRICARE Dental Plan. In cases where the service member dies, the child's nonparticipation due to their young age disadvantages them from future eligibility. This section would authorize these dependents to participate in the den-

tal plan in the same manner as other dependents of service members who die while on active duty.

Section 712—Comptroller General Report on Provision of Health and Support Services for Exceptional Family Member Program Enrollees

This section would require the Comptroller General to evaluate the effect of the Exceptional Family Member Program (EFMP) on health and support services in select civilian communities near military communities with a high concentration of EFMP enrollees that use federal, state and local health and support services. The study mandated under this section would pay special attention to:

(1) Identifying communities that have high concentrations of EFMP enrollees that use local health and support services;

(2) Evaluating the needs, if any, that are not met by federal, state and local health and support service for EFMP enrollees;

(3) Determining the burden, if any, placed on federal, state and local health and support services that provide care to EFMP enrollees;

(4) Evaluating TRICARE's ability to meet the needs of EFMP enrollees;

(5) Examining the reason for any limitations of TRICARE, the EFMP, and state and local health and support services in providing assistance to military families with EFMP members; and

(6) Providing recommendations for more effectively meeting the needs of EFMP enrollees.

The study would examine no less than four major communities where EFMP enrollees live and in which several major military installations exist, including installations from multiple military services. The Comptroller General shall submit his report of findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2005.

Section 713—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.

Section 714—Transition to Home Health Care Benefit Under Subacute Care Program

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to extend previous benefits for part-time or intermittent home health care after the transition to new managed care support contracts that result in a change in benefits.

### Section 715—Requirement Relating to Prescription Drug Benefits for Medicare-Eligible Enrollees Under Defense Health Care Plans

This section would prohibit the prescription drug cost-sharing requirements for Medicare-eligible beneficiaries from being in excess of the cost-sharing requirements applicable to non-Medicare-eligible beneficiaries.

### Section 716—Professional Accreditation of Military Dentists

This section would allow the secretaries of the military departments to authorize the treatment of no more than 2,000 children, under the age of 13 per year at certain military facilities offering residency programs in oral and maxillofacial surgery and orthodontics. This authority would maintain the viability of military dental training programs by allowing treatment of a pediatric population, as required by the American Dental Association for the accreditation of such programs.

### Section 717—Addition of Certain Unremarried Former Spouses to Persons Eligible for Dental Insurance Plan of Retirees of the Uniformed Services

This section would permit certain unremarried former spouses of a member or former member to participate in the TRICARE Retiree Dental Program if they do not have dental coverage under an employer-sponsored health plan.

### Section 718—Waiver of Collection of Payments Due from Certain Persons Unaware of Loss of CHAMPUS Eligibility

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the collection of certain payments for health care services provided during a period of ineligibility between July 1, 1999 and December 31, 2004 for beneficiaries under age 65 entitled to Medicare on the basis of disability or end stage renal disease. The waiver would apply to those beneficiaries who were unaware of their loss of eligibility to receive health benefits at the time they were received. The amendment would also require the Department of Defense to report quarterly to Congress regarding DOD efforts to identify the eligibility status of individuals for such benefits and the actions taken when individuals are determined to be ineligible.

## SUBTITLE C—PLANNING, PROGRAMMING, AND MANAGEMENT

### Section 721—Pilot Program for Transformation of Health Care Delivery

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a three-year pilot program to test a model for future health care delivery systems at one or more military installations where the military population is expected to expand. The model to be tested would focus on coordinating and leveraging the use of existing health care resources, to include federal, state, local, and contractor assets to meet increased health care requirements. Historically, the approach to providing military health care to military beneficiaries has centered on building a military treatment facility on the installation. With increasing requirements to repair or replace aging

military treatment facilities it may be more feasible and cost effective to leverage non- military health care resources. The Secretary would be required to submit an interim report by July 1, 2005 on the implementation plan for the pilot program and a final report by July 1, 2007 on the results of the pilot program to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

### Section 722—Study of Provision of Travel Reimbursement to Hospitals for Certain Military Disability Retirees

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of the feasibility and desirability of providing disability retirees travel and transportation benefits to receive medical treatment at military hospitals for two years after their retirement. The provision would direct the Secretary to report the results of the study to the congressional defense subcommittees by March 1, 2005.

# TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

### Section 801—Rapid Acquisition Authority to Respond to Combat Emergencies

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a streamlined acquisition process for use when combat fatalities have occurred, the combatant commander has an urgent need of equipment, and delay would cause a continuation of combat fatalities. This process is to be used as a "quick start" bridge to the normal acquisition process.

The committee finds that the current Department of Defense acquisition system cannot respond in a timely manner to the combatant commander's urgent need of combat equipment. A rapid response to emergency combat situations would minimize combat fatalities when reacting to changes in the opponent's battlefield tactics.

### Section 802—Defense Acquisition Workforce Changes

This section would amend various sections in chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code. First, it would align the provisions in chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code, relating to defense acquisition workforce with similar provisions contained in chapter 99 of title 5, United States Code. Second, it would authorize the Secretary of Defense to designate critical acquisition positions. Third, it would require the Secretary and scholarship participants to enter written agreements that identify obligations and consequences for breach of contract.

Section 803—Limitation on Task and Delivery Order Contracts

This section would amend section 2304a of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the Secretary of Defense has authority to enter into task and delivery contracts for a base period of up to five years, and that the contract may include additional options for a period of time as is deemed appropriate.

Section 804—Funding for Contract Cancellation Ceilings for Certain Multiyear Procurement Contracts

This section would amend section 2306b(g) and section 2306c(d) of title 10, United States Code, to require the head of the agency concerned to provide written notification, to the congressional defense committees, in those instances when cancellation costs that are above $100 million are not fully funded. The written notification would include a financial risk assessment for not fully funding the cancellation ceiling.

Section 805—Increased Threshold for Requiring Contractors to Provide Specified Employee Information to Cooperative Agreement Holders

This section would amend section 2416(d) of title 10, United States Code, by raising the $0.5 million reporting requirement to $1.0 million. Currently, the Secretary of Defense is required to provide some basic contractor information to certain organizations on contracts that have a value of $0.5 million or more.

Section 806—Extension of Authority for Use of Simplified Acquisition Procedures

This section would amend section 4202(e) of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–106) by extending until October 1, 2009, the time frame in which the secretary of an executive agency may use simplified procedures to purchase commercial items that have a value of $5.0 million or less.

Section 807—Authority to Adjust Acquisition-Related Dollar Thresholds for Inflation

This section would authorize the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council to amend the dollar threshold of procurement statutes in accordance with inflationary rates in order to maintain the constant dollar value of the threshold. In those instances where a procurement statute applies to a single agency, the secretary of that agency has authority to amend the dollar threshold. This section would require any proposed change to be coordinated with the Director of Office of Management and Budget and to be published in the Federal Register for public comment. This section would not authorize adjustments to the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. 276(a)), the Service Contract Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 351 et. seq), or title III of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2511 et seq).

## SUBTITLE B—UNITED STATES DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE PROVISIONS

### Section 811—Defense Trade Reciprocity

This section would establish a defense trade policy based upon the principle of fair trade and reciprocity. Further, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the offset regulations or policies of a foreign country are reduced to the same level as the domestic content requirements of the United States before the Secretary acquires defense products from a foreign firm operating in that country.

Offsets are defined as compensation required as a condition of purchase in government-. to-government or commercial sales of defense products or services. Therefore, in order to sell defense products to many of our foreign security partners, the majority of the manufacturing jobs and technology must be transferred to the purchasing country. In many cases, the value of the offset compensation of U.S. manufacturing jobs or technology exceeds the value of the product sold. The U.S. has no offset requirements for its foreign trading partners.

The committee is concerned that the cost of offsets in foreign export defense sales is the loss of U.S. subcontractor jobs and the loss of U.S. technology paid for by the U.S. taxpayer.

### Section 812—Amendments to Domestic Source Requirements

This section would amend section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, also known as the Berry Amendment, to require the Secretary of Defense to notify Congress and the public when the Secretary exercises a waiver.

This section would also amend section 2533a to clarify the covered item described as clothing.

### Section 813—Three-Year Extension of Restriction on Acquisition of Polyacrylonitrile (PAN) Carbon Fiber from Foreign Sources

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to delay for three years, phasing out of the restriction of acquisition of Polyacrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fiber from foreign sources.

The committee is aware of the January 2001 report that recommended phasing out of restriction on the acquisition of PAN carbon fiber form foreign sources.

The committee finds that the aerospace market conditions have significantly declined since September 11, 2001, and the rationale for phasing out of the restriction is no longer valid.

### Section 814—Grant Program for Defense Contractors to Implement Strategies to Avoid Outsourcing of Jobs

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to award grants to qualified defense contractors in order to assist the contractor in avoiding the outsourcing of jobs. Grant funds would be used to implement strategies that would enable defense contractors to retain domestic employees. Examples of such strategies include retraining employees or plant upgrades. This provision would limit the grant to fifty percent of the cost of the strategy and require

that the proposed strategy would retain at least ten domestic jobs dedicated to the performance of a defense contract.

### Section 815—Preference for Domestic Freight Forwarding Services

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to grant preferences to freight forwarder companies owned and controlled by U.S. citizens that offer fair and reasonable rates in the award of transportation service contracts for transportation services to, from, or within Iraq or Afghanistan.

## SUBTITLE C—OTHER ACQUISITION MATTERS

### Section 821—Sustainment and Modernization Plans for Existing Systems while Replacement Systems are Under Development

This section would require the Department of Defense to plan and budget for the sustainment and modernization of current military systems until such time that the replacement system under development is fielded and assumes responsibility for the mission.

The committee is aware of the fiscal realities that make it difficult to fund simultaneously the development of transformational future military systems and the maintenance and sustainment of current military systems. In general, the military services map out program strategies for sustainment and modernization. However, significant gaps exist. In 2003, the General Accounting Office reported that 15 of the 25 systems reviewed had insufficient funding requested by the Department of Defense or projected in the Future Years Defense Program to execute the military services' program strategies to sustain or replace their equipment.

It is the responsibility of the Department of Defense to develop military systems that provide the armed forces with superiority over potential adversaries. However, funding for transformational future systems that are decades from field operational capability must not preclude the funding required to sustain and modernize the current force.

The committee is concerned that escalating cost growth in development programs and accelerating transformation is funded by underinvestment in the current force which may undermine the readiness and capabilities of the forces that we must rely upon for the foreseeable future.

### Section 822—Review and Demonstration Project Relating to Contractor Employees

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of Department of Defense policies, procedures, and practices relating to employees of defense contractors and their subcontractors. Specifically, it would require the Secretary to review DOD policies, procedures, and practices of ensuring compliance with Executive Order 12989, as amended by Executive Order 13286, which prohibits the secretaries of executive agencies from contracting with employers who hire or recruit unauthorized aliens. The committee is aware of numerous instances in which the Department contracted with vendors who employed unauthorized aliens for work on military installations. The review should identify problems with existing security policies, procedures, and practices, as well as

develop and implement reforms to strengthen, upgrade, and improve the overall DOD contracting process. This section would require the Secretary to conduct the review within 180 days of enactment of this Act.

This section would also require the Secretary to conduct a demonstration program for the procurement of military construction, renovation, maintenance or repair service on military installations, under which significant weight would be given to bidding contractors offering effective, reliable staffing plans that ensure all employees are properly authorized to be employed in the United States and properly qualified to perform the services required under the contract. The Secretary shall report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2005, the benefits of the demonstration program and the extent to which lessons learned from the program should be incorporated throughout DOD procurements.

### Section 823—Defense Acquisition Workforce Limitation and Reports

This section would require the Department of Defense to reduce the defense acquisition workforce personnel by five percent on or before October 1, 2005. This provision would also require the General Accounting Office and Defense Acquisition University to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the current status of the Defense Acquisition Workforce by March 1, 2005.

### Section 824—Provision of Information to Congress to Enhance Transparency in Contracting

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide information on contract or task or delivery orders to the chairman or ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee or the House Armed Services Committee, within 14 days of the request.

## TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

### ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### National Defense University

The committee commends the National Defense University (NDU) for its work in scenario modeling and simulation methodologies. The committee encourages the NDU to continue its work by employing advanced technologies that will increase the effectiveness, realism and creativity of these scenarios. The committee notes that the immersive technologies being developed by the Department of Defense are similar to some advanced technologies that the entertainment industry employs and encourages contact between the Department and entertainment industry technologists as a means of fully exploiting such technologies to the benefit of the armed forces.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 901—Change in Title of Secretary of the Navy to Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would redesignate the title of the Secretary of the Navy 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.

### Section 902—Transfer of Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs from National Defense University to United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission

This section would transfer the Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs at the National Defense University, established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission, established in the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398).

### Section 903—Transfer to the Secretary of the Army of Responsibility for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program

This section would transfer oversight of 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 to the Secretary of the Army not later than January 1, 2005. Additionally, this section 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. Finally, this section would require the Army to fully implement the alternative technologies previously selected for the 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, 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 would further require that the program manager shall act independently of the Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization (PMCD) and shall report to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology.

Numerous General Accounting 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 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 ex-

cept that stored at the Blue Grass Army Depot and the Pueblo Chemical Army Depot; and the Project Manager(PM), ACWA, who reports directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and has responsibility only for destruction of those parts of the stockpile stored at Blue Grass and Pueblo. In 2003 the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) (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 the new management structure, which brings together all elements of the chemical weapons demilitarization 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

Section 904—Modification of Obligated Service Requirements under National Security Education Program

This section would modify the service requirements to ensure that recipients of scholarships and fellowships obtain employment in a federal national security position that utilizes the unique language and region expertise acquired by the recipient. This section would also set 12 months as the minimum length of federal service for all recipients. This section would also require the recipient to gain employment in an approved position within three years of completion of the scholarship, or within two years in the case of a recipient of a fellowship.

Section 905—Change of Membership of Certain Councils

This section would make the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy a statutory member of the Nuclear Weapons Council and implement the corresponding technical changes in law. Current law (10 U.S.C. 179) establishes the Nuclear Weapons Council to, among other things, coordinate programming and budget matters pertaining to nuclear weapons programs between the Department of Defense and Department of Energy and to provide broad guidance on nuclear research and development priorities. By statute, the council comprises the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics; the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and the Undersecretary of Energy for Nuclear Security. As a result of the congressionally-. mandated Nuclear Posture Review, which set out a new course in strategic policy, the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy has come to play an increasing role in coordinating nuclear weapons policy and making recommendations to the President.

### Section 906—Actions to Prevent the Abuse of Detainees

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe policies regarding procedures for the Armed Forces, other elements of the Department of Defense, and Department of Defense contractor personnel in order to prevent the abuse of prisoners held by the United States as part of the Global War on Terrorism. The Secretary would be required to issue such policies within 120 days of the enactment of this Act, provide those policies to Congress immediately, and report to Congress on their implementation one year after their issuance.

### Section 907—Responses to Congressional Inquiries

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, or any other official of the Department of Defense, to respond to written requests for information made by the respective Chairmen of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services in writing within 21 days of the transmission of such a request.

# TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

#### Overview

The budget request contained $852.7 million for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to $160.2 million, for operational tempo which is included within the operating budgets of the military services. The budget is organized in fiscal year 2005 to address three broad national priorities: (1) demand reduction; (2) domestic support; and (3) international support, intelligence and technology.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2005 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| FY05 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request | $852,697 |
| Demand Reduction | 122.209 |
| Domestic Support | 207,998 |
| International Support, Intelligence and Technology | 522,590 |
| Recommended Decreases: | |
| Intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance and tanker support | 2,000 |
| Tethered Aerostat Radar System | 5,000 |
| Recommended Increases: | |
| Southwest Border Fence | 5,000 |
| Northern Command Counter-Narcotics Support | 2,000 |
| Recommendation | 852,697 |

#### Items of Special Interest

*Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and tanker support*

The budget request contained $2.7 million for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and tanker support. The budget re-

quest for this activity in fiscal year 2004 was 0.4 million. Reductions in support activities are planned in light of other worldwide commitments and performance of depot-level maintenance on related assets.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $2.0 million for this activity.

*Northern Command counter-narcotics support*

The budget request contained $9.1 million to support the United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) counter-narcotics missions, including those which are performed through Joint Task Force-6 located at Fort Bliss, Texas.

The committee is concerned that the current funding levels will diminish the ability to provide additional mobile training teams. The mobile training teams help train federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies across the country on a wide variety of subjects related to narcotics interdiction. Without the proper funding, the committee is concerned that law enforcement agencies will not be able to develop the critical skills necessary for effective counter-narcotics law enforcement, and in assisting in war against terrorism in the homeland.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $2 million for additional mobile training teams along with the attendant headquarters' support for this enhanced mission.

The committee recognizes that, in order to utilize these funds, Joint Task Force-6 will need to be able to utilize authority provided by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). Section 1022 of that bill provided authority to joint task forces of the Department of Defense that provide support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-drug activities to also provide support to those agencies conducting counter-. terrorism activities. The committee understands that the Department of Defense 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.

*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 construction 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.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for this purpose.

*Tethered Aerostat Radar System*

The budget request contained $32.3 million for the operation of the Tethered Aerostat Radar System at multiple locations in the United States. Of the $32.3 million requested, $6.7 million was included for the procurement of additional spare parts.

The committee recommends a decrease of $5.0 million dollars in the procurement component of this request. The committee notes that the Congress has not received the detailed analysis it has requested to justify the continued increases in this program.

## OTHER ACTIVITIES

### Airlift Support for Homeland Defense Missions

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) has not adequately considered the need for airlift support to speed uniquely capable DOD assets to wherever needed to perform urgent homeland defense missions. The Department has developed considerable expertise across a range of disparate skills that may be needed in a homeland defense mission, but this expertise is scattered in various locations across the country. The committee is aware of a proposal to provide such support through the use of C–130 equipped Air National Guard units and believes that the proposal has merit. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report by March 31, 2005, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, his views on whether the Commander, Northern Command should have dedicated Air National Guard C–130 units at his disposal for the purpose of responding to attacks or incidents involving weapons of mass destruction.

### Civil Reserve Air Fleet

The committee understands that the Secretary of Defense requires that commercial air lines participating in the civil reserve air fleet receive at least 60 percent of its air transportation revenues from sources other than the Department of Defense. The committee is concerned that the Secretary is not enforcing this requirement. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary to enforce this requirement, and directs the Secretary to report to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee when this business practice is not followed, with an explanation as to why it was not followed.

### Defense Transformation

The committee supports the efforts of the Department of Defense to transform the armed forces into capabilities based, networked joint forces that are rapidly deployable and more lethal than today's highly capable military. Despite the Department's success in recent combat operations, the committee recognizes that the Department's transformation goals are long term, evolving objectives that will be very difficult to achieve without a joint strategy to guide it.

The committee is encouraged that the Army has embarked on an aggressive transformation program that encompasses all aspects of the Army, including personnel policies, unit structure, doctrine,

and equipment. While the committee has concerns about the development strategy for the Future Combat System, addressed elsewhere in this report, the committee believes the Army's plan to create more combat power by fielding at least 45 active maneuver brigades is the correct approach.

Similarly, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force have embraced transformation as an objective, and have proposed several specific concepts as transformational. The committee is concerned that each military service has embarked on its own transformational campaign, without an enforceable, integrated joint forces roadmap to ensure the services' plans are mutually supportive and overlap only when necessary. For that reason, the committee questions the services' plans to sustain excessive headquarters structure despite the services' increasing requests for information technology funding purportedly designed to flatten combat organizations.

Accordingly, the committee believes that the Joint Forces Command should continue to evolve as the principal coordinator of service transformation efforts.

## Global War on Terrorism

The committee applauds and supports the valiant efforts of the men and women of America's armed forces who are prosecuting the global war on terrorism in increasingly hostile areas overseas. The committee believes that the war should be fought on the enemy's home ground, and does not believe that a more passive strategy of disengagement would be a prudent policy for the safety of the United States and its citizens. In that regard, the committee supports a number of initiatives intended to enhance the ability of the armed forces to respond to the demands of the global war on terror. These initiatives range from measures intended to speed the development and fielding of force protection measures urgently needed by our forces in Iraq, to measures that will enhance the Special Operations Command's ability to work in a variety of settings. The committee understands the prominent roles played by other agencies in this fight, particularly the Departments of State and Homeland Security, but the committee continues to believe that the Department of Defense has performed and will continue to perform the most critical missions in the global war on terror.

## Homeland Defense Forces

In hearings over the past two years, the committee has reviewed the Department of Defense's plans for use of the National Guard in homeland defense missions and encouraged the Department to include the Department of Homeland Security in this review. Since the National Guard is a strategic national force that is frequently deployed, the committee is concerned that homeland defense and homeland security plans, which are dependent on National Guard units, must consider the need for contingency assets.

The committee is pleased to note the testimony of the Director, National Guard Bureau, describing his efforts to ensure that National Guard assets are continuously available for homeland defense missions. The committee is also heartened by the concept of the National Guard chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear

(CBRNE) enhanced response force packages, which would augment existing civil support teams in each of the 12 Federal Emergency Management Agency regions.

The committee is interested to learn whether the ongoing force rebalancing measures will yield sufficient available assets, given recent overseas deployments, and whether the Department should consider augmenting the capabilities of state defense forces authorized by title 32, United States Code, with available training opportunities and surplus equipment.

In that regard, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director, National Guard Bureau, to report any measures necessary to enhance the capabilities of the National Guard to perform homeland defense and homeland security missions. This report should address any unmet requirements related to CBRNE enhanced response teams and any necessary measures to augment the capabilities of state defense forces, and be provided to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee by December 31, 2004.

### Wisconsin Project's International Export Control Center

The committee notes that Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control began a public-. private initiative to improve export controls in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. This initiative was supported by the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Customs Service. The committee further notes that the Wisconsin Project is the leading source of unclassified information on world entities suspected of building weapons of mass destruction or have links to terrorism. The Wisconsin Project's database lists the activities of more than 3,700 suspected individuals and organizations.

Recognizing the importance of tracking and updating information related to entities which are attempting to build weapons of mass destruction, the committee believes the Wisconsin Project should expand its efforts to help foreign governments improve their export control mechanisms.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an additional $1.3 million to the Defense Threat Reduction Agency for the expansion of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control's International Export Control Center.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

### Section 1001—Transfer Authority

This section would provide fiscal year 2005 transfer authority to the Department of Defense for amounts up to $3.0 billion. This would include $500 million of specific transfer authority between the services' active component and reserve component accounts.

## Section 1002—Budget Justification Documents for Operation and Maintenance

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to include in congressional justification materials for the operation and maintenance budget request the baseline costs for programs in which there is an identified program increase or decrease. The Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) failed to identify these baseline costs, despite the direction to do so in the committee report on the H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106).

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to include in the operation and maintenance justification documents the amount of funds requested for personal service contracts and the number of personal service contractors expected to be compensated at an annual rate in excess of the annual rate of pay for the Vice President.

This section would also require the Secretary of the Navy to distinguish the cost of ship depot-level maintenance and repair and ship intermediate maintenance when presenting justification material to support the budget request for operation and maintenance funds. Specifically, the Secretary would be required to present to Congress separate sub-activity groups for ship depot operations and ship intermediate operations. The Secretary failed to maintain separate sub-activity groups when presenting the justification of estimates for fiscal year 2005 despite the direction to do so in the committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106).

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to include, in the justification materials for the operations and maintenance budget request, the average civilian salary cost by sub-activity group as a component of the personnel summary. The Secretary of Defense Comptroller) failed to identify such costs, despite the direction to do so in the committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106).

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2006, that catalogues the elements of "other costs" and "other contracts", which are currently used in justification materials for the budget request. Although the committee directed in the committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) to provide this report by October 21, 2003, the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) failed to do so.

## Section 1003—Retention of Fees from Intellectual Property Licenses

The section would allow the Department of Defense to establish programs to license trademarks and insignias, and to retain associated fees. Fees received from the trademark licenses would be used to cover the costs incurred in securing trademark registrations. Any funds in excess of such costs would be available for military personnel recruiting and retention activities, as well as morale, welfare, and recreation activities.

### Section 1004—Authority to Waive Claims of the United States when Amounts Recoverable are Less than Costs of Collection

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense or his designee to waive indebtedness when the cost of processing the transaction exceeds the amounts recoverable. The maximum amount that may be waived under this statue would be the micro-purchase threshold, currently $2,500.

### Section 1005—Repeal of Funding Restrictions Concerning Development of Medical Countermeasures against Biological Warfare Threats

This section would repeal section 2370a of title 10, United States Code, which requires that, of the funds allocated for the medical component of the biological defense research program within the Department of Defense, no more than 80 percent may be obligated or expended for product development or research, development, test, and evaluation of medical countermeasures against near-term validated biowarfare threat agents. Additionally, no more than 20 percent may be obligated or expended for product development or research, development, test, and evaluation, of medical countermeasures against mid-term or far-term validated biowarfare agents.

The current law defines biological warfare threats primarily in intelligence terms. The committee believes that this is overly restrictive because intelligence on biological warfare threats is inherently limited due to the ease with which biological warfare programs can be concealed and dangerous pathogens and toxins can be acquired. The situation is further exacerbated by the rapid advancements in bio-technology that are widely available throughout the world. Additionally, the current law categorizes biological warfare agents by the time period in which they may become threats: near-, mid-, and far-term. For the same reasons that make it difficult to define biological warfare agents in terms of available intelligence, the committee believes that it is difficult to project the time periods during which such agents might become threats.

In responding to such threats, the committee believes that more flexibility is needed in the medical components of the biological defense research program.

### Section 1006—Report on Budgeting for Exchange Rates for Foreign Currency Fluctuations

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 by December 1, 2004, on the foreign currency exchange rate projection used in the annual Department of Defense budget.

## SUBTITLE B—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

### Section 1011—Authority for Award of Contracts for Ship Dismantling on Net-Cost Basis

This section would allow the Secretary of the Navy to accept bids for domestic warship dismantling contracts based on the estimated

cost of performance as well as the estimated value of scrap and reusable equipment. This section would also allow contractors to retain proceeds from the sale of such scrap and reusable equipment. With the price of steel at very high levels, this provision is intended to allow for greater efficiencies in the disposal of obsolete former naval vessels. Nothing in the provision alters any environmental requirements pertaining to disposals.

### Section 1012—Independent Study to Assess Cost Effectiveness of the Navy Ship Construction Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an entity independent of the Department of Defense to conduct a study of the cost-effectiveness of the ship construction program of the Navy. The study would look at near-term improvements to make shipbuilding more efficient, and long-term improvement to make the United States shipbuilding industry commercially competitive in the global market. This provision would require the Secretary to submit the report to the congressional defense committees by June 1, 2005.

### Section 1013—Authority to Transfer Specified Former Naval Vessels to Certain Foreign Countries

This section would authorize the transfer of three obsolete former naval vessels to Chile, Portugal, and to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States.

### Section 1014—Limitation on Leasing of Foreign-Built Vessels

This section would prohibit the secretary of a military department from entering into a contract for a lease or charter of a vessel for a term of more than 12 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 national security interests of the United States.

## SUBTITLE C—SUNKEN MILITARY CRAFT

### Sections 1021–28—Protection of Sunken Military Craft

This section would protect sunken United States military vessels, aircraft, and spacecraft, as well as the remains and personal effects of their crews, from salvage, recovery, or other disturbance without proper authorization from the secretary of the military department concerned.

Thousands of U.S. and foreign sunken military craft now lie within and beyond U.S. internal waters, the U.S. territorial sea, and the U.S. contiguous zone. Because of recent advances in science and technology, many of these sunken state craft have become accessible to scientists, researchers, salvors, treasure-hunters, and others. The unauthorized disturbance or recovery of these sunken state craft and any remains of their crews and passengers is a growing concern both within the United States and internationally. In addition to deserving respect as gravesites, theses sunken craft may contain objects of a sensitive, archaeological, or historical nature. They often also contain unexploded ordnance or

other substances, including fuel oil and other hazardous liquids, which could pose a danger to human health and the marine environment if disturbed. This section would clarify the circumstances under which sunken military craft, entitled to sovereign immunity when they sank, remain the property of the flag state until officially abandoned. This section would also encourage and authorize the negotiation of international agreements with other nations to protect sunken military state craft and, through reciprocal treatment, to protect sunken U.S. warships.

Finally, this section would allow the secretary of the military department concerned to issue and enforce permits for activities directed at sunken U.S. military craft, including contract salvage. It would not invalidate any permitting system currently in place nor would it affect any prior lawful transfer or express abandonment of title to any sunken military craft.

## SUBTITLE D—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

### Section 1031—Continuation of Authority to Use Department of Defense Funds for Unified Counter-Drug and Counter-Terrorism Campaign in Colombia

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use funds available for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities to provide assistance to the government of Colombia to support not only a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking, but to also support a unified campaign against activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations.

### Section 1032—Limitation on Number of United States Military Personnel in Colombia

This section would limit the number of United States military personnel in the Republic of Colombia to 500 at any given time. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to exclude certain military personnel from the limitation, including those personnel engaged in rescue efforts, members of the armed forces assigned to the U.S. Embassy in Colombia, members of the armed forces participating in relief efforts, non-operational transient military personnel, and members of the armed forces making a port call from a military vessel in Colombia.

## SUBTITLE E—REPORTS

### Section 1041—Study of Continued Requirement for Two-Crew Manning for Ballistic Missile Submarines

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the current status of the requirement for two-man crewing of fleet ballistic missile submarines.

### Section 1042—Study of Effect on Defense Industrial Base of Elimination of United States Domestic Firearms Manufacturing Base

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, within 60 days of enactment, a report detailing the impact on military readiness and the defense

industrial infrastructure of the elimination of the United States domestic firearms manufacturing base as a result of ongoing civil litigation.

Section 1043—Study of Extent and Quality of Training Provided to Members of the Armed Services to Prepare for Post-Conflict Operations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to identify and assess the training that members of the armed forces assigned to support contingency operations receive in post-conflict operations. The Secretary would further be required to submit a report on his findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services no later than March 15, 2005.

## SUBTITLE F—SECURITY MATTERS

### Section 1051—Use of National Driver Register for Personnel Security Investigations and Determinations

This section would authorize federal agencies to access the National Driver Register for use in personnel security investigations with regard to federal employment. The Secretary of Transportation and the chief driver licensing official in each state, who provides driver licensing records to the National Driver Register, cooperatively manage the system. Access to the information is currently provided to multiple federal agencies.

### Section 1052—Standards for Disqualification from Eligibility for Department of Defense Security Clearances

This section would amend section 986 of title 10, United States Code, to allow decisions on granting meritorious waivers related to the granting of a security clearance to be delegated by the Secretary of Defense or the secretary of a military department to appropriate subordinates. This change is intended to improve the operation of the current program and decrease the time required to adjudicate security clearance eligibility without creating any additional risk to national security.

## SUBTITLE G—TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

### Section 1061—Use of Military Aircraft to Transport Mail to and from Overseas Locations

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense authority to use military aircraft to transport mail and parcels to, from, and between overseas locations. This authority, however, would be limited to the following circumstances:

(1) There is excess space on a scheduled military flight;

(2) There is no overall cost increase to the Department of Defense or the United States Postal Service;

(3) The United States Transportation Command would pay the cost of transporting mail from United States Postal Service, to customs clearance facilities, and military debarkation locations at rates not to exceed Department of Transportation rates for commercial airlines;

(4) There is no degradation of mail service; and

(5) There is no diversion of such military aircraft during contingencies or other events.

Section 1062—Reorganization and Clarification of Certain Provisions Relating to Control and Supervision of Transportation within the Department of Defense

This section would amend sections 4744 through 4747 of title 10, United States Code, by moving these sections from chapter 47 to chapter 26. This section would also repeal sections 9741, 9743, and 9746 of title 10, United States Code. These changes reflect the Secretary of Defense's role in transportation versus the individual role of the service secretaries.

Section 1063—Determination of Whether Private Air Carriers are Controlled by United States Citizens for Purposes of Eligibility for Government Contract for Transportation of Passengers or Supplies

This section would amend section 2710 of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–11), to clarify that the Secretary of Transportation is responsible for certifying whether an air carrier is effectively controlled by citizens of the United States.

Section 1064—Evaluation of Whether to Prohibit Certain Offers for Transportation of Security-Sensitive Cargo

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to evaluate whether, and under what circumstances, it would be appropriate to limit competition for domestic freight transportation of security-sensitive cargo to motor carriers that are not part of a group of motor carriers under common financial or administrative control. The Secretary would be required to submit the evaluation to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee by January 1, 2005.

SUBTITLE H—OTHER MATTERS DEFENSE TO ENGAGE IN COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES AS SECURITY FOR INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES ABROAD

This section would provide for a two year extension of the authority of the Secretary of Defense to engage in commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities.

Section 1072—Assistance for Study of Feasibility of Biennial International Air Trade Show in the United States and for Initial Implementation

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to select and provide assistance to a community in conducting a joint study to determine the feasibility of establishing an international air trade show in that community. The committee believes that international air trade shows are an important component of efforts to demonstrate the effectiveness of United States military equipment to other nations and seeks to increase the importance of U.S. based air trade shows in the conduct of international aerospace trade.

This provision would also require that the Secretary make his selection through competitive procedures, while giving preference to communities that already host an air show and have demonstrated a history of supporting air shows with local resources.

### Section 1073—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments to existing law of a non-substantive basis.

### Section 1074—Commission on the Long-Term Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States

This section would establish a new commission to review the long-term implementation of the Nuclear Posture Review.

### Section 1075—Liability Protection for Certain Department of Defense Volunteers Working in the Maritime Environment

This section would remedy an inadvertent oversight in existing law by extending to volunteers working in the maritime training environment the same status and legal protections presently available to volunteers working on land-based assignments.

### Section 1076—Transfer of Historic F3A–1 Brewster Corsair Aircraft

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer ownership of a historic F3A–1 Brewster Corsair aircraft to a private citizen. The aircraft would be transferred in its current unflyable, "as is" condition, and at no cost to the United States.

## TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

### OVERVIEW

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), Congress enacted the Department of Defense National Security Personnel System (NSPS), as chapter 99 of title 5, United States Code. In doing so, Congress created a more flexible and rewarding personnel system for the Department. The Secretary of Defense tasked the Secretary of the Navy with responsibility for designing and implementing a human resources management system in accordance with NSPS. The committee strongly supports the Secretary of the Navy's outreach to unions, executive agencies, and Congress, as he fulfills this task. The Secretary of the Navy has, thus far, promoted a thorough and thoughtful plan, with continued communication and collaboration with the employees and their representatives to ensure a responsible human resources management system.

In light of the Department's current effort to implement NSPS, the committee recommends only minor changes to civilian personnel policy. These changes, however, exemplify the committee's continued respect for the civilian workforce and the need to reward properly individual accomplishments.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 1101—Payment of Federal Employee Health Benefit Premiums for Mobilized Federal Employees

This section would provide a federal government employee, who is a member of a reserve component ordered to active duty in support of a contingency and placed on leave without pay, to continue to receive coverage under the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program for 24 months. This section would also authorize the executive agency authority to pay both the employee's share and the agency's share of the premiums for continued coverage up to 24 months.

### Section 1102—Foreign Language Proficiency Pay

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to offer special pay to a Department of Defense employee who is certified to be proficient in a language deemed necessary for national security interests and whose duties require such language proficiency. This section would repeal the requirement that the individual be assigned duties during a contingency operation in section 1596a of title 10, United States Code.

### Section 1103—Pay Parity for Civilian Intelligence Personnel

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use a performance appraisal system for personnel in the defense intelligence senior executive service to ensure pay parity for all personnel in the defense senior executive service.

### Section 1104—Pay Parity for Senior Executives in Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to adjust the pay cap for Department of Defense nonappropriated fund executives to ensure that the compensation paid to such employees remains consistent with the Senior Executive Service employees.

### Section 1105——Prohibition of Unauthorized Wearing or Use of Civilian Medals or Decorations

This section would prohibit any person from merchandising or wearing a Department of Defense civilian medal or decoration without the written permission of the Secretary of Defense. This section would also authorize the Attorney General to initiate a civil proceeding in a United States district court to enjoin the prohibited practice.

# TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

#### Section 1201—Documentation of Conditions in Iraq under Former Dictatorial Government as Part of Transition to Post-Dictatorial Government

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to expedite, where practical, the review of documents seized from the Iraqi government and Ba'ath Socialist Party of Iraq relating to the functioning, crimes, and atrocities of those entities against the Iraqi people during the regime of Saddam Hussein. The Secretary would be further directed to transfer those documents, as appropriate, to Iraqi entities in Iraq dedicated to documenting the crimes and nature of the Hussein regime, to serve as a reminder of the dangers of tolerating dictatorship in Iraq. Analysts have found that such efforts in other post-dictatorial countries can contribute to the reconstruction and reconciliation process. The committee believes Iraqi democracy would benefit from a similar effort.

#### Section 1202—Support of Military Operations to Combat Terrorism

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense, during fiscal year 2005, to expend up to $25.0 million in operation and maintenance funds authorized by Title XV of this Act to provide support to foreign forces, irregular forces, or individuals who actively support United States special operations forces engaged in military operations against terrorists. The section would not authorize U.S. special operations forces to engage in covert actions, as defined by the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413b(e)). Thus, the intent is to provide additional resources to special operations forces engaged in clandestine operations, during which they often operate without the support of larger military units, but not to allow U.S. special operations forces to engage in activities traditionally performed by the intelligence community under title 50, United States Code. This section would require quarterly reports on how this authority is used.

#### Section 1203—Commander's Emergency Response Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to $300.0 million in operations and maintenance funding available to the Secretary from funds made available by Title XV of the Act for the Commander's Emergency Response Program, under which commanders in Iraq and Afghanistan receive funds for use in small humanitarian and reconstruction projects in the areas in which they are deployed. The section requires quarterly reports on the source and use of funds under this section.

### Section 1204—Status of Iraqi Security Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act, to submit to Congress a strategic plan setting forth the manner and timeline under which the United States will achieve the goal of establishing viable and professional Iraqi security forces. The Secretary would further be required to submit updates on progress implementing the strategic plan every 90 days thereafter.

### Section 1205—Guidance and Report Required on Contractors Supporting Deployed Forces in Iraq

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 90 days of the date of the enactment of this Act, to issue guidance on the management of contractors that support deployed military forces and to direct the secretaries of the military departments to develop procedures to implement that guidance. The Secretary of Defense would further be required to report to Congress within 30 days of issuing the aforementioned guidance on how it addressed certain issues and to establish and implement a process for collecting information on contractors providing certain security services in Iraq.

### Section 1206—Findings and Sense of Congress Concerning Army Specialist Joseph Darby

This section would make a series of findings regarding the importance of Specialist Joseph Darby's actions in reporting abuses at the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq and expresses the sense of Congress that Specialist Darby should be commended for his actions.

## SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 1211—Assignment of Allied Naval Personnel to Submarine Safety Programs

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to assign military personnel from NATO countries and other countries, including Australia, Sweden, South Korea, and Japan, to United States commands for the purpose of working on the standardization, development, and interoperability of submarine safety and rescue systems and procedures. The Department of Defense requested authority to assign foreign naval personnel to the International Submarine Escape and Rescue Liaison Office within Allied Submarine Command.

### Section 1212—Expansion of Entities of the People's Republic of China Subject to Certain Presidential Authorities when Operating in the United States

This section would expand the definition of a "Communist Chinese military company" as defined in the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261), to include Chinese firms owned or operated by a ministry of the People's Republic of China or an entity affiliated with the defense industrial base of the People's Republic of China, such as the China State Shipbuilding Corporation or the China Overseas Ship-

ping Corporation. Existing law only applies the definition to entities owned or operated by the People's Liberation Army, thereby excluding a class of firms engaged in Chinese military modernization.

### Section 1213—Report by President on Global Peace Operations Initiative

This section would require the President to report to Congress on the Global Peace Operations Initiative, a new program announced by the administration after the submission of the budget request.

On April 29, 2004, administration officials briefed committee staff on the Global Peace Operations Initiative. In general, the initiative is a joint venture between the Department of Defense and the Department of State to train and equip roughly 75,000 foreign military personnel in peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations over five years. The administration further proposed legislative authority for the Department of Defense to spend up to $100 million in operations and maintenance funding on training foreign military forces, either by transferring those funds to the Department of State or conducting the training itself. Over the next five years, the administration estimated that the total cost of the initiative would be $606 million and that the Department of Defense would be responsible for roughly eighty percent of the total. However, the administration did not request those funds for the Department of Defense in the fiscal year 2005 budget request and that they are not currently programmed in the five-year defense plan.

In general, the committee supports the goals of the Global Peace Operations Initiative. However, it is concerned about the process by which the administration seeks to fund the program and move it forward. Historically, the Department of State has trained and equipped foreign military forces for the United States under title 22 of the U.S. Code, which restricts the kinds of training that can be provided and the countries to which it can be provided in order to ensure that such activities are consistent with U.S. human rights practices and foreign policy. In this case, however, the administration proposed exempting the Global Peace Operations Initiative from those legal constraints and requested authority to use Department of Defense funding intended to pay for the operations and maintenance of U.S. forces. As a result, any use of the authority could mean depriving U.S. forces of the resources that the administration had requested, and which Congress had authorized and appropriated, for their operations and maintenance. Therefore, the committee recommends against granting the authority requested. Instead, it recommends a provision that would seek additional information on the Global Peace Operations Initiative.

### Section 1214—Procurement Sanctions against Foreign Persons that Transfer Certain Defense Articles and Services to the People's Republic of China

This section would make it the policy of the United States to prevent destabilizing arms transfers to the People's Republic of China by denying Department of Defense procurement contracts to foreign companies that sell China items similar to those found on the

U.S. Munitions List. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to publish a list of such companies in the Federal Register.

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

## OVERVIEW

The budget request included $409.2 million for Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs with the states of the former Soviet Union for fiscal year 2005. This is $41.6 million less than requested for fiscal year 2004 and $39.4 million less than was appropriated for fiscal year 2004. The funding request breaks out as follows: $58.5 million for strategic offensive arms elimination in Russia; $48.7 million for nuclear weapons storage security in Russia; $26.2 million for nuclear weapons transportation security in Russia; $158.4 million for chemical weapons destruction in Russia; $55.0 million for biological weapons proliferation prevention in the states of the former Soviet Union; $40.0 million for weapons of mass destruction proliferation prevention in the states of the former Soviet Union; $8.0 million for defense and military contacts; and, $14.3 million for activities designated as Other Assessments/Administrative Support. Programmatic funding levels are generally consistent with those requested in fiscal year 2004 with one notable exception. The request for chemical weapons destruction in Russia is $41.9 million less than requested and appropriated for fiscal year 2004. According to the Department of Defense, the decrease in funding reflects the state of construction at the Russian chemical weapons dismantlement facility in Shchuch'ye.

The committee continues to support the goals of the Cooperative Threat Reduction program and recommends funding at the levels requested. In particular, it notes the positive steps being taken to improve oversight of the program within the Department, such as beginning the process of identifying and deploying on-site managers to improve project oversight within states of the former Soviet Union and increased reporting as required in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). The Department took the additional step of making officials within the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (OUSD/AT&L) responsible for oversight of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs. As a result, OUSD/AT&L established cost, schedule, and performance baselines, a milestone decision authority process, and a phased approach to project implementation that have long been lacking in CTR programs, and to which most acquisition programs are routinely subjected. Together, these efforts address many of the shortcomings that the committee identified and worked to address during the 1990s.

The committee further applauds the steps that Cooperative Threat Reduction partners have taken to increase their commitment of resources to the goals of the program. In particular, the committee notes increases in Russian funding for chemical weapons destruction from 2001 to 2002 and the President's December 6, 2003, certification that Russia would spend at least $33.0 million on the Shchuch'ye project in 2003. Additionally, during 2003, Rus-

sia took proactive steps to improve chemical weapons destruction by concluding in March 2003 a legally binding agreement to destroy all nerve agents at a single site, which it reaffirmed in a September 2003 amendment to the agreement. Together, these steps mark significant progress in meeting the conditions upon which Congress made continued assistance for the Shchuch'ye facility dependent. They also validate the committee's approach to funding CTR programs, in which the United States commitment is carefully matched to significant, concrete, and concurrent demonstrations of commitment by the respective CTR partner.

Despite the improvements discussed above, some Russian behavior continues to suggest that the Russian government does not place as high a priority on the goals of the Cooperative Threat Reduction program as the United States. First, Russia continues to modernize its strategic nuclear forces, suggesting it views modernizing its strategic arsenal as more important than securing and dismantling excess weapons of mass destruction inherited from the Soviet Union. At the end of 2003, for example, it deployed several new Topol-M intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). In contrast, the United States has not deployed a new ICBM in almost two decades. Second, questions remain about the completeness and accuracy of Russia's declarations regarding the size of the chemical weapons stockpile in Russia. While U.S. and Russian negotiators continue to discuss the problem, Russian officials have consistently rejected U.S. proposals intended to increase visibility into Russian chemical weapons stockpiles. Third, Russia has not developed a comprehensive and credible plan for destroying its stockpile of nerve agents. Such a plan is necessary to ensure that the value of U.S. expenditures on the Shchuch'ye chemical weapons dismantlement facility is fully realized.

As a result of these last two factors, the President cannot certify that Russia is in compliance with the preconditions for continuing U.S. CTR assistance in section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) as amended. Consequently, the President has again requested authority to waive those conditions.

## ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Visa Requirements

The committee is aware of concerns that efforts to tighten visa requirements after September 11, 2001 may have had the unintended consequence of hampering the effectiveness of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy nonproliferation programs by imposing delays in collaborative programs and complicating the international cooperation and coordination required. Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy submit a report no later than six months after the enactment of this Act, identifying the causes of any new delays and assessing the costs and benefits of various means by which those delays might be remedied.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would specify the kinds of programs to be funded under this title and authorize them at the level of the budget request. It would also make fiscal year 2005 Cooperative Threat Reduction funds available for three years.

### Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate fiscal year 2004 funding for various Cooperative Threat Reduction purposes and activities at the levels requested by the President.

### Section 1303—Temporary Authority to Waive Limitation on Funding for Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Russia

This section would extend for one year the President's authority to waive preconditions established in section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) for continuing certain Cooperative Threat Reduction programs. The President's current authority expires at the end of fiscal year 2004. The committee notes that Russia has made progress in meeting several of the aforementioned conditions and believes that the existence of those conditions serves as an incentive for further progress.

# TITLE XIV—EXPORT CONTROLS AND COUNTERPROLIFERATION MATTERS

## OVERVIEW

The committee agrees with the President that the nexus of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism is a critical threat facing the United States in the 21st century. The committee also agrees with the President's call on February 11, 2004 to strengthen export controls, both domestic and international, as a means of ensuring that terrorist groups and their state supporters are not able to acquire capabilities to design, develop, or employ weapons of mass destruction. In particular, it notes that proliferation networks have grown increasingly sophisticated at exploiting legitimate international trade to spread such capabilities. The network of Pakistani weapons scientist A.Q. Khan, for example, has been widely implicated in spreading nuclear technology to a number of countries of concern. At the same time, the committee notes the growing role of international consortia in producing advanced military capabilities. In general, certain exceptions in existing export control regimes were designed to govern state-to-state transactions, but are now being employed to facilitate international transactions among non-state actors. The committee is concerned that these two trends are beginning to intersect and that proliferation networks will begin to exploit loopholes in existing export control regimes to acquire dangerous capabilities. Therefore, the committee, in close cooperation with the Committee on International Relations, developed a series

of provisions intended to rationalize and harmonize export controls with the new international security environment.

Recognizing the importance of a multilateral approach, the committee also recommends provisions intended to assist other countries in improving their capacity to prevent proliferation networks from acquiring sensitive technology through illicit activities disguised as legitimate defense trade. These include domestic counterproliferation fellowships for foreign military and defense ministry personnel in order to improve their understanding and application of counterproliferation tools and an expansion of the Secretary of Defense's authority to provide assistance to existing programs by the U.S. Customs Bureau and Federal Bureau of Investigations to train foreign customs and law enforcement officials in the skills needed to stem the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Defense Technology Security Administration

The budget request included $20.5 million for the Defense Technology Security Administration (DTSA), which seeks to safeguard the United States and its allies by controlling and monitoring international technology transfers and preventing inappropriate technology transfers. The committee recommends $21.5 million in order to bolster the Administration's ability to prevent U.S. high technology from falling into the hands of potential adversaries.

### Defense Threat Reduction Agency

The budget request included $325.5 million for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) which seeks to reduce the threat of future weapons of mass destruction being employed against the United States and its allies. The committee supports the work of DTRA and recommends an increase of an additional $1.4 million to the Defense Threat Reduction Agency in order to strengthen and expand the existing federal effort to help foreign governments improve their export control performance through an export control data base currently used by some 18 countries in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. The committee recommends the funds be used to continue existing subscriptions of the export control database for foreign countries, supply the database to additional countries around the globe, provide education and training for its use worldwide, enhance the quality and utility of the database by expanding its coverage of weapons of mass destruction information, and perform related research and public education initiatives on export control policy.

### Nonproliferation Education

The committee notes that the next Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) review conference will be held in 2005, and will come at a time of heightened concern over the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The committee welcomes the important steps taken by the Administration to enhance current U.S. counter and non-proliferation efforts, including the four proposals offered by the President on February 11, 2004:

(1) Expansion of the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) to go beyond shipments and transfers, to increase collaboration between intelligence, law enforcement, and military agencies to target and shut down weapons traffickers, WMD suppliers, their labs, and buyers;

(2) Strengthened laws and international controls governing proliferation, including a new Security Council resolution requiring all states to criminalize proliferation, enact strict export controls, and secure all sensitive materials within their borders;

(3) Expansion of U.S. Nunn-Lugar efforts, where the President noted great success since 1991 but also added, "We have more work to do there;" and

(4) Elimination of a Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty loophole that has been exploited by nations such as North Korea and Iran, which have been allowed to produce nuclear material that can be used to build bombs under the cover of civilian nuclear programs.

The committee believes that increased attention to proliferation concerns provides an opportunity to stimulate and encourage new entrants into nonproliferation and international security careers, and a chance to increase public understanding of the national and international security ramifications of the NPT and other efforts to stem WMD proliferation. The committee commends efforts by universities and other non-government organizations to broaden awareness of these critical issues, and believes that efforts to encourage the study of nonproliferation and international security issues are a welcome addition to postsecondary educational curricula.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—EXPORT CONTROLS

#### Section 1401—Definitions under Arms Export Control Act

This section would clarify the definitions of "license," "agent," and "exporting agent" as they are applied under the Arms Export Control Act (Public Law 90–629). Currently, such terms are not defined. The definition of "license" would require it to be in written form. While current regulations require licenses to be in writing, the Department of State recently unilaterally issued a "verbal" license to approve the export of military guidance and sensor chips to the People's Republic of China (PRC), at a time when such items are normally prohibited for sale to the PRC. The chips were embedded in a commercial aircraft sale, but can be used in missile guidance systems. The Department of State's explanation for this significant departure from normal practice—that weather conditions in Washington, DC precluded the timely issuance of a written license—is not acceptable given the sensitivity of the technology involved.

The definition of "agent" would ensure that persons covered by the definition are in fact empowered by their governments to act as emissaries of those governments in some capacity. Restrictions on the transfer of exported goods generally limit such transfers among those governments or their agents. However, several Euro-

pean states have begun to re-interpret "agents" to mean representatives of a commercial firm within their borders. This looser definition effectively creates a loophole in which exports to certain countries could be approved with the expectation that the only individuals who have access to those exports are government officials, but in which access is considerably broader. The committee believes this change is necessary to ensure that advanced technology entrusted to foreign governments continues to be controlled with the care that has historically been afforded to it.

The definition of "exporting agent" means the freight forwarder or consignee as designated on a license application and authorized to act on behalf of the license applicant.

### Section 1402—Exemption from Licensing Requirements for Export of Significant Military Equipment

This section would prohibit the President from creating regulatory exemptions for significant military equipment that would otherwise require an export license. Section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794) defines "significant military equipment" as articles for which special export controls are warranted and are identified on the United States Munitions List. As a practical matter, this limitation would result in little change from current practice. However, the Department of State recently proposed exempting a class of significant military equipment from the requirement to obtain a license, raising concerns about setting precedents for the license-free export of major combat systems. This section would inoculate the U.S. Government from pressures to export those systems without first giving such exports the added scrutiny and safeguards inherent in the licensing process.

### Section 1403—Cooperative Projects with Friendly Foreign Countries

This section would create a process by which Congress has an opportunity to reject a cooperative project proposal it currently receives under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2767). Similar procedures already exist for commercial and military exports undertaken under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776). This section would also ensure that commercial exports embedded in an international cooperative project will require a license under Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act governing commercial arms exports. Historically, cooperative projects with friendly foreign countries were conducted as government-to-government activities. However, in recent years, such projects have increasingly included corporate entities and accorded them growing authority in making project decisions, outside of the normal licensing process. As the United States makes increasing use of such projects in the research, development, and acquisition process, the committee is concerned that controls on the exports of sensitive military technologies are being inadvertently loosened in order streamline the project's execution. It is concerned that this process may take place without regard to the need to ensure sensitive military capabilities do not fall into the hands of potential adversaries or terrorist groups. By aligning the Congressional review process on cooperative projects with the review process on commercial arms exports

and requiring a license for commercial entities embedded in a cooperative project, this section would ensure that security interests continue to predominate in such projects.

### Section 1404—Licensing Requirement for Export of Militarily Critical Technologies

This section would require the President to require exporters of militarily critical technologies to obtain an export license for the export or re-export of any item on the Militarily Critical Technologies List published by the Department of Defense (DOD). The Export Administration Act of 1979 established process for licensing import or export of dual-use technologies. It also required the Department of Defense to prepare a Militarily Critical Technologies List (MCTL). The Departments of Defense and Commerce are expected to integrate the MCTL into the list of dual-use goods and technologies that require a license to export under the Export Administration Act.

However, in recent years, concerns have been raised that MCTL goods were not being appropriately controlled. Section 1211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) requires DOD to prepare a report on technologies needed to ensure U.S. military superiority and identify whether those items were controlled under any export control regime. That report was delivered on March 5, 2004 and identified several technologies that are not controlled under the Export Administration Regulations or the Arms Export Control Act, including, among others,: (1) Amorphous Silicon Focal Plane Arrays used in Night Vision Devices; (2) UAV kits to convert civil aircraft; (3) Precision Approach Radars containing electronically scanned arrays (useful in EW); (4) Surveillance Direction Finders; (5) GPS receivers with interference protection; and, (6) High-Precision, Multi-Axis Job Grinders, a machine tool used to make missile guidance components. These systems fall into categories identified on the MCTL, confirming that such technologies are not adequately controlled. This section would continue to allow exports of such militarily critical technologies, but would ensure that the exports remain consistent with national security.

### Section 1405—Control of Exports of United States Weapons Technology to the People's Republic of China

This section would prohibit the export of certain technologies to individuals or countries engaged in the sale of such items to the security services of the People's Republic of China unless certain conditions are met. Such conditions would require that a license was approved for that export, the Secretary of Defense concurs in the export, and the foreign person or country agrees in writing not to transfer title, possession of, or otherwise provide access to that item without prior, written, consent by the President.

The committee is concerned by reports that military trade embargos imposed on the People's Republic of China after the Tiananmen Square massacre might be weakened or discontinued. The committee is also concerned that the weakening of such restrictions would send the wrong message about the importance of respecting human rights, undermine international controls in-

tended to prevent the proliferation of sensitive dual-use and military technology, and exacerbate a serious military imbalance in Asia.

### Section 1406—Strengthening International Export Controls

This section would make it the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiations to strengthen the international export control system for arms and militarily-sensitive goods and technologies to countries of concern. It requires a Presidential report on progress made in strengthening international controls 180 days after enactment and every six months thereafter.

## SUBTITLE B—COUNTERPROLIFERATION MATTERS

### Section 1411—Defense International Counterproliferation Programs

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to expand existing programs to train foreign border and law enforcement officials in preventing the illicit transfer of weapons of mass destruction in the states of the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and the Baltic states, by granting the Secretary authority to conduct those programs in any other country in which the Secretary determines a significant threat exists. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337) established a joint program between the Department of Defense and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to conduct training of law enforcement officials in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to deter, interdict, and counter any organized crime involvement in the illegal acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) established a joint program between the Department of Defense and the United States Customs Service to assist customs and border guard entities in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to prevent the unauthorized transfer and transportation of weapons of mass destruction and related material.

### Section 1412—Defense Counterproliferation Fellowship Program

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a fellowship program to train and educate foreign defense policymakers and military officers in identifying and using counterproliferation tools to combat the spread of weapons of mass destruction. It would further direct the Secretary to establish a domestic fellowship program for the purposes of improving the Department of Defense's ability to exploit non-government expertise in combating the spread of weapons of mass destruction. The President has identified the nexus among terrorists, weapons of mass destruction, and rogue states as a critical threat to United States national security. Nonproliferation and counterproliferation tools, such as export controls and the Proliferation Security Initiative, can play a vital role in containing that threat worldwide.

## SUBTITLE C—INITIATIVES RELATING TO COUNTRIES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

### Section 1421—Silk Road Initiative

This section would make it the policy of the United States to establish and promote programs to prevent the proliferation from former Soviet scientists, engineers, and technicians of the expertise useful to the development of weapons of mass destruction. It further authorizes the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program known as the Silk Road Initiative to promote employment in the former Soviet republics in the Caucasus and Central Asia. It encourages the Secretary to begin a pilot program in the Republic of Georgia and authorizes the Secretary to spend up to $10.0 million on the program from within funds available for nonproliferation and international security in fiscal year 2005.

### Section 1422—Teller-Kurchatov Nonproliferation Fellowships

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to conduct a fellowship program in which an American scientist serves as a fellow at the Kurchatov Institute in Russia and a Russian scientist to serve as a fellow in the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. It authorizes the Secretary to spend up to $10.0 million on the program from within funds available for nonproliferation and international security in fiscal year 2005.

### Section 1423—Collaboration to Reduce the Risks of a Launch of Russian Nuclear Weapons

This section finds that certain limitations of the Russian nuclear command and control system raise concerns about the prospects for an accidental or unauthorized launch of Russian strategic ballistic missiles. It directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress no later than November 1, 2005 on steps that might be taken to reduce that danger, including an assessment of the risks and opportunities associated with taking those steps.

# TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION FOR INCREASED COSTS DUE TO OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

## OVERVIEW

The committee recommends authorization of $25 billion in funds to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 to support the defense activities principally associated with Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom and the global war on terrorism. These funds are designated for emergency contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to H. Con. Res. 393, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2004 and 2006 though 2009, as passed by the House of Representatives on March 25, 2004.

The increase in insurgent and terrorist action during the period preceding the return of sovereignty to the Iraqi government has increased the cost of operations. The committee believes that it is es-

sential to recognize the change in operational level and ensure full funding is available to support U.S. troops and their needs.

## SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATION

The following table provides a summary of the committee's authorization of funds for this purpose by appropriations account.

Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

| PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Committee Recommendation | Budget Authority Implication of Recommendation |
|---|---|---|
| **PROCUREMENT** | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | | |
| Aviation Combat Loss Replacement | 498,300 | 498,300 |
| Total Aircraft Procurement, Army | 498,300 | 498,300 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | | |
| Javelin, Modularity | 42,800 | 42,800 |
| Total Missile Procurement, Army | 42,800 | 42,800 |
| Weapons and Tracked Vehicles Procurement, Army | | |
| XM-8 Assault Weapon, Modularity | 25,900 | 25,900 |
| Rapid Fielding Initiative | 166,600 | 166,600 |
| Weapons and Tracked Vehicles Procurement, Modularity | 9,400 | 9,400 |
| Total Weapons and Tracked Vehicles Procurement, Army | 201,900 | 201,900 |
| Ammunition Procurement, Army | | |
| Small Arms Ammunition, Modularity | 78,750 | 78,750 |
| Total Ammunition Procurement, Army | 78,750 | 78,750 |
| National Guard and Reserve Equipment, Army | | |
| Equipment for Deployment to OIF/OEF | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Total for National Guard and Reserve Equipment, Army | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Other Procurement, Army | | |
| Shadow TUAV, Force Protection | 125,200 | 125,200 |
| M1114 Up-Armor HMMWV, Force Protection | 704,700 | 704,700 |
| Vehicle Bolt-on Armor and Emerging Requirements | 332,400 | 332,400 |
| Rapid Fielding Initiative | 130,800 | 130,800 |
| Other Procurement, Modularity | 249,200 | 249,200 |
| Trucks Combat Loss Replacement | 25,110 | 25,110 |
| Total Other Procurement, Army | 1,567,410 | 1,567,410 |
| Ammunition Procurement, Marine Corps | | |
| Unfunded Requirements | 38,402 | 38,402 |
| Total Ammunition Procurement, Marine Corps | 38,402 | 38,402 |
| General Procurement, Marine Corps | | |
| Shadow TUAV | 46,680 | 46,680 |
| Silver Fox UAV | 6,110 | 6,110 |
| Unfunded Requirements | 45,400 | 45,400 |
| Total General Procurement, Marine Corps | 98,190 | 98,190 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | | |
| Predator A, Force Protection | 99,000 | 99,000 |
| Total Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 99,000 | 99,000 |
| Procurement, Defense-wide | | |
| SOCOM Unfunded Requirements | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| Other Programs | 660,000 | 660,000 |
| Total Procurement, Defense-wide | 720,000 | 720,000 |
| Total Procurement | 3,394,752 | 3,394,752 |

Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

| PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2005 Committee Recommendation | Budget Authority Implication of Recommendation |
|---|---|---|
| **OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE** | | |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army | | |
| Incremental wartime costs | 8,505,763 | 8,505,763 |
| Costs associated with active end strength increase | 260,000 | 260,000 |
| Depot Maintenance | 205,250 | 205,250 |
| Rapid Fielding Initiative | 219,700 | 219,700 |
| Interceptor Body Armor | 295,000 | 295,000 |
| Interceptor Body Armor Deltoid & Auxiliary Protection | 90,000 | 90,000 |
| Modularity (OPTEMPO) | 31,400 | 31,400 |
| Total Operations and Maintenance, Army | 9,607,113 | 9,607,113 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy | | |
| Incremental wartime costs | 180,500 | 180,500 |
| Depot maintenance | 76,000 | 76,000 |
| Total Operations and Maintenance, Navy | 256,500 | 256,500 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps | | |
| Incremental wartime costs | 2,301,860 | 2,301,860 |
| Costs associated with active end strength increase | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Depot Maintenance | 26,875 | 26,875 |
| Initial Issue | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| Total Operations and Maintenance, Marine Corps | 2,398,735 | 2,398,735 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force | | |
| Incremental wartime costs | 1,515,000 | 1,515,000 |
| Depot Maintenance | 76,000 | 76,000 |
| Interceptor Body Armor | 44,000 | 44,000 |
| Total Operations and Maintenance, Air Force | 1,635,000 | 1,635,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide | | |
| Incremental wartime costs | 663,900 | 663,900 |
| Army active end strength increase | 44,000 | 44,000 |
| Marine Corps active end strength increase | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Technical Support Working Group | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| Other Programs | 1,540,000 | 1,540,000 |
| Total Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide | 2,327,900 | 2,327,900 |
| Total Operations and Maintenance | 16,225,248 | 16,225,248 |
| Defense Health Program | | |
| Army active end strength increase | 59,000 | 59,000 |
| Marine Corps active end strength increase | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| Total Defense Health Program | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL** | | |
| Military Personnel | | |
| Incremental wartime costs | 4,400,000 | 4,400,000 |
| Army active end strength increase | 605,000 | 605,000 |
| Marine Corps active end strength increase | 159,000 | 159,000 |
| Extension of Imminent Danger Pay | 86,000 | 86,000 |
| Extension of Family Separation Allowance | 55,000 | 55,000 |
| Total Military Personnel | 5,305,000 | 5,305,000 |
| Total Department of Defense (051) | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 |

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Procurement

It is the highest priority of the committee that our troops be supported with the equipment necessary to successfully accomplish their missions in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom and the global war on terrorism. The committee recommends authorization for procurement to support force protection, the rapid fielding initiative for basic infantry combat equipment, combat losses of essential equipment, the Army's modularity initiative, and essential combat related unfunded requirements of our armed forces.

The committee's recommendations for procurement in this title include full support of the force protection needs of our units. Included in the force protection recommendation is full funding for the Up Armor High Mobilility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV); bolt-on ballistic armor for HMMWVs and trucks; and Interceptor Body Armor (IBA), including funding for add-on protection for the shoulder and side body areas. Intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) are important elements of force protection and are critical to interdict, disrupt, and defeat the insurgent and terrorist threat. Therefore, this title also includes authorization to procure unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) that are currently in production to provide these UAV assets to the units in theater in sufficient quantity to meet both their operational and ISR requirements.

The committee fully supports the Army's efforts to transform the structure of its divisions into smaller organizations to create additional combat relevant units. This reorganization known as "modularity" will contribute to the reduction of stress on our troops due to the high operational tempo of operations in southwest Asia. This title authorizes an aggressive down payment for the equipment costs of both modularity and the rapid fielding initiative as displayed in the Army unfunded requirements list so that every infantry soldier has the equipment necessary to perform their mission.

This title also provides authorization for the combat related, unfunded equipment requirements of the Marine Corp and Army as submitted by the service chiefs in February and March 2004 and to replace combat losses in aviation and other equipment.

### Operations and Maintenance

The military departments and defense agencies need operations and maintenance (O&M) funds to pay for food, fuel, spare parts, maintenance, transportation, camp, post, and base expenses that have risen dramatically as a result of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). Much of these expenses are captured in the O&M funding for operating tempo. This cost is significant. Without additional funding at the start of fiscal year 2005, the military departments will be forced to use third and fourth quarter O&M funds in the initial months of fiscal year 2005 to pay for OIF and OEF costs. This presents significant accounting and budgetary hurdles and alters the ability to plan properly for the entire year. The committee, therefore, believes that O&M war-

related costs should be funded prior to the start of the fiscal year. In addition, the committee is funding critical equipment for the Iraq and Afghanistan theater that will improve our troops' welfare and combat effectiveness. The committee believes that these items should be funded immediately.

Military Personnel

The committee long has advocated for increases in active component manpower to sustain the full range of capabilities required of and missions assigned to the Armed Forces. Thus the committee recommended in the National Defense Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 2003 and 2004 increases of 10,350 and 6,240 respectively in active component manpower above the budget requests.

More recently, the Army Chief of Staff announced a plan for a temporary increase of 30,000 in the Army's active component end strength, not only to improve its ability to meet the full range of its worldwide missions, but also to increase its current active combat capability from 33 brigades to 43–48 brigades. To support the Army's need, the committee recommends in this title a cumulative active component increase of 30,000 (to an end strength of 512,400), in increments of 10,000 each in fiscal years 2005 through 2007. The committee would also temporarily adjust the minimum end strength floors to reflect the increases in authorized end strength.

To ensure the Marine Corps can continue to provide and sustain the force levels required of it by the national security strategy, the committee recommends in this title a cumulative active component Marine Corps increase of 9,000 (to and end strength of 184,000), in increments of 3,000 each in fiscal years 2005 through 2007. The committee would also adjust the minimum end strength floors to reflect the increases in authorized end strength.

The committee recommends an additional $1,179 million for military personnel, operations and maintenance to fund the additional Army and Marine Corps active component manpower in fiscal year 2005. To fund increased Army and Marine Corps manpower in fiscal years 2006 and beyond, the committee recommends that starting in fiscal year 2006 the Secretary of the Treasury would assume the requirement for the annual payment to the Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund that is now made by the Secretary of Defense. The committee expects that the Secretary of Defense will use the resulting funding flexibility to fully fund the costs of the Army transformation efforts and Marine Corps end strength growth in fiscal year 2006 and beyond.

To address the concerns of the Secretary of Defense and the Chief of Staff of the Army that end strength increases should not be made permanent, the committee's recommendation provides for only temporary end strength growth through the end of fiscal year 2007—the point at which Army leadership has indicated it will be in a better position to assess future manning levels. Furthermore, this committee recommendation would require that if the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army, or the Secretary of the Navy, believes changes should be made to the strength levels authorized by this title, then those changes must be provided to the committee prior to the submission of the budget request for any fiscal year.

Finally, to provide for the active component and reserve component military manpower deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan for the first quarter of fiscal year 2005, the committee would authorize $4.4 billion. In addition, the committee would also authorize $141 million to extend the authority of the Department of Defense to continue paying higher levels of family separation allowance and imminent danger pay.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 1501—Purpose

This section would establish this title as an authorization of appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide funds for additional costs due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

### Section 1511—Army Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $2,439.2 million for fiscal year 2005 Army procurement.

### Section 1512—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $136.6 million for fiscal year 2005 Navy and Marine Corps procurement.

### Section 1513—Air Force Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $99.0 million for fiscal year 2005 Air Force procurement.

### Section 1514—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $720.0 million for fiscal year 2005 Defense-Wide Activities procurement.

### Section 1515—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize an additional $16,225.2 million for fiscal year 2005 operation and maintenance programs.

### Section 1516—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize $75.0 million to be appropriated to the Defense Health Program (DHP) for operations and maintenance for fiscal year 2005.

### Section 1517—Military Personnel

This section would authorize $5,305.0 million to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for military personnel for fiscal year 2005.

### Section 1518—Treatment as Additional Authorization

This section would authorize an additional $25 billion for emergency contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism to the amounts otherwise authorized in this Act.

### Section 1519—Transfer Authority

This section would provide fiscal year 2005 transfer authority of $2.5 billion to the Department of Defense for the authorizations contained in this title.

### Section 1520—Designation of Emergency Authorization

This section would authorize $25 billion for fiscal year 2005 to support emergency contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism.

## SUBTITLE B—PERSONNEL PROVISIONS

### Section 1531—Three Year Increase in Active Army Strength Levels

This section would increase the active Army end strength authorized for fiscal year 2005 by 10,000 above the authorization contained in section 401. This section would also authorize active Army end strengths for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 of 502,400 and 512,400 respectively. This section would establish temporary new minimum active duty end strengths for the Army as of September 30, 2005, 2006 and 2007 respectively. These changes in minimum strengths reflect the committee's recommendations for Army end strength provided by this section. The section would also direct that if the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, determines that adjustments are necessary to the minimum end strength levels, then the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report of his recommendations and rationale for change to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services prior to the submission of the budget request for the fiscal year in which the change would be effective.

### Section 1532—Three Year Increase in Active Marine Corps Strength Levels

This section would increase the United States Marine Corps active end strength authorized for fiscal year 2005 by 3,000 above the authorization contained in section 401. This section would also authorize U.S. Marine Corps active end strengths for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 of 181,000 and 184,000 respectively. This section would establish temporary new minimum active duty end strengths for the Marine Corps as of September 30, 2005, 2006 and 2007 respectively. These changes in minimum strengths reflect the committee's recommendations for Marine Corps active end strength provided by this section. The section would also direct that if the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, determines that adjustments are necessary to the minimum end strength levels, then the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report of his recommendations and rationale for change to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on

Armed Services prior to the submission of the budget request for the fiscal year in which the change would be effective.

Section 1533—Extension of Increased Rates for Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance

This section would make permanent the increase in the rate of imminent danger pay from $150 per month to $225 per month and the increase in the rate of family separation allowance from $100 per month to $250 per month.

Subtitle C—Financial Management Matters

Section 1541—Revised Funding Methodology for Military Retiree Health Care Benefits

This section would revise the process for funding the annual payments that are required to be paid into the Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund. Beginning in fiscal year 2006, the Secretary of the Treasury would make the annual payments from the general fund of the Treasury. Under current law the Secretary of Defense, as well as the secretaries of the other departments whose beneficiaries participate in the TRICARE for Life program, make these annual payments.

# DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

## PURPOSE

Division B provides military construction and related authorities in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2005. As recommended by the committee, Division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $9,930,475,000 for construction in support of the active forces, reserve components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2005.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense (DOD) requested $5,308,879,000 for military construction and $4,171,596,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $5,778,709,000 for military construction and $4,151,766,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2005. The committee's recommendations are consistent with a total budget authority level of $9,930,475,000 for military construction and family housing in fiscal year 2005.

The committee's recommendation to increase the budget request for military construction and family housing reflects continued concern about the state of DOD infrastructure. Every Congress for the past decade has acted on similar concerns by adding funds to military construction and family housing budgets. This historic trend is a clear indication that the annual budget requests for DOD infrastructure and facilities are routinely inadequate.

Of additional concern is the fact that the fiscal year 2005 budget request for military construction and family housing includes less

funding than the fiscal year 2004 program, as enacted. Furthermore, the fiscal year 2005 request for these programs is nearly $1,400,000,000 smaller than was forecast in the fiscal year 2004 budget. Finally, the forecasted total for military construction over the fiscal year 2005 Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) is $6,000,000,000 less than the amounts forecasted in the fiscal year 2004 FYDP.

Unless these forecasted increases become reality, the Department will not be able to meet its current facilities needs, nor will it be able to meet the substantial facilities requirements associated with Army transformation, increased Army force structure, and the Global Posture Review. Considering the importance of facilities and infrastructure to military readiness, quality of life, retention, and operational capabilities, the committee urges the Department to ensure that future military construction and family housing budget requests are properly resourced.

With regard to maintenance, repair, and sustainment of facilities, the committee applauds the Department for implementing a legitimate model for determining sustainment budgets. However, the Department does not have an effective model for base operations, repair, and modernization budgets. As a result, these accounts continue to be funded at levels that do not support "must pay" bills for utilities and critical base services. While operations, maintenance, and repair budgets are primarily funded in title III of this Act, funding shortfalls in these areas directly affect the condition, usability, and lifespan of military facilities and family housing projects funded in Division B. Therefore, the committee urges the Department to fully fund facilities-related budgets, including military construction, family housing, base operations, sustainment, restoration, and maintenance programs.

Finally, the Department continues to develop the Global Posture Review, a comprehensive review and restructuring of the Department's overseas basing strategy. While the Department has provided Congress glimpses of parts of the review, it has not yet finalized its overseas basing decisions, nor has it provided Congress with a complete picture of its plans.

While this would be troubling in any year, the committee is particularly concerned that the review, which is expected to return significant numbers of overseas-based military personnel to the United States, will not be finalized until the base closure process is well under way. As a result, Congress will not have the opportunity to review and validate the Department's overseas basing decisions before they are implemented through the base closure process. Furthermore, the Department is in the midst of several additional evolving efforts that are likely to have significant effects on the infrastructure requirements of the military services, including force transformation and changes in endstrength related to the active and reserve personnel mix of the services. Therefore, the committee has included provisions in Division B to ensure that the Department presents Congress with a complete plan of future infrastructure requirements before proceeding with the base closure process.

A tabular summary of the authorizations provided in Division B for fiscal year 2005 follows:

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVIII - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING
(Dollars in Thousands)

| | Authorization Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Military Construction** | | | |
| Military Construction, Army | 1,771,285 | 94,924 | 1,866,209 |
| Military Construction, Navy | 1,060,455 | 17,407 | 1,077,862 |
| Military Construction, Air Force | 663,964 | 128,090 | 792,054 |
| Military Construction, Defense-Wide | 699,437 | 9,500 | 708,937 |
| Chemical Demilitarization Construction | 81,886 | 0 | 81,886 |
| NATO Security Investment Program | 165,800 | 0 | 165,800 |
| BRAC IV | 246,116 | 0 | 246,116 |
| Military Construction, Army National Guard | 295,657 | 97,568 | 393,225 |
| Military Construction, Air National Guard | 127,368 | 57,252 | 184,620 |
| Military Construction, Army Reserve | 87,070 | 29,885 | 116,955 |
| Military Construction, Naval and Marine Corps Reserve | 25,285 | 5,670 | 30,955 |
| Military Construction, Air Force Reserve | 84,556 | 29,534 | 114,090 |
| **Total Military Construction** | **5,308,879** | **469,830** | **5,778,709** |
| | | | |
| **Family Housing** | | | |
| Family Housing Construction, Army | 636,099 | 0 | 636,099 |
| Family Housing Support, Army | 928,907 | (2,400) | 926,507 |
| Family Housing Construction, Navy | 139,107 | 0 | 139,107 |
| Family Housing Support, Navy | 704,504 | (8,200) | 696,304 |
| Family Housing Construction, Air Force | 846,959 | 0 | 846,959 |
| Family Housing Support, Air Force | 863,896 | (9,230) | 854,666 |
| Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide | 49 | 0 | 49 |
| Family Housing Support, Defense-Wide | 49,575 | 0 | 49,575 |
| Family Housing Improvement Fund | 2,500 | 0 | 2,500 |
| **Total Family Housing** | **4,171,596** | **(19,830)** | **4,151,766** |
| | | | |
| **Total Military Construction and Family Housing** | **9,480,475** | **450,000** | **9,930,475** |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Alabama | Army | Anniston AD | Powertrain Component Rebuilding Facility | 23,690 | | 23,690 |
| 2 | Alabama | MDA | Huntsville | MDA Center, Von Braun Complex, Phase 2 | 19,560 | | 19,560 |
| 3 | Alabama | Army National Guard | ARNGRC Centreville | Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS) | 5,537 | | 5,537 |
| 4 | Alabama | Army National Guard | ARNGRC Clanton | Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS) | 3,649 | | 3,649 |
| 5 | Alabama | Army National Guard | ARNGRC Oneonta | Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS) | 4,527 | | 4,527 |
| 6 | Alabama | Army National Guard | Haleyville | Joint Armed Forces Reserve Center | | 13,849 | 13,849 |
| 7 | Alaska | Army | Ft Richardson | Barracks Complex | 7,600 | | 7,600 |
| 8 | Alaska | Army | Ft Richardson | Digital Multipurpose Training Range | 13,600 | | 13,600 |
| 9 | Alaska | Army | Ft Richardson | Sniper Field Fire Range | 3,100 | | 3,100 |
| 10 | Alaska | Army | Ft Wainwright | Barracks Complex - Lorraine Road | 39,815 | | 39,815 |
| 11 | Alaska | Army | Ft Wainwright | Barracks Complex Renewal-Santiago Road | 30,912 | | 30,912 |
| 12 | Alaska | Army | Ft Wainwright | Combined Arms Collective Training Facility | 21,732 | | 21,732 |
| 13 | Alaska | Air Force | Elmendorf AFB | C-17 Flight Simulator Facility | 7,700 | | 7,700 |
| 14 | Alaska | Air Force | Elmendorf AFB | C-17 Support Utilities | 6,400 | | 6,400 |
| 15 | Alaska | Air Force | Elmendorf AFB | Fitness Center | 11,957 | | 11,957 |
| 16 | Alaska | TMA | Ft Wainwright | Hospital Replacement, Phase 6 | - | | - |
| 17 | Arizona | Navy | MCAS Yuma | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters | 18,740 | | 18,740 |
| 18 | Arizona | Navy | MCAS Yuma | Station Ordnance Area | 7,930 | | 7,930 |
| 19 | Arizona | Air Force | Davis-Monthan AFB | Airfield Obstruction-Hazardous Cargo Pad | 4,243 | | 4,243 |
| 20 | Arizona | Air Force | Davis-Monthan AFB | CSAR C-130 Squadron Operations | 5,786 | | 5,786 |
| 21 | Arizona | Air Force | Davis-Monthan AFB | EC-130 Squadron Operations Facility | | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| 22 | Arizona | Air Force | Luke AFB | ATFP Litchfield Road Underpass and Entry Point Replacement | | 7,900 | 7,900 |
| 23 | Arizona | Air Force | Luke AFB | Dorm (120 Rm) | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| 24 | Arizona | Army National Guard | ARNG Camp Navajo | Qualification Training Range | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| 25 | Arkansas | Air Force | Little Rock AFB | C-130J ADAL Simulator Facility | 5,031 | | 5,031 |
| 26 | Arkansas | Air Force | Little Rock AFB | Child Development Center | | 3,900 | 3,900 |
| 27 | Arkansas | Army National Guard | Camp Robinson | Army Aviation Support Facility | 33,020 | | 33,020 |
| 28 | Arkansas | Army National Guard | Ft Chaffee | Ammunition Supply Point | 13,798 | | 13,798 |
| 29 | California | Army | Ft Irwin | CIDC Field Operations Building | 2,600 | | 2,600 |
| 30 | California | Army | Ft Irwin | Command and Control Facility | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| 31 | California | Army | Ft Irwin | Land Acquisition, Phase 2 | 14,500 | | 14,500 |
| 32 | California | Navy | MAGTFTC Twentynine Palms | Operational Training Center | | 15,700 | 15,700 |
| 33 | California | Navy | MCB Camp Pendleton | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, | 19,975 | | 19,975 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | California | Navy | MCB Camp Pendleton | Close Combat Battle Course | 6,940 | | 6,940 |
| 35 | California | Navy | MCB Camp Pendleton | Consolidated Operations Center | 4,910 | | 4,910 |
| 36 | California | Navy | MCB Camp Pendleton | Tertiary Sewage Treatment Plant, Increment 2 | 25,690 | | 25,690 |
| 37 | California | Navy | MCB Camp Pendleton | Weight Handling Shop | 6,630 | | 6,630 |
| 38 | California | Navy | MLB Barstow | Blasting Facility | | 4,930 | 4,930 |
| 39 | California | Navy | NAF El Centro | Apron & Hangar Recapitalization, Increment 1 | 33,331 | | 33,331 |
| 40 | California | Navy | NAS North Island | Base Main Gate and Entrance Street | | 10,180 | 10,180 |
| 41 | California | Navy | NSWC Division Corona | Warfare Assessment Laboratory Addition | | 9,850 | 9,850 |
| 42 | California | Air Force | Beale AFB | Global Hawk Add to Age Facility | 1,866 | | 1,866 |
| 43 | California | Air Force | Beale AFB | Global Hawk Upgrade Dock 2 | 8,320 | | 8,320 |
| 44 | California | Air Force | Edwards AFB | Addition/Renovate JSF Complex, Phase 2 | 9,965 | | 9,965 |
| 45 | California | Air Force | Travis AFB | Add C-17 Engine Storage Facility | 2,400 | | 2,400 |
| 46 | California | Air Force | Travis AFB | C-17 Utilities/Road | 12,844 | | 12,844 |
| 47 | California | Air Force | Travis AFB | Security Forces Armory/Combat Arms Campus | | 3,650 | 3,650 |
| 48 | California | DLA | Travis AFB | Replace Hydrant Fuel System | 15,100 | | 15,100 |
| 49 | California | Spec Ops | Corona | SOF MOUT Training Complex | 13,600 | | 13,600 |
| 50 | California | Spec Ops | NAS North Island | SOF Ground Mobility Support Building | 1,000 | | 1,000 |
| 51 | California | TMA | DLI (Presidio) | Dental Clinic | | 6,700 | 6,700 |
| 52 | California | Army National Guard | Camp Parks | Readiness Center (ADRS) | 11,318 | | 11,318 |
| 53 | California | Air Force Reserve | March ARB | Alter C-17 Hangar Tower | 2,089 | | 2,089 |
| 54 | California | Air Force Reserve | March ARB | C-17 Maintenance Hangar, Phase 2 | 7,400 | | 7,400 |
| 55 | Colorado | Army | Ft Carson | Arrival Departure Area Group Complex Ph 1a | | 12,400 | 12,400 |
| 56 | Colorado | Army | Ft Carson | Barracks Complex - Hospital Area | 14,108 | | 14,108 |
| 57 | Colorado | Army | Ft Carson | Digital Multipurpose Training Range | 33,000 | | 33,000 |
| 58 | Colorado | Air Force | Buckley AFB | Chapel Center | 6,147 | | 6,147 |
| 59 | Colorado | Air Force | Buckley AFB | Child Development Center | 6,100 | | 6,100 |
| 60 | Colorado | Army National Guard | ARNG Denver | Add/Alter Army Aviation Support Facility | 34,000 | | 34,000 |
| 61 | Colorado | Army National Guard | Ft Carson | Automated Qualification/Training Range | 3,205 | | 3,205 |
| 62 | Colorado | Army Reserve | Aurora | Add/Alter Military Equipment Parking | 1,758 | | 1,758 |
| 63 | Colorado | Chem DeMil | Pueblo AD | Ammunitions Demilitarization Facility, Phase 5 | 44,792 | | 44,792 |
| 64 | Colorado | TMA | Buckley AFB | Add/Alter Aeromedical Clinic | 2,100 | | 2,100 |
| 65 | Connecticut | Navy | NSB New London | Gates 3 and 5 Security Improvements | | 4,420 | 4,420 |
| 66 | Connecticut | Navy | NSB New London | MK-10 Submarine Escape Trainer | 17,100 | | 17,100 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 67 | Connecticut | Navy | NSB New London | Pier 6 Replacement | 28,782 | | 28,782 |
| 68 | Connecticut | Army National Guard | Southington | Readiness Center | | 4,087 | 4,087 |
| 69 | District of Columbia | Navy | Naval Observatory | Atomic Clock Vault | 3,239 | | 3,239 |
| 70 | District of Columbia | DIA | Bolling AFB | HVAC Upgrade to DIAC | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| 71 | Florida | Navy | Eglin AFB | Eglin Air Force Base Road Construction | 2,060 | | 2,060 |
| 72 | Florida | Navy | NS Mayport | Airfield Control Tower | 6,200 | | 6,200 |
| 73 | Florida | Air Force | Tyndall AFB | 1 AF Headquarters / AFFOR Center Ph 1 | | 10,200 | 10,200 |
| 74 | Florida | Air Force | Tyndall AFB | Addition F-22 Operations Facility | 1,548 | | 1,548 |
| 75 | Florida | Air Force | Tyndall AFB | F-22 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit/Hangar | 17,414 | | 17,414 |
| 76 | Florida | Spec Ops | Hurlburt Field | SOF Operations Training Facility | | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| 77 | Florida | TMA | Jacksonville | Add/Alter Hospital | 28,438 | | 28,438 |
| 78 | Florida | Army National Guard | Camp Blanding | Regional Training Institute, Phase 1 | | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| 79 | Florida | Air National Guard | Jacksonville Int Airport | F-15 Corrosion Control Facility | | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| 80 | Florida | Navy Reserve | Jacksonville | New Reserve Training Center | 9,300 | | 9,300 |
| 81 | Florida | Air Force Reserve | Homestead ARB | Visitor's Quarters, Ph 1 | | 6,570 | 6,570 |
| 82 | Georgia | Army | Ft Benning | Barracks Complex - Kelly Hill/Main Post | 49,565 | | 49,565 |
| 83 | Georgia | Army | Ft Benning | Hazardous Cargo Loading Apron | 3,850 | | 3,850 |
| 84 | Georgia | Army | Ft Benning | Physical Fitness Training Center | 18,362 | | 18,362 |
| 85 | Georgia | Army | Ft Benning | Revitalize Ranger Barracks 6012 | | 1,850 | 1,850 |
| 86 | Georgia | Army | Ft Gillem | Recruiting Brigade Operations Building | 5,800 | | 5,800 |
| 87 | Georgia | Army | Ft McPherson | Child Development Center | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| 88 | Georgia | Army | Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF | Aircraft Maintenance Hanger (SOF) | 21,100 | | 21,100 |
| 89 | Georgia | Army | Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF | Barracks Complex-5th & 16th St, Phase 2 | 32,950 | | 32,950 |
| 90 | Georgia | Army | Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF | Chapel | 9,500 | | 9,500 |
| 91 | Georgia | Army | Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF | Command and Control Facility | 24,695 | | 24,695 |
| 92 | Georgia | Army | Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF | Tactical Equipment Complex | 10,200 | | 10,200 |
| 93 | Georgia | Navy | SWFLANT Kings Bay | Enclave Fencing and Parking | 16,000 | | 16,000 |
| 94 | Georgia | Air Force | Moody AFB | Consolidated Base Support Center | | 9,600 | 9,600 |
| 95 | Georgia | Air Force | Robins AFB | Aircraft Ramp | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| 96 | Georgia | Spec Ops | Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF | SOF Battalion Operations Complex | 17,600 | | 17,600 |
| 97 | Georgia | TMA | Ft Benning | Consolidated Health Clinic | 7,100 | | 7,100 |
| 98 | Georgia | Army National Guard | Savannah | Army Aviation Support Facility | 16,554 | | 16,554 |
| 99 | Georgia | Air Force Reserve | Dobbins ARB | Upgrade Maintenance Bays | | 10,000 | 10,000 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 100 | Hawaii | Army | Helemano Mil. Res. | Drum Road Upgrade, Phase 1 | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| 101 | Hawaii | Army | Helemano Mil. Res. | Tank Trails - Helemano | 7,300 | | 7,300 |
| 102 | Hawaii | Army | Hickam AFB | Hot Cargo Pad Expansion | 11,200 | | 11,200 |
| 103 | Hawaii | Army | Pohakuloa | West PTA Modifications | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| 104 | Hawaii | Army | Schofield Barracks | Barracks Complex Renewal - Quad E, Phase 2 | 36,000 | | 36,000 |
| 105 | Hawaii | Army | Schofield Barracks | Barracks Complex Renewal-Capron Ave, Phase 3 | 48,000 | | 48,000 |
| 106 | Hawaii | Army | Schofield Barracks | Battle Area Live Fire Complex | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| 107 | Hawaii | Army | Schofield Barracks | Combined Arms Collective Training Facility | 32,542 | | 32,542 |
| 108 | Hawaii | Army | Schofield Barracks | Fire Station | 4,800 | | 4,800 |
| 109 | Hawaii | Army | Schofield Barracks | Qualification Training Range | 4,950 | | 4,950 |
| 110 | Hawaii | Army | Schofield Barracks | Tactical Vehicle Wash Facility | 3,500 | | 3,500 |
| 111 | Hawaii | Army | Schofield Barracks | Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Phase 1 | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| 112 | Hawaii | Army | Wheeler AAF | Deployment Facility | 24,000 | | 24,000 |
| 113 | Hawaii | Navy | NSY Pearl Harbor | Drydock 4 Shorepower Improvements | | 5,100 | 5,100 |
| 114 | Hawaii | Air Force | Hickam AFB | Alter C-17 Maintenance/Supply Areas | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| 115 | Hawaii | Air Force | Hickam AFB | C-17 Clear Water Rinse | 4,300 | | 4,300 |
| 116 | Hawaii | Air Force | Hickam AFB | C-17 Maintenance Shop Facility | 8,200 | | 8,200 |
| 117 | Hawaii | Air Force | Hickam AFB | C-17 Munitions Storage | 1,950 | | 1,950 |
| 118 | Hawaii | Air Force | Hickam AFB | C-17 Support Utilities, Phase 2 | 2,450 | | 2,450 |
| 119 | Hawaii | DLA | NS Pearl Harbor | Multi-Product Interface Tank | 3,500 | | 3,500 |
| 120 | Illinois | Navy | NTC Great Lakes | Battle Stations Training Facility, Increment 2 | 58,200 | | 58,200 |
| 121 | Illinois | Navy | RTC Great Lakes | RTC Barracks | 38,851 | | 38,851 |
| 122 | Illinois | Navy | RTC Great Lakes | RTC Barracks | 35,920 | | 35,920 |
| 123 | Illinois | Army National Guard | Galesburg | Readiness Center (ADRS) Phase 2 | | 4,400 | 4,400 |
| 124 | Illinois | Army National Guard | Springfield | Total Army School System (Multifunctional Facility) | 13,596 | | 13,596 |
| 125 | Indiana | Navy | NSWC Crane | COTS Product Assurance and Test Management Facility | | 10,580 | 10,580 |
| 126 | Indiana | Army National Guard | ARNGRC Remington | Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS) | 1,458 | | 1,458 |
| 127 | Iowa | Army National Guard | Camp Dodge | Company Grade BOQ | | 3,485 | 3,485 |
| 128 | Kansas | Army | Ft Leavenworth | Lewis & Clark Instructional Facility, Phase 2 | 44,000 | | 44,000 |
| 129 | Kansas | Army | Ft Riley | Barracks Complex Renewal | 41,000 | | 41,000 |
| 130 | Kansas | Army | Ft Riley | Communications Center | 3,050 | | 3,050 |
| 131 | Kansas | Army National Guard | Topeka | Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS) | 3,086 | | 3,086 |
| 132 | Kansas | Air National Guard | Forbes Field | Replace Operations and Training Complex | | 9,800 | 9,800 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 133 | Kansas | Army Reserve | ARC Hays | Army Reserve Center/Organization Maintenance Support | 7,451 | | 7,451 |
| 134 | Kansas | Army Reserve | New Century | AR Ctr / OMS / AMSA / Unh Storage | | 8,723 | 8,723 |
| 135 | Kentucky | Army | Ft Campbell | Barracks Complex-42nd St/Indiana Ave, Phase 1 | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| 136 | Kentucky | Army | Ft Campbell | Command and Control Facility | 33,000 | | 33,000 |
| 137 | Kentucky | Army | Ft Campbell | Shoot House | 1,600 | | 1,600 |
| 138 | Kentucky | Army | Ft Knox | Shoot House | | 1,850 | 1,850 |
| 139 | Kentucky | Army | Ft Knox | Trainee Barracks Basic Training Complex 1, Phase 1 | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| 140 | Kentucky | Chem DeMil | Blue Grass AD | Ammunitions Demilitarization Facility, Phase 5 | 37,094 | | 37,094 |
| 141 | Louisiana | Army | Ft Polk | Ammunition Supply Point Upgrade | 7,500 | | 7,500 |
| 142 | Louisiana | Army | Ft Polk | Fixed Wing Aircraft Parking Apron | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| 143 | Louisiana | Army | Ft Polk | Hazard Cargo Loading Apron | 14,503 | | 14,503 |
| 144 | Louisiana | Army | Ft Polk | Pallet Processing Facility | 8,800 | | 8,800 |
| 145 | Louisiana | Army | Ft Polk | Passenger Processing Facility | 11,700 | | 11,700 |
| 146 | Louisiana | Army | Ft Polk | Urban Assault Course | 3,450 | | 3,450 |
| 147 | Louisiana | Navy | JRB/NAS New Orleans | Child Development Center | | 3,450 | 3,450 |
| 148 | Louisiana | Navy | JRB/NAS New Orleans | Indoor Small Arms Range | | 2,580 | 2,580 |
| 149 | Louisiana | Air Force | Barksdale AFB | Dormitory (168 Rm) | 13,800 | | 13,800 |
| 150 | Louisiana | Army National Guard | Camp Beauregard | Army Aviation Support Facility | 15,738 | | 15,738 |
| 151 | Maryland | Army | Fort Detrick | Remote Truck Inspection Station | | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| 152 | Maryland | Navy | NSWC Indian Head | AGILE Chemical Facility | 13,900 | | 13,900 |
| 153 | Maryland | Navy | NSWC Indian Head | Joint Aircrew Escape Component Center | | 9,100 | 9,100 |
| 154 | Maryland | Air Force | Andrews AFB | ASA-Alter Aircraft Support Facilities | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| 155 | Maryland | Air Force | Andrews AFB | ASA-Fighter Aircraft Alert Complex | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| 156 | Maryland | Air Force | Andrews AFB | ASA-Munitions Storage Igloo | 1,100 | | 1,100 |
| 157 | Maryland | NSA | Ft Meade | Critical Communication Path | 3,450 | | 3,450 |
| 158 | Maryland | NSA | Ft Meade | NSA Deep Wells | 8,140 | | 8,140 |
| 159 | Maryland | NSA | Ft Meade | Reconfigured Chilled Water, Phase 2 | 3,417 | | 3,417 |
| 160 | Maryland | Army Reserve | Ft Meade | Army Reserve Center / OMS / Unheated Storage, Ph 2 | 14,642 | | 14,642 |
| 161 | Massachusetts | Air National Guard | Otis ANG Base | Eliminate Airfield Obstructions | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| 162 | Massachusetts | Air National Guard | Otis ANG Base | Replace Control Tower | | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| 163 | Michigan | Army National Guard | ARNG Grandledge | Army Aviation Support Facility | 27,600 | | 27,600 |
| 164 | Michigan | Air National Guard | Selfridge ANG Base | Visitors Center and ID Complex | | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| 165 | Michigan | Air National Guard | W.K. Kellogg | Fire Crash/Rescue Station | | 5,100 | 5,100 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 166 | Minnesota | Air National Guard | Duluth IAP (ANG) | ASA - Alert Crew Quarters | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| 167 | Minnesota | Air National Guard | Duluth IAP (ANG) | ASA- Arm, Dearm Apron and Taxiway | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| 168 | Minnesota | Air National Guard | Duluth IAP (ANG) | ASA- Relocate Base Entrance Road | 3,500 | | 3,500 |
| 169 | Minnesota | Air National Guard | Minneapolis - St Paul IAP ARS | Add/Alter Joint Use Physical Fitness Center | | 4,400 | 4,400 |
| 170 | Mississippi | Air Force | Columbus AFB | Fire Crash Rescue Station | | 7,700 | 7,700 |
| 171 | Mississippi | Army National Guard | Camp Shelby | MOUT Collective Training Facility (Small) | | 5,300 | 5,300 |
| 172 | Missouri | Army | Ft Leonard Wood | Mine Detection Dog Kennel | | 3,700 | 3,700 |
| 173 | Missouri | Army | Ft Leonard Wood | Range | 2,750 | | 2,750 |
| 174 | Missouri | Army | Ft Leonard Wood | WMD Respond Training Facility | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| 175 | Missouri | Air Force | Whiteman AFB | Child Development Center | | 7,600 | 7,600 |
| 176 | Montana | Army National Guard | Havre | Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS) | 2,398 | | 2,398 |
| 177 | Montana | Army National Guard | Helena | Army Aviation Support Facility Add/Alt, Phase 1 | 7,600 | | 7,600 |
| 178 | Nebraska | Army National Guard | Hastings Train Range | Modified Record Fire Range (Remoted Target System) | 1,487 | | 1,487 |
| 179 | Nevada | Navy | NAS Fallon | High Explosives Magazine | | 4,980 | 4,980 |
| 180 | New Hampshire | Air National Guard | Pease International Tradeport | Upgrade Aircraft Parking Apron Ph 2 | | 4,900 | 4,900 |
| 181 | New Jersey | Army | Picatinny Arsenal | Pyrotechnics Facility | | 9,900 | 9,900 |
| 182 | New Jersey | Navy | NWS Earle | General Purpose Berthing Pier, Increment 2 | 49,200 | | 49,200 |
| 183 | New Jersey | Air National Guard | Atlantic City IAP (ANG) | ASA - Replace Alert Complex | 10,400 | | 10,400 |
| 184 | New Jersey | Air National Guard | Atlantic City IAP (ANG) | Replace Alert 2 Shelters | | 2,300 | 2,300 |
| 185 | New Jersey | Army Reserve | Ft Dix | Controlled Humidity Storage, Ph 1 | | 9,502 | 9,502 |
| 186 | New Mexico | Army | White Sands Missile Range | Electromagnetic Vulnerability Assessment | 33,000 | | 33,000 |
| 187 | New Mexico | Air Force | Kirtland AFB | Corrosion Control Facility | | 9,200 | 9,200 |
| 188 | New York | Army | Ft Drum | Airfield Arrival/Departure Facility | 4,950 | | 4,950 |
| 189 | New York | Army | Ft Drum | Barracks Complex-Wheeler Sack AAF, Phase 2 | 48,000 | | 48,000 |
| 190 | New York | Army | Ft Drum | Defensive Live Fire Range | | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| 191 | New York | Army | Ft Drum | Upgrade Educational Transitional Facilities | | 5,700 | 5,700 |
| 192 | New York | Army | Ft Hamilton | Military Police Station | 7,600 | | 7,600 |
| 193 | New York | Army | Hancock Field | Military Entrance Processing Station | | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| 194 | New York | Army | MEPS Buffalo | Military Entrance Processing Station | 6,200 | | 6,200 |
| 195 | New York | Army | USMA West Point | Library & Learning Center, Phase 1 | 34,500 | | 34,500 |
| 196 | New York | Army National Guard | ARNG Utica | Addition Readiness Center (ADRS) | 5,704 | | 5,704 |
| 197 | New York | Army National Guard | ARNGRC Auburn | Addition Readiness Center (ADRS) | 4,406 | | 4,406 |
| 198 | New York | Army National Guard | ARNGRC Auburn | Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS) | 2,472 | | 2,472 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 199 | New York | Army National Guard | ARNGRC Kingston | Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS) | 3,827 | | 3,827 |
| 200 | New York | Army National Guard | Ft Drum | Readiness Center (ADRS) | 6,489 | | 6,489 |
| 201 | New York | Air National Guard | Hancock Field | Replace Mobility Processing Center | | 2,300 | 2,300 |
| 202 | New York | Air Force Reserve | Niagara ARS | Fire & Crash Rescue Station | | 7,800 | 7,800 |
| 203 | North Carolina | Army | Ft Bragg | Air Traffic Control Tower | 2,500 | | 2,500 |
| 204 | North Carolina | Army | Ft Bragg | Barracks Complex - Armistead St. Ph 2 | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 205 | North Carolina | Army | Ft Bragg | Barracks Complex - Donovan Street, Phase 5 | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| 206 | North Carolina | Army | Ft Bragg | Barracks Complex Renewal Blackjack St, Phase 1 | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| 207 | North Carolina | Army | Ft Bragg | Barracks Complex-Bastogene Dr, Phase 2 | 48,000 | | 48,000 |
| 208 | North Carolina | Army | Ft Bragg | Shoot House | 1,650 | | 1,650 |
| 209 | North Carolina | Army | Ft Bragg | Shoot House | 2,037 | | 2,037 |
| 210 | North Carolina | Navy | MCAS New River | Aircraft Maintenance Training Facility | 12,090 | | 12,090 |
| 211 | North Carolina | Navy | MCAS New River | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters | 20,780 | | 20,780 |
| 212 | North Carolina | Navy | MCAS New River | Simulator Building Addition | 2,270 | | 2,270 |
| 213 | North Carolina | Navy | MCB Camp Lejeune | Armory, Camp Geiger | 4,010 | | 4,010 |
| 214 | North Carolina | Navy | MCB Camp Lejeune | Combat Training Pool | 2,410 | | 2,410 |
| 215 | North Carolina | Navy | MCB Camp Lejeune | Explosive Ordnance Disposal Operations Facility | | 4,610 | 4,610 |
| 216 | North Carolina | Navy | Washington County | Outlying Landing Field (OLF) Facilities, Increment 2 | 33,900 | (33,900) | - |
| 217 | North Carolina | Navy | Washington County | Outlying Landing Field (OLF) Land Acquisition, Increment 1 | 61,750 | (61,750) | - |
| 218 | North Carolina | Air Force | Pope AFB | Combat Control School Expansion | 12,950 | | 12,950 |
| 219 | North Carolina | Air Force | Pope AFB | Indoor Firing Range for Combat Controlled School | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| 220 | North Carolina | DLA | MCAS Cherry Point | Replace Hydrant Fuel System | 22,700 | | 22,700 |
| 221 | North Carolina | Spec Ops | Ft Bragg | Kennedy Hall Renovation | 11,988 | | 11,988 |
| 222 | North Carolina | Spec Ops | Ft Bragg | SOF Company Operations Building | 4,600 | | 4,600 |
| 223 | North Carolina | Spec Ops | Ft Bragg | SOF Company Operations Complex | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| 224 | North Carolina | Spec Ops | Ft Bragg | SOF Company Operations Facility | 4,500 | | 4,500 |
| 225 | North Carolina | Spec Ops | Ft Bragg | SOF Isolation Unit Training Facility | 8,300 | | 8,300 |
| 226 | North Carolina | Spec Ops | Ft Bragg | SOF Resistance Training Facility | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| 227 | North Carolina | Army National Guard | ARNGRC Burlington | Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS) | 1,360 | | 1,360 |
| 228 | North Carolina | Army National Guard | ARNGRC Windsor | Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS) | 2,409 | | 2,409 |
| 229 | North Carolina | Army National Guard | Ft Bragg | Regional Training Institute, Phase 3 | 6,319 | | 6,319 |
| 230 | North Carolina | Navy Reserve | NRC Asheville | Reserve Center | 3,492 | | 3,492 |
| 231 | North Carolina | Air Force Reserve | Seymour Johnson AFB | Reserve Security Forces Operations | 2,300 | | 2,300 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 232 | Ohio | Air Force | Wright-Patterson AFB | Replace Steam Lines/Tunnels, Area B, Ph 1A | | 9,200 | 9,200 |
| 233 | Ohio | DLA | Columbus | Replace Physical Fitness Facility | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| 234 | Ohio | Army National Guard | Columbus | Combined Support Maintenance Shop Phase 1 | | 9,980 | 9,980 |
| 235 | Ohio | Army National Guard | Columbus | Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS) | 2,225 | | 2,225 |
| 236 | Ohio | Air National Guard | Toledo Express Airport | Replace Logistics Complex | | 6,900 | 6,900 |
| 237 | Ohio | Air Force Reserve | Wright-Patterson AFB | C-5 Airfield Pavements, Phase 1 | 4,300 | | 4,300 |
| 238 | Ohio | Air Force Reserve | Wright-Patterson AFB | C-5 Multi-Purpose Hangar | 16,821 | | 16,821 |
| 239 | Oklahoma | Army | Ft Sill | CIDC Field Operations Building | | 3,400 | 3,400 |
| 240 | Oklahoma | Army | Ft Sill | Consolidated Maintenance Complex, Phase 3 | 13,100 | | 13,100 |
| 241 | Oklahoma | Army | Ft Sill | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 14,400 | | 14,400 |
| 242 | Oklahoma | DLA | Tinker AFB | Add/Alter Hydrant Fuel System | 5,400 | | 5,400 |
| 243 | Oklahoma | Army National Guard | Camp Gruber Training Center | Multi-purpose Machine Gun Range | | 3,201 | 3,201 |
| 244 | Oregon | Army National Guard | AFRC Eugene | Armed Forces Reserve Center, Phase 2 | 12,635 | | 12,635 |
| 245 | Oregon | Army National Guard | Salem | Army Aviation Support Facility | | 4,917 | 4,917 |
| 246 | Oregon | Air Force Reserve | Portland IAP | Add/Alter Building 315 For PJ Squadron Operations | 1,640 | | 1,640 |
| 247 | Oregon | Air Force Reserve | Portland IAP | Consolidated Training, Phase 2 | 3,800 | | 3,800 |
| 248 | Oregon | Air Force Reserve | Portland IAP | Maintenance Hangar & Pavements | 12,400 | | 12,400 |
| 249 | Pennsylvania | DLA | DDSP New Cumberland | Consolidated Maintenance Facility | 22,300 | | 22,300 |
| 250 | Pennsylvania | Army National Guard | Fort Indiantown Gap | Unit Equipment Training Site | | 20,387 | 20,387 |
| 251 | Pennsylvania | Army Reserve | Ft Indiantown Gap | Army Reserve Center/Organizational Maintenance Support | 13,156 | | 13,156 |
| 252 | Pennsylvania | Navy Reserve | NAS JRB Willow Grove | Fitness Center | 7,700 | | 7,700 |
| 253 | South Carolina | Navy | MCAS Beaufort | Aircraft Fire and Rescue Facility | | 5,480 | 5,480 |
| 254 | South Carolina | Air Force | Shaw AFB | Base Library | | 3,700 | 3,700 |
| 255 | South Carolina | Air Force | Shaw AFB | Sewer Outfall Line to Wateree River | 3,300 | | 3,300 |
| 256 | South Carolina | TMA | MCRD Parris Island | Replace Medical/Dental Clinic | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| 257 | South Dakota | Army National Guard | ARNGRC Mobridge | Readiness Center | 2,944 | | 2,944 |
| 258 | Tennessee | Air Force | Arnold AFB | Add/Alter Wingo Inn Visiting Quarters | | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| 259 | Tennessee | Air Force | Arnold AFB | Upgrade Jet Engine Induction System, Phase 5 | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| 260 | Tennessee | Air National Guard | Memphis IAP | C-5 Aircraft Parking Apron & Hydrant Refuel Station | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| 261 | Tennessee | Air National Guard | Memphis IAP | C-5 Corrosion Control Hangar | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| 262 | Texas | Army | Camp Bullis | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | | 5,300 | 5,300 |
| 263 | Texas | Army | Ft Bliss | Missile Defense Instruction Facility | 16,500 | | 16,500 |
| 264 | Texas | Army | Ft Bliss | Tac Equip Shop-AAMDC | | 2,900 | 2,900 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 265 | Texas | Army | Ft Hood | Barracks Complex | 49,888 | | 49,888 |
| 266 | Texas | Army | Ft Hood | Command & Control Facility Ph 2 | | 7,100 | 7,100 |
| 267 | Texas | Army | Ft Hood | Digital Multipurpose Range | 28,200 | | 28,200 |
| 268 | Texas | Army | Ft Hood | Training Area Tank Trails | | 3,700 | 3,700 |
| 269 | Texas | Air Force | Dyess AFB | Refueling Vehicle Maintenance Shop | | 3,300 | 3,300 |
| 270 | Texas | Air Force | Lackland AFB | Security Forces Training Expansion | 2,596 | | 2,596 |
| 271 | Texas | Air Force | Laughlin AFB | T-1 Squadron Operations Facility | | 6,900 | 6,900 |
| 272 | Texas | Air Force | Sheppard AFB | F-22 Technical Training Facility | 21,284 | | 21,284 |
| 273 | Texas | Air Force | Sheppard AFB | Student Dormitory (300 Rm) | 29,000 | | 29,000 |
| 274 | Texas | DLA | NAS Kingsville | Replace Jet Fuel Storage Tank | 3,900 | | 3,900 |
| 275 | Texas | Army Reserve | Corpus Christi Storage Complex | Controlled Humidity Storage Ph 1 | | 9,038 | 9,038 |
| 276 | Texas | Navy Reserve | NAS JRB Fort Worth | Combined Reserve Training Admin Building | | 5,520 | 5,520 |
| 277 | Texas | Air Force Reserve | Lackland AFB | Add/Alter C-5 Aircraft Generation Facility | 1,200 | | 1,200 |
| 278 | Texas | Air Force Reserve | Lackland AFB | C-5 Training Schoolhouse Complex | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| 279 | Texas | Air Force Reserve | Lackland AFB | C-5 Training Load Assembly Facility | 1,850 | | 1,850 |
| 280 | Texas | Air Force Reserve | NAS JRB Fort Worth | Aircraft Parts Store | | 1,850 | 1,850 |
| 281 | Utah | Air Force | Hill AFB | 729th ACS Operations / Maintenance Facility | | 4,900 | 4,900 |
| 282 | Utah | Air Force | Hill AFB | Fitness Center | 13,113 | | 13,113 |
| 283 | Utah | Army Reserve | ARC Ogden | Add/Alter Army Reserve Center | 7,932 | | 7,932 |
| 284 | Virginia | Army | Ft A.P. Hill | Shoot House | 3,975 | | 3,975 |
| 285 | Virginia | Army | Ft Lee | Fire and Emergency Services Center Ph 3 | | 4,250 | 4,250 |
| 286 | Virginia | Army | Ft Myer | Barracks Complex-Sheridan Ave, Phase 1 | 49,526 | | 49,526 |
| 287 | Virginia | Navy | Camp Elmore USMC Det | Command Operations Facility | 13,500 | | 13,500 |
| 288 | Virginia | Navy | MCB Quantico | Armory (The Basic School) | 4,580 | | 4,580 |
| 289 | Virginia | Navy | MCB Quantico | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters | 15,090 | | 15,090 |
| 290 | Virginia | Navy | MCB Quantico | Green Side Hangar Complex | 21,180 | | 21,180 |
| 291 | Virginia | Navy | MCB Quantico | Heritage Center Road Improvements | 950 | (950) | - |
| 292 | Virginia | Navy | MCCDC Quantico | HQ and Service BN / TBS | | 4,470 | 4,470 |
| 293 | Virginia | Navy | NAB Little Creek | Gate 5 Security Improvements | 2,850 | | 2,850 |
| 294 | Virginia | Navy | NAB Little Creek | Police & Security Ops Facility | | 6,700 | 6,700 |
| 295 | Virginia | Navy | NAS Oceana | Post 2 Security Improvements | 2,770 | | 2,770 |
| 296 | Virginia | Navy | NS Norfolk | Gate 5 Security Improvements | 4,330 | | 4,330 |
| 297 | Virginia | Navy | NS Norfolk | Pier 11 Replacement, Increment 2 | 40,000 | | 40,000 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 298 | Virginia | Navy | NWS Yorktown | Ordnance Handling Vehicle Maintenance Shop | 9,870 | | 9,870 |
| 299 | Virginia | DLA | Def Dist Depot Richmond | Conference Center | 3,600 | | 3,600 |
| 300 | Virginia | DLA | Def Dist Depot Richmond | Security Enhancements | 6,500 | | 6,500 |
| 301 | Virginia | DLA | DFSP NAS Oceana | Bulk Fuel Storage Tank | 3,589 | | 3,589 |
| 302 | Virginia | Spec Ops | FCTC Dam Neck | Addition SOF Operational Trainer Support Facility | 4,300 | | 4,300 |
| 303 | Virginia | Spec Ops | FCTC Dam Neck | SOF High Explosives Magazine | 1,400 | | 1,400 |
| 304 | Virginia | Spec Ops | Ft A.P. Hill | SOF Ground Mobility Support Building | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| 305 | Virginia | Spec Ops | NAB Little Creek | Boat Support Facility | 10,500 | | 10,500 |
| 306 | Virginia | Spec Ops | NAB Little Creek | SEAL Team Operations Facility | | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| 307 | Virginia | Spec Ops | NAB Little Creek | SOF Combat Skills Compound | 12,700 | | 12,700 |
| 308 | Virginia | Spec Ops | NAB Little Creek | SOF Ground Mobility Maintenance Facility | 1,000 | | 1,000 |
| 309 | Virginia | Army National Guard | Ft Pickett | Infantry Platoon Battle Course (SBCT) | 5,170 | | 5,170 |
| 310 | Virginia | Army National Guard | Ft Pickett | MOUT Assault Course (SBCT) | 1,409 | | 1,409 |
| 311 | Virginia | Navy Reserve | NMCRC Norfolk | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 3,290 | | 3,290 |
| 312 | Virginia | TMA | Ft Belvoir | Hospital Replacement, Phase I | 43,000 | | 43,000 |
| 313 | Virginia | TMA | Langley AFB | Add/Alter Hospital | 50,800 | | 50,800 |
| 314 | Washington | Army | Ft Lewis | Barracks Complex-41st Div Dr/B St, Phase 2 | 48,000 | | 48,000 |
| 315 | Washington | Navy | NAS Whidbey Island | Hazardous Materials Storehouse | | 1,990 | 1,990 |
| 316 | Washington | Navy | NS Bremerton | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters-Shipboard Ashore | 34,125 | | 34,125 |
| 317 | Washington | Navy | NSY Puget Sound | CVN Maintenance Complex | 20,305 | | 20,305 |
| 318 | Washington | Navy | NSY Puget Sound | Ocean Engineering Support Facility | | 3,150 | 3,150 |
| 319 | Washington | Navy | SWFPAC Bangor | Limited Area Processing & Storage Complex | 35,770 | | 35,770 |
| 320 | Washington | Army National Guard | Camp Murray | Alter Readiness Center (ADRS) | 1,400 | | 1,400 |
| 321 | Washington | Army Reserve | Vancouver | Land Acquisition | 2,500 | | 2,500 |
| 322 | West Virginia | Air National Guard | Martinsburg ANG | C-5 Maintenance Hangar and Shops | 36,000 | | 36,000 |
| 323 | Wisconsin | Air National Guard | Truax Field | ASA - Munitions Maintenance and Storage Complex | 5,900 | | 5,900 |
| 324 | Wisconsin | Army Reserve | Ft McCoy | Infantry Platoon Battle Course | 2,712 | | 2,712 |
| 325 | Wisconsin | Army Reserve | Ft McCoy | Squad Defense Range | 1,248 | | 1,248 |
| 326 | Wyoming | Air Force | F.E. Warren AFB | Upgrade Storm Water Drainage System Ph 1 | | 5,500 | 5,500 |
| 327 | Bahamas | Navy | NUWC Andros Island | Bachelor Quarters | 20,750 | | 20,750 |
| 328 | Diego Garcia | Navy | NAVSUPPFAC Diego Garcia | Solid Waste Management Center | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| 329 | Diego Garcia | TMA | Diego Garcia | Dental Clinic Replacement | 3,800 | | 3,800 |
| 330 | Germany | Army | Grafenwoehr | Barracks Complex | 28,500 | | 28,500 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 331 | Germany | Army | Grafenwoehr | Barracks Complex - Brigade | 34,000 | | 34,000 |
| 332 | Germany | Army | Grafenwoehr | Brigade Support Complex | 14,700 | | 14,700 |
| 333 | Germany | Air Force | Ramstein AB | Small Diameter Bomb Facilities | 1,200 | | 1,200 |
| 334 | Germany | Air Force | Ramstein AB | USAFE Theater Aerospace Operations Support Center | 24,204 | | 24,204 |
| 335 | Germany | DODEA | Grafenwoehr | New Elementary/Middle School | 36,247 | | 36,247 |
| 336 | Germany | DODEA | Vilseck | High School Renovation/Addition | 9,011 | | 9,011 |
| 337 | Germany | TMA | Grafenwoehr | Add/Alter Dispensary/Dental Clinic | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| 338 | Greenland | Air Force | Thule AB | Dormitory (72 Rm) | 19,800 | | 19,800 |
| 339 | Guam | Navy | NPWC Guam | Water Treatment Plant Upgrade | 20,700 | | 20,700 |
| 340 | Guam | Navy | NS Guam | KILO Wharf Improvements | 12,500 | | 12,500 |
| 341 | Guam | Air Force | Andersen AFB | War Reserve Storage Facility | 19,593 | | 19,593 |
| 342 | Guam | Spec Ops | NS Guam | SOF Ground Mobility Support Building | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| 343 | Guam | DODEA | NS Guam | High School Replacement | 26,964 | | 26,964 |
| 344 | Italy | Army | Livorno | Warehouse Operations Facility | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| 345 | Italy | Navy | Sigonella | Access Improvements | 7,430 | | 7,430 |
| 346 | Italy | Navy | Sigonella | Base Operations Support, Phase 2 | 15,120 | | 15,120 |
| 347 | Italy | Air Force | Aviano AB | Add/Alter Weapons Load/Maintenance Training Facility | 2,300 | | 2,300 |
| 348 | Italy | Air Force | Aviano AB | Airfield Obstruction-Expand North Ramp, Phase 2 | 1,626 | | 1,626 |
| 349 | Italy | Air Force | Aviano AB | Flight Simulator | 2,834 | | 2,834 |
| 350 | Japan | Air Force | Misawa AB | Expand Strategic Airlift Ramp | 6,700 | | 6,700 |
| 351 | Japan | DLA | Misawa AB | Hydrant Fuel System | 19,900 | | 19,900 |
| 352 | Korea | Army | Camp Humphreys | Sanitary Sewer System | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| 353 | Korea | Air Force | Kunsan AB | Dorm (144 Rm) | 18,550 | | 18,550 |
| 354 | Korea | Air Force | Kunsan AB | Dorm (144 Rm) | 18,550 | | 18,550 |
| 355 | Korea | Air Force | Osan AB | Dormitory (156 Rm) | 18,600 | | 18,600 |
| 356 | Portugal | Air Force | Lajes Field | Add/Alter Fitness Center, Phase 2 | 5,689 | | 5,689 |
| 357 | Portugal | DLA | DFSP Lajes Field | Replace Hydrant Fuel System | 19,113 | | 19,113 |
| 358 | Puerto Rico | Army Reserve | ARC Aguadilla | Army Reserve Center | 21,523 | | 21,523 |
| 359 | Spain | Navy | NS Rota | Command Operations Consolidation | 32,700 | | 32,700 |
| 360 | Spain | Air Force | NS Rota | Aircraft Parking Apron, Phase 2 | 14,153 | | 14,153 |
| 361 | United Kingdom | Air Force | RAF Lakenheath | 4-Bay Mission Training Center | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| 362 | United Kingdom | Spec Ops | RAF Mildenhall | SOF Operations/Intelligence Facility | 10,200 | | 10,200 |
| 363 | Worldwide Classified | Air Force | Classified | Classified | 28,090 | | 28,090 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 364 | Worldwide Classified | Air Force | Worldwide Unspecified Clas | Special Tactical Unit Detachment Facility | 704 | | 704 |
| 365 | Worldwide Classified | Spec Ops | Worldwide Unspecified Clas | SOF Building Addition | 2,600 | | 2,600 |
| 366 | Worldwide Classified | Spec Ops | Worldwide Unspecified Clas | SOF Information Operations Facility Addition | 4,800 | | 4,800 |
| 367 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| 368 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 130,335 | 9,874 | 140,209 |
| 369 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Host Nation Support | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| 370 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| 371 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | White Side Complex | 18,560 | | 18,560 |
| 372 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 87,067 | 6,737 | 93,804 |
| 373 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Presidential Helicopter Programs Support Facility | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| 374 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Predator B Beddown | 26,121 | | 26,121 |
| 375 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| 376 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 140,786 | 25,340 | 166,126 |
| 377 | Worldwide Unspecified | Spec Ops | Unspecified Worldwide | Training Facility | 2,900 | | 2,900 |
| 378 | Worldwide Unspecified | Spec Ops | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 2,710 | | 2,710 |
| 379 | Worldwide Unspecified | Spec Ops | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 10,566 | 1,300 | 11,866 |
| 380 | Worldwide Unspecified | MDA | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 2,769 | | 2,769 |
| 381 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army National Guard | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 30,845 | 13,262 | 44,107 |
| 382 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army National Guard | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 4,472 | 2,700 | 7,172 |
| 383 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air National Guard | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| 384 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air National Guard | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 11,764 | 6,552 | 18,316 |
| 385 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air National Guard | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 1,804 | | 1,804 |
| 386 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army Reserve | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 2,923 | | 2,923 |
| 387 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army Reserve | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 11,225 | 2,622 | 13,847 |
| 388 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy Reserve | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 1,503 | 150 | 1,653 |
| 389 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force Reserve | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 5,493 | 3,314 | 8,807 |
| 390 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force Reserve | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 5,263 | | 5,263 |
| 391 | Worldwide Unspecified | DFAS | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 1,497 | | 1,497 |
| 392 | Worldwide Unspecified | BRAC IV | BRAC IV | Base Realignment & Closure | 246,116 | | 246,116 |
| 393 | Worldwide Unspecified | TJS | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 7,214 | | 7,214 |
| 394 | Worldwide Unspecified | Other | Unspecified Worldwide | Energy Conservation Improvement Program | 60,000 | (10,000) | 50,000 |
| 395 | Worldwide Unspecified | Other | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| 396 | Worldwide Unspecified | Other | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 22,216 | | 22,216 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 397 | Worldwide Unspecified | Other | Unspecified Worldwide | Contingency Construction | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| 398 | Worldwide Unspecified | Other | Unspecified Worldwide | NATO Security Investment Program | 165,800 | | 165,800 |
| 399 | Worldwide Unspecified | DODEA | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 746 | | 746 |
| 400 | Worldwide Unspecified | TMA | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 3,002 | | 3,002 |
| 401 | Worldwide Unspecified | TMA | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 29,400 | | 29,400 |
| 402 | Alaska | Army | Ft Richardson | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 42,000 | | 42,000 |
| 403 | Alaska | Army | Ft Wainwright | Family Housing New Construction | 41,000 | | 41,000 |
| 404 | Alaska | Army | Ft Wainwright | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 37,000 | | 37,000 |
| 405 | Alaska | Army | Ft Wainwright | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 46,000 | | 46,000 |
| 406 | Arizona | Army | Ft Huachuca | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 41,000 | | 41,000 |
| 407 | Arizona | Army | Yuma PG | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 14,900 | | 14,900 |
| 408 | Arizona | Air Force | Davis-Monthan AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 6 | 48,500 | | 48,500 |
| 409 | California | Air Force | Edwards AFB | Replace Family Housing | 41,202 | | 41,202 |
| 410 | California | Air Force | Vandenberg AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 8 | 30,906 | | 30,906 |
| 411 | Florida | Air Force | MacDill AFB | Construct Housing Maintenance Facility | 1,250 | | 1,250 |
| 412 | Florida | Air Force | MacDill AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 6 | 21,723 | | 21,723 |
| 413 | Idaho | Air Force | Mountain Home AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 6 | 39,333 | | 39,333 |
| 414 | Kansas | Army | Ft Riley | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 33,000 | | 33,000 |
| 415 | Mississippi | Air Force | Columbus AFB | Family Housing Management Facility | 711 | | 711 |
| 416 | Missouri | Air Force | Whiteman AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 6 | 37,087 | | 37,087 |
| 417 | Montana | Air Force | Malmstrom AFB | Replace Family Housing | 29,910 | | 29,910 |
| 418 | New Mexico | Army | White Sands Missile Range | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 31,000 | | 31,000 |
| 419 | North Carolina | Navy | MCAS Cherry Point | Replace SLOCUM Village, Phase 3 | 27,002 | | 27,002 |
| 420 | North Carolina | Air Force | Seymour Johnson AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 8 | 32,693 | | 32,693 |
| 421 | North Dakota | Air Force | Grand Forks AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase H | 26,169 | | 26,169 |
| 422 | North Dakota | Air Force | Minot AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 11 | 37,087 | | 37,087 |
| 423 | Oklahoma | Army | Ft Sill | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 47,000 | | 47,000 |
| 424 | South Carolina | Air Force | Charleston AFB | Construct Huntley Park Fire Station | 1,976 | | 1,976 |
| 425 | South Dakota | Air Force | Ellsworth AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 4 | 21,482 | | 21,482 |
| 426 | Texas | Air Force | Dyess AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 5 | 28,664 | | 28,664 |
| 427 | Texas | Air Force | Goodfellow AFB | Construct Military Family Housing, Phase 1 | 20,604 | | 20,604 |
| 428 | Virginia | Army | Ft Lee | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 46,000 | | 46,000 |
| 429 | Virginia | Army | Ft Monroe | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 16,000 | | 16,000 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 430 | Germany | Air Force | Ramstein AB | Replace Family Housing | 57,691 | | 57,691 |
| 431 | Italy | Air Force | Aviano AB | Replace Housing Office | 2,542 | | 2,542 |
| 432 | Korea | Air Force | Osan AB | Construct Family Housing, Phase 3 | 46,834 | | 46,834 |
| 433 | United Kingdom | Air Force | RAF Lakenheath | Replace Family Housing | 43,976 | | 43,976 |
| 434 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Services Account | 36,174 | | 36,174 |
| 435 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Maintenance of Real Property | 402,060 | (2,400) | 399,660 |
| 436 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Construction Improvements | 211,990 | | 211,990 |
| 437 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 37,411 | | 37,411 |
| 438 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Management Account | 74,895 | | 74,895 |
| 439 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Privatization Support | 26,644 | | 26,644 |
| 440 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Utilities Account | 132,356 | | 132,356 |
| 441 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Miscellaneous Account | 1,333 | | 1,333 |
| 442 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Leasing Account | 218,033 | | 218,033 |
| 443 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Interest Payments | 1 | | 1 |
| 444 | Worldwide Unspecified | Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 29,209 | | 29,209 |
| 445 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Utilities Account | 137,226 | | 137,226 |
| 446 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Services Account | 57,691 | | 57,691 |
| 447 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Leasing Account | 136,883 | | 136,883 |
| 448 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Miscellaneous Account | 654 | | 654 |
| 449 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Management Account | 81,859 | | 81,859 |
| 450 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 20,756 | | 20,756 |
| 451 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Privatization Support | 16,991 | | 16,991 |
| 452 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Interest Payments | 61 | | 61 |
| 453 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Construction Improvements | 112,105 | | 112,105 |
| 454 | Worldwide Unspecified | Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Maintenance of Real Property | 252,383 | (8,200) | 244,183 |
| 455 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Interest Payments | 38 | | 38 |
| 456 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Leasing Account | 119,908 | | 119,908 |
| 457 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 38,266 | | 38,266 |
| 458 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 44,459 | (2,500) | 41,959 |
| 459 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Services Account | 26,070 | | 26,070 |
| 460 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Miscellaneous Account | 2,396 | | 2,396 |
| 461 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Privatization Support | 39,104 | | 39,104 |
| 462 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Maintenance of Real Property | 435,782 | (230) | 435,552 |

**Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005**
**(Dollars in Thousands)**

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Installation | Project Title | FY 2005 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2005 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 463 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Utilities Account | 125,459 | | 125,459 |
| 464 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Construction Improvements | 238,353 | | 238,353 |
| 465 | Worldwide Unspecified | Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Management Account | 70,680 | (6,500) | 64,180 |
| 466 | Worldwide Unspecified | DLA | Unspecified Worldwide | Maintenance of Real Property | 397 | | 397 |
| 467 | Worldwide Unspecified | DLA | Unspecified Worldwide | Management Account | 293 | | 293 |
| 468 | Worldwide Unspecified | DLA | Unspecified Worldwide | Services Account | 76 | | 76 |
| 469 | Worldwide Unspecified | DLA | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 36 | | 36 |
| 470 | Worldwide Unspecified | DLA | Unspecified Worldwide | Utilities Account | 419 | | 419 |
| 471 | Worldwide Unspecified | NSA | Unspecified Worldwide | Leasing Account | 11,257 | | 11,257 |
| 472 | Worldwide Unspecified | NSA | Unspecified Worldwide | Miscellaneous Account | 53 | | 53 |
| 473 | Worldwide Unspecified | NSA | Unspecified Worldwide | Utilities Account | 471 | | 471 |
| 474 | Worldwide Unspecified | NSA | Unspecified Worldwide | Management Account | 13 | | 13 |
| 475 | Worldwide Unspecified | NSA | Unspecified Worldwide | Maintenance of Real Property | 1,939 | | 1,939 |
| 476 | Worldwide Unspecified | NSA | Unspecified Worldwide | Services Account | 381 | | 381 |
| 477 | Worldwide Unspecified | NSA | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 116 | | 116 |
| 478 | Worldwide Unspecified | NSA | Unspecified Worldwide | Construction Improvements | 49 | | 49 |
| 479 | Worldwide Unspecified | DIA | Unspecified Worldwide | Leasing Account | 30,199 | | 30,199 |
| 480 | Worldwide Unspecified | DIA | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 3,925 | | 3,925 |
| 481 | Worldwide Unspecified | Other | Unspecified Worldwide | Family Housing Improvement Fund | 2,500 | | 2,500 |
| | | | | **Total Authorization of Appropriations** | 9,480,475 | 450,000 | 9,930,475 |

# TITLE XXI—ARMY

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,771,285,000 for Army military construction and $1,565,006,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $1,866,209,000 for military construction and $1,562,606,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005.

## ITEMS 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: $750,000 for an aircraft maintenance hangar at Cairns Army Air Field, Fort Rucker, Alabama; $561,000 for a runway extension at Amedee Army Airfield, Sierra Army Depot, California; $2,250,000 for a receptee barracks expansion at Fort Benning, Georgia; $310,000 for a law enforcement complex at Fort Gordon, Georgia; $365,000 for a consolidated shipping center at Bluegrass Depot, Kentucky; $278,000 for a child development center at Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania; $486,000 for a military operations on unbanized terrain collective training facility at Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia; and $500,000 for access roads at Fort 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 2005. 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 2005.

### Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize new improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2005.

### 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 2005. 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 Projects

This section would amend the table in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136) to increase the amounts authorized for construction at Fort Stewart, Georgia, and Fort Drum, New York.

### Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2003 Project

This section would amend the table in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314) to increase the amount authorized for construction at Fort Sill, Oklahoma.

## TITLE XXII—NAVY

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,060,455,000 for Navy military construction and $843,611,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $1,077,862,000 for military construction and $835,411,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005.

### ITEMS 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: $250,000 for an advanced sensors integration facility at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California; $268,000 for physical gate security enhancements at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, California; $150,000 for phase two of an aircraft parking apron at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida; $150,000 for a consolidated operations support facility at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida; and $1,032,000 for improvements to machine shops at Norfolk Naval Shipyard Detachment, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

### LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

#### Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2005. 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 2005.

### Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize new improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2005.

### 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 2005. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

## TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $663,964,000 for Air Force military construction and $1,710,855,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $792,054,000 for military construction and $1,701,625,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005.

### ITEMS 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: $880,000 for a security forces operational facility at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida; $8,000,000 for a consolidated Central Command facility at MacDill Air Force Base, Florida; $1,340,000 for a logistics readiness center at Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho; $1,332,000 for a consolidated mobility processing center at McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas; $890,000 for alteration of a fuel cell dock at Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota; $497,000 for runway repair at Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska; $837,000 for a fire and crash rescue station at Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada; and $670,000 for a mission support complex at Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington.

### 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 2005. 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 2005.

### Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize new improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2005.

### 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 2005. 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 $699,437,000 for defense agency military construction and $49,624,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005. The budget request also included $81,886,000 for chemical demilitarization construction projects in a separate title. The committee recommends including chemical demilitarization construction in Title XXIV. Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of $790,823,000 for military construction and $49,624,000 for family housing for defense agencies for fiscal year 2005.

### 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 2005. 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—Improvements to Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2005.

### Section 2403—Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

### Section 2404—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize specific amounts for each line item contained in the defense agencies' budgets for fiscal year 2005. 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 $165,800,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) infrastructure fund (NATO Security Investment Program) for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $165,800,000 for fiscal year 2005.

## 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 $165,800,000 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 $619,936,000 for military construction of guard and reserve facilities for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2005 of $839,845,000 to be distributed as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Army National Guard | $393,225,000 |
| Air National Guard | 184,620,000 |
| Army Reserve | 116,955,000 |
| Naval and Marine Corps Reserve | 30,955,000 |
| Air Force Reserve | 114,090,000 |
| Total | 839,845,000 |

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### 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: $772,000 for a composite operations and training facility at Montgomery, Alabama; $509,000 for a space warning system squadron support facility at Greeley Air National Guard Station, Colorado; $300,000 for the relocation of the base entrance at Capital Municipal Airport, Illinois; $650,000 for a fire and crash rescue station at Rosecrans Memorial Airport, Missouri; $990,000 for a pararescue complex at

Francis S. Gabreski Airport, New York; and $501,000 for a fire and crash rescue station at Stewart International Airport, New York.

### Planning and Design, Air Reserve

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 project: $954,000 for phase one of a joint services lodging facility at Youngstown Air Reserve Station, Ohio.

### 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: $789,000 for a joint armed forces reserve center at Daytona Beach, Florida; $844,000 for a armed forces reserve center at Gary, Indiana; $614,000 for a national guard and reserve center building at Lincoln Airbase, Nebraska; $485,000 for a readiness center at Hermitage, Pennsylvania; $1,999,000 for phase two of a readiness center addition and alteration at Nashville, Tennessee; $935,000 for a joint armed forces reserve center at Smyrna, Tennessee; $530,000 for a readiness center at Winchester, Virginia; and $2,014,000 for a readiness center at Fort Lewis, Washington.

### 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: $843,000 for a reserve center at Garden Grove, California.

### Unspecified Minor Construction, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Army execute the following project: $2,700,000 for a wastewater treatment facility at Camp Shelby, Mississippi.

## 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 2005. 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, 2007, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2008, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2007, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2008, whichever is later.

### Section 2702—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2002 Projects

This section would extend fiscal year 2002 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2005, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2006, whichever is later. The extended authorization applies to the following projects: $23,000,000 for construction of a power plant cooling tower at Fort Wainwright, Alaska; $1,500,000 for Parker Ranch land acquisition at Pohakuloa Training Area, Hawaii; $11,400,000 for construction of family housing at Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado; and $7,300,000 to replace family housing at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana.

### Section 2703—Extension and Renewal of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2001 Projects

This section would extend certain fiscal year 2001 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2005, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2006, whichever is later. The extended authorizations apply to the following projects: $250,000 for construction of family housing at Fort Jackson, South Carolina; $7,400,000 for Defense Finance and Accounting Service building renovation at Kleber Kaserne, Germany; and $843,000 for an elementary school classroom addition at Osan Air Base, Korea.

### 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, 2004, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

# TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Base Realignment and Closure

By May 16, 2005, the Secretary of Defense must present recommendations for base closures and realignments to Congress and the base closure commission. With this deadline approximately one year away, the committee is increasingly concerned by the significant number of uncertainties and ongoing turbulent events that will dramatically affect the Department's infrastructure requirements both during and after the base closure process.

For example, the demands of the global war on terrorism continue to change, the manpower and infrastructure requirements related to the effort to rebuild Iraq continue to evolve, the Department has not yet completed a global review of its overseas military installations, each of the military services is in the midst of force transformation, end strength requirements of the services continue to be unsettled issues, and the infrastructure and force requirements for the Department to meet homeland security missions have not yet been determined.

Therefore, the committee includes a provision to require the Department to report to Congress on a number of unresolved infrastructure-related issues. Pending submission of these reports, the provision would suspend the base closure process until 2007.

The committee notes that a two-year postponement of the base closure and realignment round would have several benefits. First, postponement would allow the Department to stabilize force and funding requirements related to Iraq, Afghanistan, the war against terrorism, and homeland security before making base closure and realignment recommendations. Second, postponement would allow DOD to understand the impact of, and in some cases resolve, significant infrastructure-related issues such as global basing and transformation before making irreversible base closure decisions. Finally, base closure actions historically result in significant upfront costs with net savings not occurring for several years after closure activities. Delay of the base closure round until 2007 would provide relief to significant budgetary pressures on the Department during the next five years.

The committee also includes a provision to amend and codify the criteria used by the Department to make base closure and realignment recommendations. The committee's recommended changes address many of the comments that the Department received during the public comment period on the selection criteria.

### Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs Health Care Facility Sharing

The committee continues to support efforts by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to design, construct, maintain, and operate health care facilities in a joint manner, and encourages the Department and VA to take advantage of opportunities to share health care facilities whenever possible. The committee report (H. Rept. 108–106) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, advocated

DOD participation in and contribution to the VA's plans to build a new hospital at the site of the closed Fitzsimons Army Hospital in Colorado. The committee reiterates its support for a joint DOD–VA hospital at the Fitzsimons Hospital site, and encourages the Department of Defense to contribute funds, at a level representative of its medical requirements, to design and construct such a facility.

### Housing Requirements Analyses

The committee is aware that recent changes to methodology used in Housing Requirements Analyses have resulted in significant decreases to on-base housing requirements at many military installations, including McChord Air Force Base, Washington and Travis Air Force Base, California. Military Housing Privatization Initiative authorities do not prohibit privatized housing maintenance or construction in excess of the minimum requirement. As such, the committee encourages the services to inform housing privatization bidders of this point, particularly for those installations that have experienced significant decreases in on-base housing requirements as a result of the new housing methodology. In the specific case of McChord Air Force Base, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to explore joint efforts with the Army and the national guard to ensure that the privatized housing initiative at McChord is responsive to the needs of all active-duty military personnel in the region.

### Military Housing Privatization Program

The committee continues to support the Department of Defense's efforts to privatize military family and unaccompanied housing. By the end of fiscal year 2004, the Department anticipates having used the privatization program to leverage private investments to provide quality housing to more than 90,000 military families. The success of this program to date validates the committee's recommendation to eliminate the $850.0 million statutory ceiling on government investment in privatization projects (section 2806), effective October 1, 2005.

Furthermore, the committee believes that the housing privatization model may be a viable means of providing housing to military personnel at enduring overseas installations. As such, the committee urges the Department to consider the feasibility of expanding housing privatization authorities to permit overseas military family housing privatization.

Finally, the committee notes that some local taxation authorities have chosen to levy real property taxes upon privatized housing projects. By taxing these properties, local authorities divert resources from reinvestment into military family housing facilities and cause significant reductions in the level of educational impact aid provided to communities with military dependents. Of particular concern are those cases where local taxation authorities have chosen to tax privatized family housing even though the local government is not providing municipal services such as trash collection and fire and police protection. The committee reminds local and state taxation authorities that taxation of privatized military family housing facilities has a direct effect on the quality of life of

military personnel stationed in their communities, and urges such authorities to repeal and refrain from real property taxation of such projects.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

#### Section 2801—Increase in Certain Thresholds for Carrying Out Unspecified Minor Military Construction Projects

This section would amend section 2805(b) of title 10, United States Code, to increase from $750,000 to $1,000,000 the threshold at which service secretaries must approve the use of operation and maintenance funds for unspecified minor construction projects. This section would also amend section 2805(c) to establish a single limit of $1,500,000 at which operation and maintenance funds may be used for unspecified minor construction projects.

#### Section 2802—Assessment of Vulnerability of Military Installations to Terrorist Attack and Annual Report on Military Construction Requirements Related to Antiterrorism and Force Protection

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish guidance for the military services on appropriate levels of antiterrorism and force protection requirements for facilities construction and perimeter defenses (including gate and fence line construction). This section would also require the Secretary to certify that all major Department installations have been assessed for vulnerabilities to terrorist attack since September 11, 2001. Finally, this section would require the Department of Defense to provide an annual list of unfunded antiterrorism and force-protection military construction requirements.

#### Section 2803—Change in Threshold for Congressional Notification Regarding Use of Operation and Maintenance Funds for Facility Repair

This section would amend section 2811(d) of title 10, United States Code, to lower the threshold at which congressional notification is required for facility repairs using operation and maintenance funds from $10,000,000 to $7,500,000.

#### Section 2804—Reporting Requirements Regarding Military Family Housing Requirements for General Officers and Flag Officers

This section would require the Department of Defense to conduct an analysis of general and flag officer housing requirements in the national capital region by March 30, 2005. This analysis must be based upon available housing in the local housing market as well as requirements for key and essential personnel to be housed in secure locations.

The military services maintain more than 170 general and flag officer quarters in the national capital region. Although the committee recognizes the value of military family housing to quality of life, it is difficult to justify the high costs of building, operating, and maintaining a sizeable inventory of large general and flag offi-

cer quarters in the region. Therefore, this section would ensure that the Department determines whether the current number of such homes is appropriate.

This section would also require the Department to report to Congress, by March 30, 2005, on its inventory of general and flag officer housing, including annual expenditures of each house for operations, utilities, and maintenance and repair over the past five years. The committee notes with concern the large expenditures on maintenance, repair, operations, and utilities on general and flag officers quarters reported in the fiscal year 2005 budget justification documents. This section is intended to provide the Congress with an historical perspective of the number and costs associated with general and flag officer quarters.

Finally, this section would require the Department to provide as part of its annual budget justification documents, by March 30 of each year, a detailed list of each general and flag officer quarters for which operations, utilities, and maintenance and repair costs, in sum, are anticipated to exceed $20,000 in the coming year. Currently, annual appropriations laws require congressional notification prior to the expenditure of more than $35,000 for maintenance and repair for any single general or flag officer quarters. This section would enhance congressional oversight of total costs associated with general and flag officer housing.

Section 2805—Congressional Notification of Deviations from Authorized Cost Variations for Military Construction Projects and Military Family Housing Projects

This section would amend section 2853(c)(3) of title 10, United States Code, to shorten the notice and wait period for significant project cost increases or scope decreases from 21 days to 14 days, if notification is provided in an electronic format to Congress.

Section 2806—Repeal of Limitation on Use of Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Family Housing

This section would amend section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, to repeal the limitation on budget authority for contracts and investments in military housing privatization projects, effective October 1, 2005.

Section 2807—Temporary Authority to Accelerate Design Efforts for Military Construction Projects Carried Out Using Design-Build Selection Procedures

This section would establish a demonstration program to allow the Department of Defense to enter into a design-build construction contract using design funds made available under sections 2807 and 18233 of title 10, United States Code, prior to the authorization of the project. Contracts entered into under this demonstration program must be selected using existing design-build contract procedures. In addition, the federal government's liability for termination for convenience of any such contract may not exceed the project's design cost. This section would permit the Department to enter into 36 contracts through September 30, 2008, and would require a report to Congress on the value of the program by March 1, 2007.

### Section 2808—Exchange or Sale of Reserve Component Facilities to Acquire Replacement Facilities

This section would amend section 18233 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to receive facilities, cash, or a combination of facilities and cash for existing reserve component facilities. Existing law only permits the Secretary to exchange reserve facilities for replacement facilities.

### Section 2809—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) to permit 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.

## SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

### Section 2811—Increase in Certain Thresholds for Reporting Real Property Transactions

This section would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from $750,000 to $1,500,000 the thresholds at which the military services must report to Congress real property transactions. This section would also make adjustments to annual reporting requirements for minor real property transactions.

### Section 2812—Reorganization of Existing Administrative Provisions Relating to Real Property Transactions

This section would consolidate and reorganize sections of chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code.

### Section 2813—Treatment of Money Rentals from Golf Course at Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois

This section would amend section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to allow 50 percent of lease receipts from the Rock Island Arsenal Golf Club, a community club that leases and operates the arsenal's golf course for the general public and local military personnel, to be placed into the Rock Island Arsenal morale, welfare, and recreation fund.

### Section 2814—Number of Contracts Authorized Department-Wide Under Demonstration Program on Reduction in Long-Term Facility Maintenance Costs

This section would amend section 2814 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) to adjust the number of contracts permitted under the building commissioning program. The existing program allows each military department to enter into 12 contracts for the construction and short-term maintenance of a facility. This section would adjust the limit to allow a total of 36 contracts for the Department of Defense.

### Section 2815—Repeal of Commission on Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States

This section would repeal section 128 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–132), which established the Commission on the Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States.

### Section 2816—Designation of Airmen Leadership School at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, in Honor of John J. Rhodes, a Former Minority Leader of the House of Representatives

This section would designate the Airmen Leadership School at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, the John J. Rhodes Airmen Leadership School in honor of the former minority leader of the House of Representatives, Congressman John J. Rhodes. Congressman Rhodes served in the United States Army Air Corps, served in the Arizona National Guard as a staff judge advocate, and represented the congressional district containing Luke Air Force Base for the majority of his service in the House of Representatives.

### Section 2817—Elimination of Reversionary Interests Clouding United States Title to Property Used as Navy Homeports

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into agreements with holders of reversionary interests at Navy homeports to secure permanent title to the properties for the Navy. In exchange, the Navy may provide in-kind consideration including forfeiture of existing agreements that require payment to the Navy for real property improvements. The committee believes that such an exchange is in the interest of all parties, and would ensure that disposal of property at these homeports, should they be closed, realigned, or otherwise declared excess to Navy needs, is conducted in a manner that does not place local communities and developers at a disadvantage to locations which do not have reversionary agreements in place.

### Section 2818—Report on Real Property Disposal at Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy, within 180 days of enactment, to report to Congress on the effort to dispose of real property at Marine Corps Air Station El Toro, California, anticipated future uses of the property, and requests received from other federal agencies for property at the air station.

## SUBTITLE C—BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT

### Section 2821—Two-Year Postponement of 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Round and Submission of Reports Regarding Future Infrastructure Requirements for the Armed Forces

This section would amend current base realignment and closure law to postpone the 2005 base closure and realignment round until 2007, pending receipt of several reports on significant infrastructure issues.

First, this section would require the Department of Defense to study and report to Congress on the following issues: the Depart-

ment's Integrated Global Basing Strategy, including basing locations, rotational plans and policies, and overseas and domestic infrastructure requirements associated with that strategy; a study of the infrastructure requirements associated with force transformation efforts; a report on infrastructure requirements related to changes to the active and reserve personnel mixtures of the services; a study of the infrastructure requirements resulting from the Secretary of Defense's "10–30–30" objective; a reassessment of excess infrastructure capacity that is based upon infrastructure, facility, and space requirements of current, future, and surged military forces; and a definition of, and infrastructure requirements associated with, "surge requirements" as determined by the Secretary as required by section 2822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). These reports must be submitted between January 1, 2006, and March 15, 2006, or the authority to conduct an additional round of base closures would be terminated.

In order to permit sufficient time for congressional review of these documents and to allow the Department to incorporate the findings of these reports into base closure and realignment recommendations, this section would suspend the base realignment and closure process until 2007.

Finally, this section would require resubmission of a force structure plan based on an assessment of probable threats to national security during the 20 year period beginning with fiscal year 2007, including anticipated endstrength and force units necessary to meet those threats. It would also require the Secretary of Defense to certify the need for an additional round of base closures as part of the fiscal year 2007 budget justification materials.

The committee notes that a two-year postponement of the base closure and realignment round would have several benefits. First, postponement would allow the Department to stabilize force and funding requirements related to Iraq, Afghanistan, the war against terrorism, and homeland security before making base closure and realignment recommendations. Second, postponement would allow DOD to understand the impact of, and in some cases resolve, significant infrastructure-related issues such as global basing and transformation before making irreversible base closure decisions. Finally, base closure actions historically result in significant upfront costs with net savings not occurring for several years after closure activities. Delay of the base closure round until 2007 would provide relief to significant budgetary pressures on the Department during the next five years.

Section 2822—Establishment of Specific Deadline for Submission of Revisions to Force-Structure Plan and Infrastructure Inventory for Next Base Closure Round

This section would amend section 2912(a)(4) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510, as amended) to establish March 15 of the base closure round year as the final deadline for revision of the force structure plan or infrastructure inventory. The Secretary of Defense published an initial force structure plan and infrastructure inventory, as required by base closure law, in March 2004. This force structure plan and infrastructure inventory, along with selec-

tion criteria, will be used by the Secretary to make base closure and realignment recommendations. While section 2912(a)(4) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 permits the Secretary to revise the plan and inventory by submitting such a revision to Congress as part of the budget justification documents for fiscal year 2006, existing law does not include a specific deadline for submission. This section would establish March 15, of the base closure round year as the deadline, thereby ensuring that any revision to the force structure plan and infrastructure inventory is made with sufficient time to permit congressional review and Department of Defense implementation.

Section 2823—Specification of Final Selection Criteria for Next Base Closure Round

This section would amend and codify the criteria that will be used by the Secretary of Defense in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States during the next base closure round.

The Secretary published draft selection criteria in the Federal Register on December 23, 2003. Following a public comment period, during which the Secretary received comments relating to approximately 200 areas of concern, the final selection criteria were published on February 12, 2004. Despite the number of public comments and criticisms, the final published selection criteria were identical to the initial proposal. This section would modify the selection criteria to incorporate many of the comments and concerns received by the Department of Defense during the comment period and would codify the amended criteria into base closure law.

Section 2824—Requirement for Unanimous Vote of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission to Add to or Otherwise Expand Closure and Realignment Recommendations made by Secretary of Defense

This section would amend section 2914(d) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510, as amended) to require a unanimous vote of the base closure commission to recommend closure, realignment, or expanded realignment of an installation not recommended for closure or realignment by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 2825—Adherence to Certain Authorities on Preservation of Military Depot Capabilities During Any Subsequent Round of Base Closures and Realignments

This section would amend the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510, as amended) to require that base closure and realignment actions comply with provisions of title 10, United States Code, that address government-owned, government-operated depot-level maintenance, repair, and logistics capabilities within the Department of Defense. In addition, this section would prohibit any base closure or realignment action from including a waiver to sections 2464 or section 2466 of title 10, United States code, relating to the preservation of government-owned, government-operated depot facilities and the annual percentage of military department funding for depot level

maintenance and repair activities that may be expended on private sector depot activities.

## SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

### PART I—ARMY CONVEYANCES

#### Section 2831—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer, without consideration, administrative jurisdiction over approximately 20 acres of real property to the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs to be used for the location of a veterans' outpatient clinic.

#### Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Fort Hood, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey approximately 662 acres at Fort Hood, Texas, to the Texas A&M University system of the state of Texas for the purpose of establishing Texas A&M University, Central Texas. In exchange, the Army shall receive fair market value in cash or in-kind consideration for the property. Finally, conveyance of the property is contingent upon the Secretary of the Army's determination that use of the land as a university will not adversely impact operations at Fort Hood's Robert Gray Army Airfield.

#### Section 2833—Land Conveyance, Army National Guard Facility, Seattle, Washington

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, approximately 10 acres of real property, including a portion of a national guard facility, to the state of Washington to support relocation of a guard unit.

### PART II—NAVY CONVEYANCES

#### Section 2841—Transfer of Jurisdiction, Nebraska Avenue Naval Complex, District of Columbia

This section would transfer jurisdiction of the Nebraska Avenue Naval Complex in Washington, D.C., from the Navy to the Administrator of General Services for the purpose of accommodating the Department of Homeland Security. The initial costs incurred by the Navy as a result of the transfer, including move-out costs and first-year lease costs, shall be paid for by the Department of Homeland Security, subject to appropriations.

The section would also express the sense of Congress that long-term relocation costs incurred by the Navy, to include final relocation costs and permanent construction, shall be paid for from federal sources outside of the Department of Defense. In addition, the provision would require the President, after consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the committees on Armed Services and Appropriations, to certify within three years of the transfer whether the Navy's costs related to its departure from the complex have been fully compensated. If the Navy's costs have not been fully compensated, the property shall revert to the jurisdiction of

the Navy, which must then dispose of the property by competitive sale.

### Section 2842—Land Conveyance, Navy Property, Former Fort Sheridan, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, a parcel of environmentally sensitive property to a nonprofit land conservation organization for the purpose of ensuring permanent protection of the lands.

### Section 2843—Land Exchange, Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey approximately five acres of real property at Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland, to the state of Maryland. In exchange, the Navy shall receive approximately 1.5 acres of property of an equal value to the conveyance.

## PART III—AIR FORCE CONVEYANCES

### Section 2851—Land Exchange, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey the Maxwell Heights Housing site at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, to the city of Montgomery, Alabama. In exchange, the Air Force shall receive approximately 35 acres of land contiguous to Maxwell Air Force Base.

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

## TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

### OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $16,797.6 million for the national security activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2005. Of this amount, $9,048.7 million is for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and $7,748.9 million is for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $16,700.6 million, a decrease of $97.0 million.

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Weapons Activities** | | | | | |
| Directed stockpile work (DSW) | | (39,000) | | (39,000) | (39,000) |
| B61 life extension program | 117,927 | | | | 117,927 |
| W76 life extension program | 213,111 | | | | 213,111 |
| W80 life extension program | 146,400 | | | | 146,400 |
| W87 life extension program | | | | | |
| B61 stockpile systems | 91,256 | | | | 91,256 |
| W62 stockpile systems | 18,401 | | | | 18,401 |
| W76 stockpile systems | 137,527 | | | | 137,527 |
| W78 stockpile systems | 44,313 | | | | 44,313 |
| W80 stockpile systems | 49,507 | | | | 49,507 |
| B83 stockpile systems | 44,995 | | | | 44,995 |
| W84 stockpile systems | 6,119 | | | | 6,119 |
| W87 stockpile systems | 94,884 | | | | 94,884 |
| W88 stockpile systems | 49,093 | | | | 49,093 |
| Retired warheads stockpile systems | 65,258 | | | | 65,258 |
| Stockpile services research & development certification and safety | 157,986 | | | | 157,986 |
| Stockpile services management, technology and production | 133,101 | | | | 133,101 |
| Stockpile services advanced concepts | 9,000 | | | | 9,000 |
| Stockpile services robust nuclear earth penetrator | 27,557 | | | | 27,557 |
| Total, Directed stockpile work | 1,406,435 | (39,000) | | (39,000) | 1,367,435 |
| Campaigns | | | | | |
| Science campaigns | | (19,500) | | (19,500) | (19,500) |
| Primary assesment technology | 81,473 | | | | 81,473 |
| Dynamic materials properties | 91,521 | | | | 91,521 |
| Advanced radiography | 62,371 | | | | 62,371 |
| Secondary assessment technologies | 65,597 | | | | 65,597 |
| Total, Science campaigns | 300,962 | (19,500) | | (19,500) | 215,865 |
| Engineering campaign | | | | | |
| Enhanced surety | 38,121 | | | | 38,121 |
| Weapons system engineering assessment technology | 27,270 | | | | 27,270 |
| Nuclear survivability | 24,460 | | | | 24,460 |
| Enhanced surveillance | 99,879 | | | | 99,879 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Microsystems and engineering sciences (MESA) other project costs (OPC) | 4,600 | | | | 4,600 |
| Microsystems and engineering sciences | | | | | |
| Application (MESA) construction | 48,654 | 20,000 | 20,000 | | 68,654 |
| Total, Engineering campaign | 242,984 | 20,000 | 20,000 | | 262,984 |
| | | | | | |
| Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign | | | | | |
| Ignition | 76,437 | | | | 76,437 |
| Support of stockpile program | 38,987 | | | | 38,987 |
| NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experiment support | 44,023 | | | | 44,023 |
| Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion | 10,080 | | | | 10,080 |
| Univeristy grants/other support | 7,776 | | | | 7,776 |
| Facility operations and target production | 63,056 | | | | 63,056 |
| Inertial fusion technology | | | | | |
| NIF demonstration program | 113,700 | | | | 113,700 |
| High-energy petawatt laser development | 7,975 | | | | 7,975 |
| NIF other project costs (OPC) | | | | | |
| NIF construction | 130,000 | | | | 130,000 |
| Total, Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign | 492,034 | | | | 492,034 |
| | | | | | |
| Advanced simulation and computing campaign | | (20,000) | | (20,000) | (20,000) |
| Advanced application development | 150,793 | | | | 150,793 |
| Verification and walidation | 49,780 | | | | 49,780 |
| Materials and physics modeling | 72,062 | | | | 72,062 |
| Problem solving environment (PSE) | 45,072 | | | | 45,072 |
| Distance computing (DisCom) | 17,068 | | | | 17,068 |
| Pathforward | 18,000 | | | | 18,000 |
| Visual interactive environment for weapons simulation (VIEWS) | 61,635 | | | | 61,635 |
| Physical infrastructure & platforms | 140,000 | | | | 140,000 |
| Computational systems | 64,081 | | | | 64,081 |
| Simulation support | 59,413 | | | | 59,413 |
| Advanced architecture | 3,000 | | | | 3,000 |
| University partnerships | 47,980 | | | | 47,980 |
| ASCI integration | 9,148 | | | | 9,148 |
| Construction projects | 3,228 | | | | 3,228 |
| Total, Advanced simulation and computing campaign | 741,260 | (20,000) | | (20,000) | 721,260 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pit manufacturing and certification campaign | 336,473 | | | | 336,473 |
| Readiness Campaign | | | | | |
| Stockpile readiness | 45,812 | | | | 45,812 |
| High explosives and weapon operations | 34,220 | | | | 34,220 |
| Non-nuclear readiness | 35,457 | | | | 35,457 |
| Tritium readiness | 58,850 | | | | 58,850 |
| Tritium readiness construction | 21,000 | | | | 21,000 |
| Advanced design & production technologies | 84,788 | | | | 84,788 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| Total, Readiness campaign | 280,127 | | | | 280,127 |
| Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF) | | | | | |
| Operations of facilities | | | | | |
| Kansas City Plant | 101,775 | 5,000 | 5,000 | | 106,775 |
| LLNL | 54,765 | 8,000 | 8,000 | | 62,765 |
| LANL | 318,913 | | | | 318,913 |
| Nevada Test Site | 70,180 | | | | 70,180 |
| Pantex Plant | 97,741 | 19,000 | 19,000 | | 116,741 |
| Sandia National Laboratories | 150,710 | 18,000 | 18,000 | | 168,710 |
| Savannah River Site | 95,173 | | | | 95,173 |
| Y-12 National Security Complex | 98,194 | 18,000 | 18,000 | | 116,194 |
| Institutional site support | 30,106 | | | | 30,106 |
| Program readiness | 106,204 | | | | 106,204 |
| Special projects | 20,534 | | | | 20,534 |
| Material recycle and recovery | 86,965 | | | | 86,965 |
| Containers | 17,910 | | | | 17,910 |
| Storage | 18,982 | | | | 18,982 |
| Subtotal, operations & maintenance | 1,268,152 | 68,000 | 68,000 | | 1,336,152 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 05-D-140 Project engineering design various locations | 11,600 | | | | 11,600 |
| 05-D-401 Building 12-64 production bays upgrades Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX | 25,100 | | | | 25,100 |
| 05-D-402 Berylium capability (BEC) project, Y-12 National Security Complex, Oakridge, TN | 3,627 | | | | 3,627 |
| 04-D-103 Project engineering and design, (PED) various locations | 1,500 | | | | 1,500 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | 24,000 | | | | 24,000 |
| 04-D-126 Building 12-44 production cellsupgrade, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX | 2,600 | | | | 2,600 |
| 03-D-102 LANL Admininistration Building (LANL) | 37,348 | | | | 37,348 |
| 03-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations | 15,275 | | | | 15,275 |
| 03-D-123 Special nuclear materials component requalification facility, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX | 4,602 | | | | 4,602 |
| 02-D-103 Project engineering and design, various locations | 5,250 | | | | 5,250 |
| 02-D-105 Engineering technology complex upgrade (ETCU), LLNL, Livermore, CA | 5,400 | | | | 5,400 |
| 01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations | 6,000 | | | | 6,000 |
| 01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN | 64,000 | | | | 64,000 |
| Total, Construction | 206,302 | | | | 206,302 |
| Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities | 1,474,454 | 68,000 | 68,000 | | 1,542,454 |
| Secure transportation asset | | | | | |
| Operations and equipment | 143,873 | | | | 143,873 |
| Program direction | 57,427 | | | | 57,427 |
| Subtotal, Secure transportation asset | 201,300 | | | | 201,300 |
| Total, Secure transportation asset | 201,300 | | | | 201,300 |
| Nuclear weapons incident response | | | | | |
| Emergency response | 93,119 | | | | 93,119 |
| Emergency management | 6,090 | | | | 6,090 |
| Total, nuclear weapons incident response | 99,209 | | | | 99,209 |
| Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 291,543 | | | | 291,543 |
| Construction | | | | | |
| 05-D-160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), project engineering and design (PED) | 8,700 | | | | 8,700 |
| 05-D-601Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y-12, National security complex, Oakridge, TN | 4,400 | | | | 4,400 |
| 05-D-602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | 10,000 | | | | 10,000 |
| 05-D-603 New master substation (NMSU) SNL | 600 | | | | 600 |
| 04-D-203 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), project engineering design (PED) | 981 | | | | 981 |
| Total, Construction | 24,681 | | | | 24,681 |
| Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program | 316,224 | | | | 316,224 |
| Safeguards and security | | | | | |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Physical security | 589,491 | | | | 589,491 |
| Cyber Security | 80,500 | | | | 80,500 |
| Subtotal, operations and maintanence | 669,991 | | | | 669,991 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 05-D-170 Project engineering and design, various locations | 17,000 | | | | 17,000 |
| 05-D-701 Security perimeter project, Los Alamos, National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | 20,000 | | | | 20,000 |
| Subtotal, construction | 37,000 | | | | 37,000 |
| Total, Safeguards and security | 706,991 | | | | 706,991 |
| **Subtotal, Weapons Activities** | 6,598,453 | 9,500 | 88,000 | (78,500) | 6,607,953 |
| Adjustments | | | | | |
| Use of prior year balances | | | | | |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work | (30,000) | | | | (30,000) |
| Total, Adjustments | (30,000) | | | | (30,000) |
| **Total, Weapons Activities** | 6,568,453 | 9,500 | 88,000 | (78,500) | 6,547,953 |
| **Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | | | | | |
| Nonproliferation and verification R&D | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 220,000 | | | | 220,000 |
| Nonproliferation and international security | 124,000 | | | | 124,000 |
| IAEA Safeguards and Nonproliferation Policy | | | | | |
| Nuclear Noncompliance Verification | | | | | |
| Nonproliferation programs with Russia | | | | | |
| International nuclear materials protection and cooperation | 238,000 | (10,500) | | (10,500) | 227,500 |
| Russian transition initiatives | 41,000 | | | | 41,000 |
| HEU transparency implementation | 20,950 | | | | 20,950 |
| International nuclear safety and cooperation | | | | | |
| Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program | 50,097 | | | | 50,097 |
| Fissile materials disposition | | | | | |
| U S surplus materials disposition | 184,700 | | | | 184,700 |
| Russian surplus materials disposition | 64,000 | | | | 64,000 |
| Total, Fissile materials disposition | 248,700 | | | | 248,700 |
| Construction: | | | | | |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC | 32,300 | | | | 32,300 |
| 99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC | 368,000 | | | | 368,000 |
| Total, Construction | 400,300 | | | | 400,300 |
| Total, Fissile materials disposition | 649,000 | | | | 649,000 |
| Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia | 999,047 | (10,500) | | (10,500) | 988,547 |
| Offsight source recovery project | 5,600 | | | | 5,600 |
| **Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | 1,348,647 | (10,500) | | (10,500) | 1,338,147 |
| Adjustments: | | | | | |
| Use of prior year balances | | | | | |
| Total, Adjustments | | | | | |
| **Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | 1,348,647 | (10,500) | | (10,500) | 1,338,147 |
| **Naval Reactors** | | | | | |
| Naval reactors development | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 761,211 | | | | 761,211 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 05-N-900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY | 6,200 | | | | 6,200 |
| 90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID | 989 | | | | 989 |
| Total, Construction | 7,189 | | | | 7,189 |
| Total, Naval reactors development | 768,400 | | | | 768,400 |
| Program direction | 29,500 | | | | 29,500 |
| Subtotal, Naval Reactors | 797,900 | | | | 797,900 |
| **Total, Naval Reactors** | 797,900 | | | | 797,900 |
| **Office Of The Administrator** | | | | | |
| Office of the Administrator | 333,700 | | | | 333,700 |
| **Total, Office of the Administrator** | 333,700 | | | | 333,700 |
| **Defense Site Acceleration Completion** *(Defense Facilities Closure Projects)* | | | | | |
| 2006 Accelerated completions | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 1,251,799 | | | | 1,251,799 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2012 Accelerated Completions | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 1,437,001 | | | | 1,437,001 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 04-D-414 Project engineering and design, various locations | 3,000 | | | | 3,000 |
| 04-D-423 3013 container surveillance capability in 235-F, SR | 20,640 | | | | 20,640 |
| 01-D-416 Waste treatment and immobilization plant, RL | 690,000 | | | | 690,000 |
| Total, Construction | 713,640 | | | | 713,640 |
| Total, 2012 Accelerated Completions | 2,150,641 | | | | 2,150,641 |
| 2035 Accelerated Completions | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 1,849,512 | | | | 1,849,512 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 04-D-408 Glass waste storage building #2, SR | 43,827 | | | | 43,827 |
| Total, Construction | 43,827 | | | | 43,827 |
| Total, 2035 Accelerated Completions | 1,893,339 | | | | 1,893,339 |
| Safeguards and security | 265,059 | | | | 265,059 |
| High level waste legislative proposal | | (100,000) | | (100,000) | (100,000) |
| Operation and maintenance | 249,442 | | | | 249,442 |
| Construction | | | | | |
| 05-D-401 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River | 52,000 | | | | 52,000 |
| 04-D-414 04-02 PED: Sodium bearing waste treatment, Idaho | 24,900 | | | | 24,900 |
| 03-D-414 PED: salt waste processing facility alternative, Savannah River | 23,658 | | | | 23,658 |
| Total, Construction | 100,558 | | | | 100,558 |
| Total, High level waste legislative proposal | 350,000 | (100,000) | | (100,000) | 250,000 |
| Technology development and deployment | 60,142 | 6,000 | | | 66,142 |
| Hammer | | | 6,000 | | |
| **Subtotal, Defense Site Acceleration Completion** | 5,970,980 | (94,000) | | (100,000) | 5,876,980 |
| Use of prior year balances | | | | | |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work | (143) | | | | (143) |
| **Total, Defense Site Acceleration Completion** | 5,970,837 | (94,000) | 6,000 | (100,000) | 5,876,837 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Defense Environmental Services** | | | | | |
| Community and regulatory support | 60,547 | | | | 60,547 |
| Federal contribution to the uranium enrichment | 463,000 | 4,000 | | | 467,000 |
| Non-closure environmental activities | | | 4,000 | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 187,864 | | | | 187,864 |
| Program direction | 271,059 | | | | 271,059 |
| Subtotal, Defense Environmental Services | 982,470 | 4,000 | 4,000 | | 986,470 |
| Use of prior year balances | | | | | |
| **Total, Defense Environmental Services** | 982,470 | 4,000 | 4,000 | | 986,470 |
| **Other Defense Activities** | | | | | |
| Energy security and assurance | | | | | |
| Energy security | 6,100 | | | | 6,100 |
| Program direction | 4,500 | | | | 4,500 |
| Total, Energy security and assurance | 10,600 | | | | 10,600 |
| Office of Security | | | | | |
| Nuclear safeguards and security | 143,197 | | | | 143,197 |
| Security investigations | 53,554 | | | | 53,554 |
| Program direction | 58,350 | | | | 58,350 |
| Total, Office of Security | 255,101 | | | | 255,101 |
| Independent oversight and performance assurance | 24,669 | | | | 24,669 |
| Civilian radioactive waste management | | | | | |
| Spent nuclear fuel management | 21,190 | | | | 21,190 |
| Program direction | 1,060 | | | | 1,060 |
| Total, Civilian radioactive waste management | 22,250 | | | | 22,250 |
| Environment, safety & health | | | | | |
| Environment, safety and health (defense) | 99,105 | | | | 99,105 |
| Program direction | 20,414 | | | | 20,414 |
| Total, Environment, safety and health | 119,519 | | | | 119,519 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Office of Legacy Management | | | | | |
| Legacy management | 19,194 | | | | 19,194 |
| Worker and community transition | 2,500 | (2,500) | | (2,500) | |
| Program direction | 13,201 | | | | 13,201 |
| Total, Office of Legacy Management | 34,895 | (2,500) | | (2,500) | 32,395 |
| Nuclear energy | | | | | |
| Infrastructure | | | | | |
| Idaho facilities management | | | | | |
| INEEL infrastructure O&M | 20,886 | 1,500 | 1,500 | | 22,386 |
| Idaho sitewide safeguards and security | 58,103 | | | | 58,103 |
| Total, Infrastructure | 78,989 | 1,500 | 1,500 | | 80,489 |
| Program direction | 33,858 | | | | 33,858 |
| Total, Nuclear energy | 112,847 | 1,500 | 1,500 | | 114,347 |
| Defense related administrative support | 92,440 | | | | 92,440 |
| Office of hearings and appeals | 4,318 | | | | 4,318 |
| Office of Future Liabilities | | | | | |
| Future Liabilities | 5,000 | (5,000) | | (5,000) | |
| **Subtotal, Other defense activities** | 681,639 | (6,000) | 1,500 | (7,500) | 675,639 |
| Adjustments: | | | | | |
| Use of prior year balances | (15,000) | | | | (15,000) |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work (SO) | | | | | |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work (NE) | (2,021) | | | | (2,021) |
| Total, Adjustments | (17,021) | | | | (17,021) |
| **Total, Other Defense Activities** | 664,618 | (6,000) | 1,500 | (7,500) | 658,618 |
| **Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal** | | | | | |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 131,000 | | | | 131,000 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | FY 2005 Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Atomic Energy Defense Activities** | | | | | |
| National Nuclear Security Administration: | | | | | |
| Weapons activities | 6,568,453 | 9,500 | 88,000 | (78,500) | 6,577,953 |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation | 1,348,647 | (10,500) | | (10,500) | 1,338,147 |
| Naval reactors | 797,900 | | | | 797,900 |
| Office of the administrator | 333,700 | | | | 333,700 |
| Total, National Nuclear Security Administration | 9,048,700 | (1,000) | 88,000 | (89,000) | 9,047,700 |
| Environmental and other defense activities: | | | | | |
| Defense site acceleration completion | 5,970,837 | (94,000) | 6,000 | (100,000) | 5,876,837 |
| Defense environmental services | 982,470 | 4,000 | 4,000 | | 986,470 |
| Other defense activities | 664,618 | (6,000) | 1,500 | (7,500) | 658,618 |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 131,000 | | | | 131,000 |
| Total, Environmental & other defense activities | 7,748,925 | (96,000) | 11,500 | (107,500) | 7,652,925 |
| **Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities** | 16,797,625 | (97,000) | 99,500 | (196,500) | 16,700,625 |
| Defense Nuclear Facilites Safety Board | 20,268 | 1,000 | 1,000 | | 21,268 |
| Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program - Corps of Engineers | [140,000] | | | | |
| **Total. Department of Energy (053)** | 16,817,893 | (96,000) | 100,500 | (196,500) | 16,721,893 |

# ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

## NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $9,048.7 million for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends $9,047.7 million, a decrease of $1.0 million.

### Adjustments to the Budget Request

*Reductions*

*Directed stockpile work*

The budget request contained $1,406.4 million for directed stockpile work.

The committee notes that the nuclear weapon stockpile requirements that guide the stockpile life extension programs are under review by the Department of Defense as part of a periodic assessment of the Nuclear Posture Review. The committee also notes that it is difficult for the committee to support increases in funding for individual warhead life extension programs until this assessment is completed and forwarded to the congressional defense committees.

The committee recommends $1,367.4 million, a decrease of $39.0 million.

*Campaigns*

The budget request contained $301.0 million for the science campaign.

The committee notes with concern that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) reported mixed results in meeting the fiscal year 2003 science campaign performance targets contained in the NNSA Future-Year Nuclear Security Program.

The committee recommends $281.5 million, a decrease of $19.5 million. This funding level represents an increase of $18.0 million over the fiscal year 2004 appropriation.

The budget request contained $741.3 million for the Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASC) campaign. The committee notes that the ASC campaign has experienced cost growth and schedule slippage. The committee also notes that the campaign is apparently procuring a considerably larger set of computers than originally envisioned.

The committee recommends $721.3 million, a decrease of $20.0 million. This funding represents funding at the fiscal year 2004 level.

*International nuclear materials protection and cooperation*

The budget request contained $43.0 million within the International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation program for security enhancements at the MinAtom Weapons complex.

The committee understands that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has had limited success in completing security upgrades at these sites due to MinAtom not granting access. While the committee supports the goals of this program, it does not

support authorizing funds for projects where NNSA does not have the access required to accomplish program objectives.

The committee recommends $32.5 million, a decrease of $10.5 million. The recommended funding is equivalent to the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2004. The committee directs the Administrator of the NNSA to submit a report with the fiscal year 2006 budget request on the status of NNSA access, as of the end of fiscal year 2004, to those MinAtom sites where Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for security upgrades.

*Increases*

*Engineering campaign*

The budget request contained $48.7 million in the engineering campaign for construction of the Microsystems and Engineering Sciences Application (MESA) complex at Sandia National Laboratories (project 01–D–108).

The committee notes that when complete, MESA will be a significant facility for modernizing the electrical, optical, and mechanical components of the nuclear stockpile using computationally enabled micro-technologies. Accelerated construction of the MESA complex will ensure timely availability of critical tools for stockpile stewardship.

The committee recommends $68.7 million, an increase of $20.0 million for further acceleration of MESA construction. The NNSA Administrator is directed to submit a revised MESA construction baseline with the fiscal year 2006 budget request that reflects congressional funding increases through the end of fiscal year 2005.

*Readiness in technical base and facilities*

The budget request contained $1,474.5 million for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities.

The committee has been encouraged by the progress made in the reduction of deferred maintenance backlogs in the defense nuclear complex.

The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million 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: $5.0 million at the Kansas City Plant, $8.0 million at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, $19.0 million at Pantex and $18.0 million at the Y–12 plant.

The committee is aware that accelerated construction and delivery of the Z Petawatt laser will add significant radiographic diagnostic capabilities to the stockpile stewardship campaign. The committee recommends an increase of $13.0 million for the Z Petawatt laser.

The committee is aware that adding a second operations shift to the Z facility will meet the increased demand for experiments conducted on the Z machine. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to fund a second shift operation at the Z facility.

Advanced Concepts and Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator

The committee supports the budget request of $9.0 million for Advanced Concepts and $27.6 million for completion of the 6.2/2A

Air Force-led study on the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP). The committee strongly reaffirms the importance of these two initiatives and authorizes the full amount of the request.

The committee notes that the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has stated in testimony before the committee that the RNEP study was being conducted at the request of the Department of Defense. The committee also takes note that a recent Defense Science Board Task Force study on Future Strategic Strike Forces specifically recommended that research be initiated on nuclear weapons that produce much lower collateral damage than those weapons in the existing nuclear stockpile. The committee also reminds the NNSA that any efforts beyond a study could only be pursued if the President approves and funds are authorized and appropriated by Congress.

### Advanced Technology Research and Development

The committee notes that the budget requests funds for advanced technology research and development in several activities within the National Nuclear Security Administration. The committee encourages the Administrator to review individual advanced technology research and development programs to ensure they are coordinated with, and do not duplicate, other similar research and development efforts.

### Los Alamos Public Schools

The committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) stated the concern that little progress has been made in developing an exit strategy for the Department of Energy to discontinue funding for the Los Alamos Public Schools system. The fiscal year 2005 budget request contained no funding for the Los Alamos Public Schools, ending a practice whereby for many years this school district was the only one receiving assistance from the Department.

The Department, in its February 2004 report, "Support for Public Education in the Vicinity of Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico," concluded that the Los Alamos Public School District must receive stable financial support if the Los Alamos Public School District is to maintain the standard of educational excellence that the Los Alamos National Laboratory staff demands. According to the report, this support to the public schools is required in order for the laboratory to attract and retain the talented and highly educated individuals required to execute its national security mission. One option the report recommended for supplementing the resources of the Los Alamos Public Schools was to allow the management and operating contractor for Los Alamos National Laboratory to support the Los Alamos Public Schools within the confines of the existing operating contract.

The committee understands the need to attract and retain highly talented personnel for the national laboratory complex. Therefore, the committee directs the Department, from within those funds authorized for Department activities at Los Alamos National Laboratory, to provide $8.0 million per year out of site contractor overhead, to support the Los Alamos Public School District.

### Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility

The committee notes the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) recent announcement of a delay until the summer of 2005 for starting construction of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility (MOX) in the Russian Federation due to delays in resolving a government-to-government liability agreement. Recent discussions with the NNSA indicate that the 2005 commencement date may also be in jeopardy. The committee notes that the projected start of construction has slipped four years since the project began in fiscal year 2000.

While the committee fully supports the MOX program objective of conversion of weapons grade plutonium into fuel for commercial reactors, it is concerned with these delays and does not want to further add to the existing uncommitted balances in the NNSA nonproliferation accounts. The committee directs the Administrator of the NNSA to notify the congressional defense committees within 30 days of any decision that construction of the MOX facility will not begin by the end of fiscal year 2005.

## Environmental and Other Defense Activities

### Overview

The budget request contained $7,748.9 million for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $7,652.9 million, a decrease of $96.0 million.

### Adjustments to the Budget Request

*Reductions*

*Waste incidental to reprocessing*

The budget request contained $350.0 million for a High Level Waste Proposal program within the Defense Site Acceleration Completion account to address a contingency for "Waste Incidental to Reprocessing." The budget materials state that these funds will only be requested to the extent that legal uncertainty concerning certain reprocessing wastes is satisfactorily resolved through pending litigation or by new legislation. This uncertainty was raised by a 2003 federal district court ruling that the Department of Energy's reclassification of waste streams generated by reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel violated the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (*Natural Resources Defense Council* v. *Spencer Abraham*, District Court of Idaho, 2003).

The committee understands that this request concerns matters that are both pending the outcome of litigation and the subject of negotiations with individual states. The committee has not received formal transmittal of a legislative proposal. However, the committee notes that the Department is actively working with the states to achieve consensus on a legislative proposal that would clarify the law and allow cleanup activities to proceed. The committee also notes it does not appear that the federal court decision requires a cessation of all current waste cleanup activities and that the budget request contains $3,368.0 million for Defense Site Acceleration Completion for sites in Idaho, South Carolina, and Washington.

The committee notes that some of the activities proposed to be funded in the High Level Waste Proposal may either be precluded by or imprudent to conduct under the federal district court ruling. The committee urges the Department to proceed with those cleanup activities that are not prevented by the federal district court ruling or are not otherwise deemed inappropriate due to the legal uncertainty resulting from the court ruling. The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 1, 2005 stating which of those activities listed under the High Level Waste Proposal can proceed consistent with the current legal determination and those that cannot, clearly stating the rationale for each such determination. The committee also urges the Department to submit a legislative proposal at the earliest opportunity to clarify the law on Waste Incidental to Reprocessing in order to facilitate long-term cleanup plans across all defense sites.

The committee recognizes the significant costs and schedule impacts for future defense site acceleration cleanup plans in the event the district court ruling stands and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act is not amended. The committee includes a legislative provision calling for a National Academy of Sciences study of the Department's plans to manage and treat prior to final disposal the high-level radioactive waste at the Savannah River Site, South Carolina, the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho and the Hanford Reservation, Washington.

The committee recommends $250.0 million, a decrease of $100.0 million. Should funds in excess of the amount authorized be required for site cleanup activities under the High Level Waste Proposal in fiscal year 2005, the Department of Energy is directed to submit a request for reprogramming of funds to the congressional defense committees.

*Worker and community transition*

The budget request contained $2.5 million for worker and community transition within the Office of Legacy Management.

The committee notes that the budget request states that the need for worker transition assistance has considerably diminished in recent years and that there is no estimated need for community transition assistance during fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommends no funds for worker and community transition and recommends the Department of Energy terminate the program.

*Office of future liabilities*

The budget contained $5.0 million for the Office of Future Liabilities. The committee notes that the Office of Future Liabilities was just recently established by the Department of Energy to fund and manage environmental liabilities not assigned to the Office of Environmental Management or other organizations within the Department. The committee also notes that the Department had previously established a new Office of Legacy Management in 2003.

While the committee is encouraged that the Office of Environmental Management is taking a long term view of future management issues, it appears premature to establish an Office of Future

Liabilities when the current Defense Site Acceleration Completion activities are scheduled to continue through fiscal year 2035.

The committee recommends no funds for the Office of Future Liabilities and encourages the Department to perform those functions within the Office of Environmental Management or Office of Legacy Management.

*Increases*

*2035 defense site accelerated completions*

The budget request contains no funds for the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response Training and Education (HAMMER) center.

The committee is aware that the HAMMER center provides valuable training for emergency response personnel. The committee is also aware that the Department of Energy is reviewing whether the HAMMER center should be operated by the Office of Environmental Management or by the Office of Energy Security and Assurance.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for operation of the HAMMER center. The committee also urges the Secretary to make a determination as to what office within the Department should have long-term responsibility for operation of the HAMMER center.

*Non-closure environmental activities*

The budget request contained $187.9 million for non-closure environmental activities.

The committee is aware of a need to fund newly generated waste requirements and ground water cleanup activities at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

The committee recommends $191.9 million, an increase of $4.0 million for newly generated waste requirements and ground water cleanup activities at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Project HQ–SW–0013Y).

*Idaho facilities management-other defense activities*

The budget request contained $20.9 million for Idaho Facilities Management-Other Defense Activities.

The committee is aware that spent nuclear fuel, a portion of which is the responsibility of the Department of Energy through contracts by the Department and its predecessor federal agencies, is in long-term storage in aluminum canisters at the Lynchburg Technology Center operated by BWX Technologies in Lynchburg, Virginia. The committee also notes that both the Department and BWX Technologies have indicated that inspections, and possibly repackaging, of the stored spent nuclear fuel are required to ensure proper long-term storage.

The committee recommends $22.4 million, an increase of $1.5 million, for the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology to inspect and repackage, as appropriate, its spent nuclear fuel stored in outside storage wells at the Lynchburg Technology Center in Lynchburg, Virginia. After the spent nuclear fuel is inspected and appropriate repackaging is completed, it is to be replaced in refurbished storage wells. The specific spent nuclear fuel covered by

this requirement is that spent nuclear fuel described in the storage contract (DE–AC02–02NE23429) between the Department, as administered by the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science, and Technology, and BWX Technologies. The committee intends for this work to start in fiscal year 2005 and conclude no later than the end of fiscal year 2007.

### Technology Deployment and Development

The committee notes that several high-level waste separation technologies under development could potentially reduce costs and shorten schedules for high-level waste remediation. The committee encourages the Department, within funds authorized under Defense Site Acceleration Completion for technology deployment and development, to fund technology demonstrations that provide alternative solutions for high-level waste separation.

### Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program

The committee is concerned with the lack of progress the Department of Energy has made in processing the backlog of defense nuclear worker claims under Subtitle D of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act. The committee notes that recent Department statistics reflect that 2,257 cases have been completed out of the 23,996 applications received for health-related claims under the Act. However, the committee also notes that only a handful of workers determined to have valid health-related claims have actually received any compensation. The committee also understands that a recent GAO report notes that the lack of a "willing payer" of workers" compensation benefits for some workers means that some workers with valid defense nuclear complex health claims may receive no compensation.

While the Department has made some progress in processing the claims, the committee notes that further improvements to processing are required to ensure that claims can be processed with proper physician advice in a manner that is both speedy and medically sound. The committee notes that the Department has requested increased funding and has requested legislative remedies that may improve the efficiency of the physician review panels.

The committee remains concerned that these and possibly other improvements are needed to achieve timely physician review panel determinations and urges the Department to work with the committee to identify any additional actions required to expedite processing and payment of claims. The committee also urges the Department to continue to work with federal agencies and other organizations to propose solutions for the "willing payer" problems.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

#### Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2005, 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 2005, 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 2005.

### Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

This section would authorize funds for defense nuclear waste disposal for fiscal year 2005.

## SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

### Section 3111—Extension of Authority for Appointment of Certain Scientific, Engineering and Technical Personnel

This section would amend section 4601 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 USC 2701) to extend authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering, and technical personnel.

### Section 3112—Requirements for Baseline of Projects under Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program

This section would amend section 3114 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) to give the NNSA Administrator greater flexibility in adding projects or updating priorities to projects within the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program.

## SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 3131—Transfers and reprogrammings of National Nuclear Security Administration funds

Title XXXII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (50 USC 2401), otherwise known as the "NNSA Act") established the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). In passing the Act, Congress created the NNSA as a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy. The mission of the NNSA is to enhance national security through the military application of nuclear energy, reduce global danger from weapons of mass destruction, and promote international nuclear safety. The cornerstone of this Act is a significant level of autonomy for the NNSA.

Among the various functions assigned in the Act, the NNSA Administrator has authority over, and is responsible for, all programs and activities of the NNSA including budget formulation, guidance and execution, and other financial matters (50 USC 2402). The NNSA Act also provides for separate treatment of the NNSA budget request within the President's budget request (50 USC 2451) and for the Administrator to establish procedures for planning, programming, budgeting, and financial activities (50 USC 2452).

The committee is concerned that execution of the NNSA budget process may not reflect the degree of autonomy intended in the NNSA Act. In order to carry out the above budget functions as intended by Congress, this provision directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security specifically to submit notifications and requests for reprogramming directly to the congressional defense committees, with the only role of the Department of Energy being for the Chief Financial Officer to certify whether funds covered by the notice or request are available. This provision is necessary to ensure responsive oversight and to safeguard the autonomy of the Administration.

The committee remains concerned that there may be additional areas of the budget process in which the autonomy intended by Congress is not being exercised. The committee encourages the Administrator to review the budget and programming process to ensure NNSA is in complete compliance with the letter and spirit of the NNSA Act.

### Section 3132—National Academy of Sciences study on management by Department of Energy of high-level radioactive waste

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to complete a study of the Department's "residual" waste streams management plans. These streams are from the Department's high-level waste tanks, which are not planned for disposal into a high-level waste repository.

This study should provide an explicit assessment of the waste streams that are planned for disposal in place in the tanks or that result from the processing of retrieved tank wastes at the Hanford Reservation in Washington, the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory in Idaho, and the Savannah River Site in South Carolina. The examination should address the full range of "residual wastes" including, among others, the high-level waste tank remainders that the Department considers incidental to reprocessing, the streams from tank waste processing, such as saltstone at the Savannah River Site, and tank waste the Department plans to immobilize and ship for disposal to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

The National Academy of Sciences should deliver an interim report on the waste planned for disposal in place in the tanks to the committee and the Secretary six months after entering into the agreement to undertake this study. A final report addressing the remainder of the task objectives should be issued twelve months after funding is received. Within funds allocated for defense environmental management the Department authorizes up to $1,500,000 for the study.

### Section 3133—Contract to Review Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, New Mexico

The current five-year Congressional authorization for Independent Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Oversight expires at the end of fiscal year 2004. This section would direct the Secretary of Energy to enter into a new contract for independent reviews of the de-

sign, construction and operations of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico.

# TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize $21.3 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2005, an increase of $1.0 million to fund cost-of-living pay increases for permanent staff and to hire outside consultants as needed for technical oversight of new Department of Energy projects.

# TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 3301—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $59.7 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund for the operation and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2005. The provision would also permit the use of additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions 45 days after Congress receives notification.

### Section 3302—Revision of Limitations on Required Disposals of Certain Materials in National Defense Stockpile

This section would amend section 3306 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) by authorizing the Secretary of Defense to dispose of 100,000 short tons of high carbon manganese ferro of the highest grade during fiscal year 2005, rather than 50,000 short tons as currently authorized.

### Section 3303—Authority to Dispose of Certain Materials in National Defense Stockpile

This section would amend section 3303 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to dispose of materials in the National Defense Stockpile so as to result in $785.0 million in receipts by the end of fiscal year 2005, and $870.0 million in receipts by the end of fiscal year 2009.

# TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISION

### Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $20.0 million for fiscal year 2005 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 2005

This section would authorize a total of $149.1 million for fiscal year 2005, an increase of $13.4 million above the budget request for the Maritime Administration. Of the funds authorized, $109.3 would be for operations and training programs, $4.8 million would be for administrative expenses related to providing loan guarantees authorized by title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, (46 App. United States Code 1271 et seq.), and $35 million would be for the disposal of obsolete ships in the National Defense Reserve Fleet. Within the funds provided for the disposal of obsolete vessels, the committee includes $2 million to begin the decommissioning, removal, and disposal of the nuclear reactor and hazardous materials aboard the Nuclear Ship Savannah, which is located at the James River facility in Virginia.

### Section 3502—Extension of Authority to Provide War Risk Insurance for Merchant Marine Vessels

This section would extend for five years the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to provide war risk insurance and reinsurance relating to merchant marine vessels. This section would also modify the existing provision to reflect the current Department of the Treasury practice of investing in public debt securities of the United States, with maturities and interest rates suitable to the needs of the fund.

# 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, March 11, 2004.*

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 2005.

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.*

---

## COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 12, 2004 the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 4200, as amended, by a vote of 60–0.

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
*Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.*

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. 4200, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005," specifically:

(1) Section 590. Continuation of impact aid assistance on behalf of dependents of certain members despite change in state of member.

(2) Section 595. Assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees.

(3) Section 596. Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps and recruiter access at institutions of higher education.

(4) Section 904. Modification of obligated service requirements under National Security Education Program.

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. 4200, the Committee does hold an

interest in preserving its future jurisdiction with respect to issues raised in the aforementioned provisions and its jurisdictional prerogatives 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. 4200 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 14, 2004.*

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. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

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 14, 2004.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: On May 12, 2004, the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. As ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services, this legislation contains a number of provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

These provisions include the following:

Section 596. Reserve Senior Officer Training Corps and recruiter access at institutions of higher education.

Section 601. Increase in basic pay for fiscal year 2005.

Section 3111. Extension of authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering, and technical personnel.

Section 3112. Requirements for baseline of projects under Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program.

Section 3131. Transfers and reprogrammings of National Nuclear Security Administration funds.

Section 3132. National Academy of Sciences study on management by Department of Energy of high-level radioactive waste.

Section 3133. Contract to review Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, New Mexico.

Section 3201. Defense Nuclear Facilities 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 asks for your support in being accorded such conferees.

I request that you include this letter as part of the report on H.R. 4200 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 14, 2004.*

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. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

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 14, 2004.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN: On May 12, 2004, the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. As you know, the H.R. 4200, as

reported, contains a number of provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. These provisions implicate the committee's jurisdiction on a number of subject including: the disposition of Federal property, the Freedom of Information Act, the Federal civil service, and procurement.

Because of your willingness to consult with this Committee, and because of your desire to move this legislation expeditiously, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Committee on Government Reform. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 4200. In addition, the Committee reserves its authority to seek conferees 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 for conferees by the Committee on H.R. 4200 or similar legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation 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 14, 2004.*

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
*Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

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 INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
*Washington, DC, May 11, 2004.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write with respect to the export control provisions of this year's proposed National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), H.R. 4200, which your Committee is preparing to mark up and report in the near future. I request that you include

in H.R. 4200 those provisions in Title XIV, Subtitle A, relating to export controls. These provisions would strengthen military export controls in areas in which the Department of Defense plays a major role, often alongside U.S. private firms regulated under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act. Other provisions would reinforce the role and responsibility of Congress to provide appropriate oversight in these areas.

These provisions complement and reinforce the policy that the Committee on International Relations has long followed in these areas and are fully consistent with provisions in H.R. 1950 (the State Department Authorization Act), which the House passed last year during the first session of the 108th Congress. In particular, I am very sympathetic to purposes which the NDAA export control provisions would advance concerning: (1) the need to strengthen (not relax) military export controls in the context of the global war on terror, and (2) to set high (not reduced) standards internationally for other governments to follow multilaterally, as well as in the administration of their national systems, regarding the control of weapons technology and military systems and equipment. Similarly, at a time when our European allies are seeking increasingly greater access to the United States defense procurement market and to our weapons technology in order to help meet their defense commitments to NATO, while simultaneously pursuing a process to expand weapons technology transfers to the People's Republic of China, it behooves our Government to ensure that fundamental principles of U.S. law and policy are upheld. This includes, above all, the right of the United States to consent to the re-export or retransfer of U.S. weapons technology by a foreign government or person to any third party or person, including the government of another country, before such a re-export or retransfer may take place.

For the foregoing reasons, I strongly support adoption by your Committee of these provisions in the proposed NDAA.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
*Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that on Wednesday, May 12, 2004, the Committee on Armed Services ordered favorably reported H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. 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.

With respect to Section 1202, Assistance to Military or Security Forces of Iraq and Afghanistan, I will request from the Speaker a referral of H.R. 4200, should this provision not be removed from the bill before it is filed.

Additional provisions within our Committee's jurisdiction are: (1) Section 811, Defense Trade Reciprocity; (2) Section 1013, Authority to Transfer Specified Former Naval Vessels to Certain Foreign Countries; (3) Section 1027, Encouragement of Agreements with Foreign Countries; (4) Section 1031, Continuation of Authority to Use Department of Defense Funds for Unified Counter-Drug and Counter-Terrorism Campaign in Colombia; (5) Section 1204, Status of Iraqi Security Forces; (6) Section 1211, Assignment of Allied Naval Personnel to Submarine Safety Programs; (7) Section 1212, Expansion of Entities of the People's Republic of China Subject to Certain Presidential Authorities When Operating in the United States; (8) Section 1213, Report by the President on Global Peace Operations Initiative; (9) Section 1214, Procurement Sanctions Against Foreign Persons that Transfer Certain Defense Articles and Services to the People's Republic of China; (10) Title XIII, Cooperative Threat Reduction with the States of the Former Soviet Union; and (11) Title XIV, Export Controls and Counter-Proliferation Matters.

Pursuant to Chairman Dreier's announcement that the Committee on Rules will move expeditiously to consider a rule for H.R. 4200 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, without waiving or ceding now or in the future this Committee's jurisdiction over the provisions in question. I will seek to have conferees appointed for these provisions during any House-Senate conference committee.

In that regard, I am particularly concerned about certain provisions in Title XIV, Subtitle B and C, regarding counter-proliferation matters and initiatives related to the former Soviet Union. I look forward to working with you regarding my concerns about these provisions as H.R. 4200 moves forward in the legislative process.

I would appreciate your including this letter as a part of the report on H.R. 4200 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 THE JUDICIARY,
*Washington, DC, May 13, 2004.*

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. 4200, the Department of Defense authorization bill, the Committee on the Judiciary hereby waives consideration of the bill. This waiver is made with the understanding that proposed sections that have been reviewed by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to the bankruptcy treatment of certain military bonuses and pay incentives, compensating employees who were exposed to radiation in certain government programs, and the

title to sunken military ships (to the extent such provision contained matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary) will not be included in the bill. These sections contain matters within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction.

I further understand that proposed sections that have been reviewed by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to the misuse of civilian medals, Federal Tort Claims Act coverage for volunteers performing volunteer duties at sea and for committee members of the Employee Support for the Guard and Reserve, waivers of DOJ prison reviews for several land conveyances, state tax preemption for the Non-Appropriated Fund Health Benefits Programs, trademark licensing of military slogans and the like, military legal assistance, a public-private employee exchange program, and allowing assignment of contract claims to sureties will be included in the bill. If these sections are added to the bill, I will not seek a sequential referral based on inclusion.

The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdiction over these provisions is in no way diminished or altered. I would appreciate your including this letter in your Committee's report on H.R. 4200 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 14, 2004.*

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. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

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 TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
*Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.*

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. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 4200 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 14, 2004.*

Hon. DON YOUNG,
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

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.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
*Washington, DC, May 11, 2004.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the Committee on Armed Services that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs hereby waives any jurisdiction it has over the provisions of section 2831 of H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, regarding "Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio." Our Committee does not desire referral of these provisions, a copy of which is enclosed.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.*

Hon. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,
*Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs 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 Veterans' Affairs 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,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
*Washington, DC, May XX, 2004.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to consideration of H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. Certain provisions of this important legislation are within the jurisdiction of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI). I support the legislation and share your desire to have it considered expeditiously by the House; hence, I do not intend to seek referral of this legislation to the HPSCI.

However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice this Committee's

valid jurisdictional interests and prerogatives on these provisions or any other similar legislation. Likewise, this should not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the HPSCI in the future. Furthermore, should these provisions or similar provisions be included in any Senate amendments and considered in a conference with the Senate, I would request that the Speaker appoint Members of the HPSCI as conferees on those provisions. Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in your report to accompany the bill. I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

PORTER GOSS, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.*

Hon. PORTER GOSS,
*Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence 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 Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence 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,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
*Washington, DC, May 11, 2004.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has come to my attention that a new section has been added to the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, incorporating the text of H.R. 3966, the "ROTC and Military Recruiter Equal Access to Campus Act of 2004." As noted in my previous letter dated, March 19, 2004, provisions of H.R. 3966 directly impact the programs and operations of the Department of Homeland Security by limiting its ability to distribute funds to institutions of higher education by grant or contract. Although I believe that these provisions fall within the jurisdiction of the Select Committee under H. Res. 5, I will not seek a sequential referral given the importance of expediting passage of this bill, which I co-sponsored and strongly support.

The Select Committee on Homeland Security takes this action with the understanding that its jurisdiction over the provision as

included in the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 is in no way diminished or altered. I would appreciate your including this letter in the Committee Report on the bill. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER COX, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.*

Hon. CHRISTOPHER COX,
*Chairman, Select Committee on Homeland Security,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Select 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 Select 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.*

# 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 2005 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. 4200 would authorize appropriations of $418.5 billion for fiscal year 2005 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. 4200 is $422.1 billion. It would also

authorize an additional $25 billion emergency appropriation for fiscal year 2005 to support Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom.

The committee estimates that enacting H.R. 4200 would not increase mandatory budget authority for fiscal year 2004 or the following five years. In terms of discretionary and mandatory budget authority, H.R. 4200 is within the allocation provided by H. Con. Res. 393, as passed by the House on March 25, 2004, which establishes the Congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 through 2009.

The committee has been in close and constant consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and has provided copies of H.R. 4200 as ordered reported on May 12, 2004, 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. 4200 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) Add 10,000 Army personnel and 3,000 Marine Corps personnel each year in fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007, enabling the military services to begin meeting long-standing manpower shortages, as well as new manning requirements;

(2) Provide every military service member an across-the-board pay raise of 3.5 percent effective January 1, 2005; and

(3) Eliminate out-of-pocket housing costs for military personnel.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving force protection for our troops, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide over $2.0 billion for force protection initiatives, including armor for vehicles, new munitions and surveillance programs; and

(2) Establish a streamlined acquisition process in order to respond in a timely manner to urgent requests for combat equipment by commanders in the battlefield.

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 $25.0 billion in emergency contingency operations supplemental funding to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 to support the war on terrorism's operational costs, personnel expenses and the procurement of new equipment; and

(2) Support the Army's efforts to transform the structure of its divisions into smaller organizations and create additional combat relevant units. This reorganization known as "modularity" will contribute to the reduction of stress on our troops due to the high operational tempo of operations in Southwest Asia.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving military housing and facilities, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide $9.9 billion for military construction and military family housing programs; and

(2) Eliminate the statutory ceiling for the military housing privatization program, allowing the Department of Defense to leverage private sector investments and business interests to build and revitalize family housing at domestic military bases.

## 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. 4200. The record of these votes is attached to this report.

The committee ordered H.R. 4200 reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 60–0, a quorum being present.

# COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
## 108TH CONGRESS
## ROLL CALL

**Motion to Close** **Date: 05/12/04**

**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 | | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | | | Mr. Reyes | | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Mr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | X | | | Mr. Turner (TX) | | | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | X | | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | X | | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | X | | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | X | | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | X | | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | X | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | X | | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | X | | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | X | | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | X | | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | X | | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Gingrey | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Rodgers | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**56 Aye** **0 Nay** **Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number: 83** **Date: 05/12/04**

**Description:** **Hefley substitute to Langevin** **Offered by: Hefley**

**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 | | | Mr. Snyder | | X | |
| Mr. Hostettler | X | | | Mr. Turner (TX) | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Gibbons | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Hayes | X | | | Mr. Rodriguez | | X | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | X | | | Ms. Tauscher | | X | |
| Mr. Calvert | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | | X | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | X | | | Mr. Larson (CT) | | X | |
| Mr. Schrock | X | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | | X | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Israel | | X | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | X | | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | | X | |
| Mr. Bradley | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Bishop | X | | | Mr. Alexander | | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | X | | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Gingrey | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Rodgers | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**28 Aye 30 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number: 36** **Date: 05/12/04**

**Description:** **Transfer BMD funds to Patriot Missile** **Offered by: Spratt**

**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 | | Mr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | X | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rodgers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**26 Aye 31 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number: 54** **Date: 05/12/04**

**Description:** **Prohibit space-based BMD program** **Offered by: Sanchez**

**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 | | Mr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | X | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rodgers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**26 Aye 34 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number: 34** **Date: 05/12/04**

**Description:** **Report on Near Field Infrared Experiment** **Offered by: Sanchez**

**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 | | Mr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | X | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rodgers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**26 Aye 34 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number: 41** **Date: 05/12/04**

**Description:** **$67 billion in supplemental appropriations** **Offered by: Cooper**

**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 | | Mr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | | X | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | X | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | | X | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rodgers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**24 Aye 35 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number: 44** **Date: 05/12/04**

**Description:** **Revision of military sex offense laws** **Offered by: Sanchez**

**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 | | Mr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | X | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rodgers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**27 Aye 33 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Final Passage of H.R. 4200** **Date: 05/12/04**
**as Amended**

**Voice Vote** **Ayes** **Nays**

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Skelton | | | |
| 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 | | | Mr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | X | | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | X | | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | X | | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | X | | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | X | | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | X | | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | X | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | X | | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | X | | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | X | | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | X | | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | X | | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Gingrey | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Rodgers | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**60 Aye 0 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 OF IKE SKELTON

The 2005 defense authorization is a good bill that makes advances on a variety of issues. I am pleased that the committee worked largely in accordance with its nonpartisan traditions, and that important initiatives from each side were considered seriously and often adopted. A few of the bill's provisions are worthy of special mention.

When the surviving spouse of a military retiree, usually a widow, becomes eligible for Social Security at the age of 62, her spousal survivor benefits drop from 55 percent of her spouse's retired pay to 35 percent. Democrats have consistently called for legislation to eliminate this "Widow's Tax" in the Survivors Benefit Program (SBP), and urged the committee to address this issue. I therefore applaud the inclusion of legislation in this bill to eliminate the SBP offset over a five-year period, beginning on October 1, 2005. I will continue to work to ensure that this legislative victory is preserved in conference with the Senate.

I remain concerned by events in Iraq. June 30 is quickly approaching, and much remains unsettled about the transition of sovereignty to the Iraqis and the role of U.S. Armed Forces after the transition. The recent revelations of prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib compound these difficulties, and point to a clear need for better congressional oversight over both the goals and conduct of U.S.-Iraqi policies.

Several amendments to strengthen congressional oversight were adopted, including two that I offered. One is a progress report on Iraqi Security Forces, and the other is to require the Department of Defense to respond more expeditiously to congressional requests. Rep. Abercrombie successfully offered an amendment to better account for and manage civilian contractors in Iraq. The unsettling news of the alleged involvement of contractors in the prison abuses and the grisly beheading of an American businessman highlight the need for a better awareness of the number and role of contractors in Iraq. We need to ensure that their roles are appropriate and that their safety can be reasonably secured.

Despite the adoption of these and other related amendments, I am not satisfied that Congress has the access to information to conduct proper oversight, nor am I confident that the civilian and military leadership at the Pentagon has access to all the information they need to make critical policy decisions. Rep. Meek introduced and withdrew an amendment regarding how critical information is relayed in the military chain of command. I look forward to working with him and others during consideration of the bill on the floor to ensure that both the Legislative and Executive branches of our government are fully informed of important events in Iraq and can provide more vigorous oversight and leadership.

While Democrats also support the inclusion of a $25 billion authorization of an emergency supplemental for ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, I am disappointed that the committee did not accept an amendment offered by Reps. Jim Cooper and Tim Ryan to authorize $67 billion. The Cooper-Ryan Amendment represents a more realistic, good-faith estimate of the likely cost, and would better ensure that Iraq and Afghanistan operations are not "cash-flowed" from regular Department of Defense appropriations. "Cash-flowing" involves using regular operations and maintenance and military personnel appropriations for contingency operations, and this practice invariably leads to disruptions in readiness levels, training, base operations, equipment maintenance, and other important peace-time military activities. The $25 billion supplemental will serve as a useful "bridge" to a future supplemental, but the Cooper-Ryan amendment was a more responsible approach both militarily and fiscally.

A positive aspect of the $25 billion supplemental was that it also included much needed end-strength increases for the Army and Marine Corps. The stress on our ground forces has been tremendous. I know of soldiers who have returned home from one year of operations in Afghanistan, only to be told three months later that they will be deployed to Iraq for a year. The supplemental authorizes the end-strength increases (10,000 annually for three years) that the Secretary of Defense indicated was needed by the Army to conduct their transformational activities while still meeting their operational requirements. It also provides a necessary increase for the Marine Corps (3,000 annually for three years) to meet their mission requirements.

Finally, this Committee in 1989 laid the foundation for joint officer development and joint professional military education as it exists today. Recent combat experience demonstrates that the services have generally achieved a remarkable integration in executing joint operations. However, as the nature of warfare evolves, future operations will become more complex and joint at lower levels than before, and the framework for developing persons skilled in joint matters must also evolve. Our committee is again improving military education by raising joint military education requirements with a corresponding increase in joint military education opportunities. This is the first step in developing joint officers ready to face the challenge of 21st century warfare.

America is a nation at war. The fiscal 2005 defense authorization recognizes that exigency and provides those who protect America the tools they need to do the job. I look forward to improving the bill even further as the legislative process proceeds.

IKE SKELTON.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

The United States must take care to use a policy of impartial diplomacy in our future relations with both the Republic of China (Taiwan) and the People's Republic of China, at all levels of our diplomatic relationship. The Pacific Rim is an area of enormous economic trade with the United States. The One-China policy is a fundamental fixture of our international policy, and we must reinforce that at all levels of our government.

As a Member of Congress who has traveled extensively in that area on military and trade missions, I have come to love the people of both China and Taiwan. They are so similar, yet so unique. People of both nations are peace-loving, yet anxious about their national character.

Taiwan is currently finding their way through the emotional aftermath of a divisive 2004 presidential election, which has only worked to further strain their relationship with the People's Republic of China. This is a difficult moment for the U.S. as tensions simmer between our friends on the Pacific Rim. The United States has much at stake when it comes to a peaceful relationship between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China.

As one of the few Americans who has traveled to North Korea and talked to officials there, I want to note that we have multiple, dangerous, strategic military concerns in this region. We must focus our attention on diplomacy and the One-China policy. We must not step off that path. China helped to set up our meeting with North Korea, and continue to be an important intermediary between North Korea and us.

The United States, as a country, has long recognized the One-China policy. It is our long-term guiding principle, and we must tread carefully along the path of diplomacy as Taiwan and China confront and deal with their differences.

We must not implement policy that will fuel the fires of dissention that simmer between these two nations. Our obligation to the American people, and to peace in that region of the world, is to aid in the process of finding diplomatic solutions for our strategic interests through the One-China policy.

We continue to hope China and Taiwan will be able to get together to work out the differences between them. The U.S. needs to give them the time and space to do that. The world has a great stake in their coming together.

SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF STEVE ISRAEL

The FY 2005 defense authorization is important because it recognizes that the greatest investment we can make is in our troops, by developing the sometimes intangible qualities of leadership, education, judgment, initiative and historic knowledge. I am pleased that the authorization bill understands the centrality of foreign language and cultural expertise to the success of military operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, as well as the Global War on Terrorism.

I commend the Committee and the Department of Defense for including legislative language in the bill that establishes a Defense Language Office within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to ensure a strategic focus on meeting present and future requirements for language and regional expertise. Other language directing the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on how the military educates and trains our soldiers in language and culture will prove invaluable. The technological revolution that has made possible our recent successes must be accompanied by a similar progression in the way we wage war.

We must continue to build on the accomplishments of Representative Skelton and others on this committee who were instrumental in raising the standard of joint officer development and education that has been so critical to the success of our military. Faced with new challenges, we must recommit ourselves to creating the educational and training framework that will give our military the language and cultural expertise they need to succeed.

I also want to recognize the contribution of Major General Robert Scales. As a leading voice for re-shaping our military to deal with the challenges of the 21st Century, his testimony before the full committee was helpful in focusing the Committee's attention on this issue. With more than 30 years of experience in the military and former commandant of the Army War College, he would be a valuable resource for the Department of Defense when it begins its assessment of military education and training.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and the defense community to ensure that our men and women in uniform have the skill necessary to navigate the cultural and geopolitical complexities to conflict in the 21st century.

STEVE ISRAEL.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF KENDRICK B. MEEK

There are many things about which to be proud in the 2005 defense authorization bill. I am very pleased that this bill will provide additional funds over the original Pentagon request to provide for the current necessities of our fighting men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan. From equipping our troops with signal-jamming equipment to replacement of damaged air and ground vehicles to the over $700 million in added funds to completely up-armor our fleet of HMMWVs, the bill intends to outfit our troops in a manner befitting the heroes of a country with the greatest resources in the world.

However, merely supplying our troops with the means and methods to fight an asymmetrical war gives them only two-thirds of what they, and we, need for ultimate success in Iraq and Afghanistan. I am concerned that information necessary for proper strategic planning is not being utilized in high-level, decision-making processes. While this information appears to be available at the operations level, the most critical elements of it do not always rise to the policy level.

The United States finds itself in a quagmire resulting from detainee abuses at Abu Ghraib that not only complicates the stabilization of Iraq and the Middle East in general, but that brings into question the moral integrity of a country that has always fought hard, even within its own borders, for human rights. Unfortunately, had the Pentagon acted sooner, there is reason to believe this situation could have been at least contained, if not avoided altogether.

In late August of 2003 and again in mid-October, Allied Forces Commander, Lt. General Ricardo Sanchez, commissioned two separate evaluation and assessment investigations of the detention and interrogation situation in Iraq. Both reports contained admonishments that policies were lacking, training subpar, and oversight non-existent. Among the similarities in the two reports:

That there were no authorities or procedures in place to affect a unified strategy to detain and interrogate internees in Iraq;

That there was a lack of active control of the internees within the detention environment, and flawed use-of-force procedures;

That the general prison population was inappropriately comingled with EPWs;

That the soldier to detainee ratio was critically deficient;

That there was indication the MPs were actively, though indirectly engaged in interrogation actions despite Army Regulations to the contrary.

Any one of these items is worthy of command level discussion and subsequent briefing to the Pentagon. Taken together, they constituted a warning shot over the bow. In fact, in the Article 15–6 Investigation performed by MG Taguba, the IO specifically states,

"Unfortunately, many of the systemic problems that surfaced during MG Ryder's team's assessment are the very same issues that are the subject of this investigation." [Taguba Report, page 12, pg 2]. However, current Army regulations do not require the transmittal of such information up the chain of command beyond the commissioning authority [AR 15–6, ss 3–18, 3–19].

Currently, only Air Force HQ is aggressive in finding sensitive information and forwarding it up the chain of command, having done so since 1998. An office was set up within HQ whose sole purpose is to learn of sensitive information items and flag them. As part of the Air Force's formal rules, personnel who learn of explosive matters- including those "with potential community reaction or press coverage"—must inform the office for briefing to the Secretary of the Air Force. The Navy also has a limited version of the Air Force's program, though it is less ambitious.

Secretary Rumsfeld said last week that it would be difficult for him to reach down through the myriad of legal cases climbing through the military justice system and find those that are potentially explosive in nature. I would counter that with the right guidance he would not have to reach down, but could expect that information to be pushed up, even before it reaches the criminal investigation stage.

Military leadership has always required critical elements of information to make sound, timely, and informed decisions on the battlefield. Determining the information needed to make these decisions is crucial to a commander's ability to act decisively in the course of battle. That same depth and speed of information is necessary for the Pentagon to direct policy and decision-making in the course of stabilization efforts afterwards.

The amendment that I offered during committee intends to move mission-critical information from the commissioning authority up to the highest-levels in short order when that information portends events or situations detrimental to our strategic plan. The language merely required that the Secretary give guidance to all Department of Defense personnel with authority to commission assessments, evaluations or investigations on what types of information would be necessary to pass up the chain of command. This guidance would specifically target those items of such potentially volatile nature as to give even the layman a reason to raise a red flag.

Were it that MG Miller's assessment had been even a topic of discussion around the water cooler at the Pentagon, we might have been able to avoid the events at Abu Ghraib. Had more intense conversation happened after MG Ryder's investigation, we would have at least had the opportunity to contain the situation, develop a strategy for correcting the problem, and alert the world in a far less internationally embarrassing fashion. Instead of the issue being a part of Pentagon discussions in the summer and fall of 2003, it was left to a courageous specialist to try to put a stop to the vile episodes at Abu Ghraib in 2004, some five months after official reports highlighted conditions for a serious problem.

It is not enough to arm our soldiers with the means and methods of war fighting. We must arm them with strategic planning. Proper planning is the offspring of proper information gathering and proc-

essing at the decision-making level. It is ironic that there are suggestions that we seek more information on seeking more information before we act. I hope that before the defense authorization bill leaves the House of Representatives we are able to improve an excellent bill even more by addressing this pertinent and timely issue.

KENDRICK B. MEEK.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE MIKE D. ROGERS

As the Committee moves forward with H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, I want to share my concern over the Department of Defense's use of the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System. The Air Force, Army, and Navy each utilize the LEED standard in some respects in its building projects. Although sustainable building design can be a valuable goal, the Department's use of the LEED standard is troubling.

First, the LEED rating system clearly discriminates against the use of renewable wood products. Through several of its specific credits for steel and concrete, certain wood products are put at a significant disadvantage. It does not recognize that wood is among the most environmentally benign of all building materials, because, among other things, it is a renewable resource that sequesters huge amounts of carbon.

Second, LEED discriminates against wood products manufactured in the United States. The LEED rating system provides a specific credit only for forest products that have been certified by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), a standard initially developed by international environmental groups to combat tropical deforestation. It is predominately recognized in Europe. FSC-certified products manufactured from wood grown in the U.S. are not readily available. However, products from other credible third party certification programs are readily available. No credits are given for wood products produced by companies independently third-party certified to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) Program standard or the American Tree Farm System®—the two largest sustainable forest management systems in the U.S.

Third, LEED has not been developed through a consensus process open to all interested parties. The process used by the U.S. Green Building Council to create and operate LEED does not meet any generally accepted definition of a voluntary consensus standard. For example, the USGBC fails to satisfy the measures of the voluntary consensus standards development process set out by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI).

And fourth, a recent National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) study, while recognizing that the LEED standard does have beneficial elements, concluded that it does not properly rate products based on environmental criteria. In the study, NIST was especially critical of LEED's arbitrary thresholds, its emphasis on cost rather than environmental impact measures, the lack of appropriate baselines and measures of improvement, and the program's inability to compare buildings in different locations on equal terms.

To address this issue, I urge the committee to accept in conference the following report language from Title XXVIII of the Senate version of the bill, S. 2400:

*Use of sustainable design standards by the Department of Defense*

Congress encourages the Department of Defense to utilize sustainable building design and construction methods to maximize the efficient use of renewable, recycled, and environmentally sound materials. However, concerns have been expressed that certain rating systems adopted by the Department to assess the standards of sustainable design and construction of facilities may unfairly discriminate against domestic producers of wood construction products. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the committee by June 1, 2005 which describes:

(1) the standards used by each military department to assess the use of sustainable design and construction methods, including credits provided for products made from renewable materials, as well as recycled materials;

(2) the extent to which such standards comply with the requirements of Section 6002 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, section 6962 of title 42, United States Code, Executive Order 13101, Office of Management and Budget Circular A–119, and other applicable requirements of law and regulation; and

(3) the extent to which the standards adopted by each military department unfairly discriminate against the use of products and materials manufactured in the United States.

The committee expects the Secretary to take appropriate action to address any noncompliance with applicable requirements of law or regulation and any unfair discrimination against any U.S. manufactured materials identified during the course of this review.

MIKE D. ROGERS.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES VIC SNYDER AND MAC THORNBERRY

We find ourselves in disagreement with the actions of the Committee regarding the delay contained in the bill of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. The Chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee included in his mark language that essentially delayed the BRAC process for two years by demanding that a series of reports be submitted late in 2005 and that the process then hold for 18 months until the committee had a chance to consider the amendments.

During the full committee markup process, an amendment was offered to cancel the entire BRAC process, to which a second degree amendment was offered reinstating the two year delay. This amendment was passed, although a number of members spoke against both amendments.

Arguments were made that the process should be delayed, and several reports be submitted, because there is a war currently going on. During debate on the amendments, the argument was advanced that the process should be cancelled because the Department of Defense has not yet been able to nominate directly to Congress any individual base that should be closed, and that, should the Department do this, Congress is perfectly capable of voting to close or realign individual bases. In my opinion, both of these arguments represent seriously wrong approaches.

We were pleased to see the committee reject the second argument. The BRAC process was created to ensure that politics and the self-interest of an individual district or member are removed from the process of base closure. To have the Department of Defense begin nominating bases and Congress voting to close individual bases would immediately cause even more tension in Congress and accusations of partisan bias in the system. This would result in gridlock and an utter failure to take needed action.

The former argument, that the process should be delayed due to the current issues in Iraq, is similarly flawed. There will never be a time during which sufficient peace and stability reign for us to carry out the BRAC process. Many people regard the 1990s as a time of relative peace, forgetting that during this window of stability the U.S. military carried out actions in Panama, Iraq, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Somalia, to say nothing of scores of other minor military engagements. Simply put, we almost always have been, and probably always will be, bemoaning the disorder that seems to constantly reign supreme. In addition, the BRAC process is as much about realignment as it is closure, and the realignment is needed to assist the Department of Defense in carrying out the very changes in the military that are designed to allow us to better address the current chaos.

There is a valid argument that the reports requested by the Committee in the provision contained in the bill should be submitted. We agree that the Committee should be better informed about the Global Posture Review, under which DoD is adjusting our overseas basing, and its diplomatic and military effects. Similarly, it would be beneficial to know more about the effects of homeland security missions and military transformation on basing. Nothing stops the Committee from demanding these reports now, and we believe that it would be entirely appropriate to do so. If we did so, presumably DoD could be ordered to produce the information by the spring of 2005 at the latest, which would give the Committee, and Congress as a whole, 6 months to consider the reports, digest the information, and hold hearings. Nothing is stopping us from carrying out this needed oversight but our own timidity, but the reports do not require delaying a much needed process by two years.

In conclusion, while the Committee has asked for much needed information, it has also delayed a needed process. It is my hope that the whole House, or at least the whole Congress acting through the conference committee, will reject the delay contained in the House bill and proceed with the process currently in law. Hoping for a respite in the current global environment is not only unrealistic, but does the military itself no favors.

VIC SNYDER.
MAC THORNBERRY.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES JIM COOPER AND TIM RYAN

We commend Chairman Hunter for including a detailed authorization for $25 billion in this year's National Defense Authorization Act, but we are gravely concerned that this down payment on the cost of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in 2005 fails to tell the whole truth to the American people.

During committee consideration of the authorization bill, we offered an amendment authorizing a full-year supplemental appropriation of $67 billion. This larger figure reflects a realistic, detailed analysis of the likely total cost of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in 2005. This amendment included funding for all of the commendable items in the Chairman's bill, including funding for critical force protection equipment, deferred vehicle maintenance, new counter-terrorism technology, replacement vehicles for those destroyed in combat operations, and additional combat troops for the Army and Marine Corps. However, it also provided sufficient funds for combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan for all of fiscal year 2005, not just the few months of funding that the Chairman's bill authorized.

We offered this amendment because we believe the House bill should reflect the true costs of these wars. Piecemeal funding of these critical military efforts sends the wrong signal to our adversaries, the American people, and U.S. troops in the field. Our adversaries are watching our actions closely, and a robust full-year authorization would have sent the signal that despite the significant challenges we face in Iraq and Afghanistan, the United States is committed to victory. To Americans here at home, a full-year authorization would demonstrate that Congress takes seriously its duty to be honest with the American people, and that when it comes to providing funding for our troops in the field, politics should truly take a backseat. Finally, our troops in the field look to Congress to provide them what they need to accomplish the missions they are assigned. Authorization of a full-year supplemental would leave no doubt that Congress supports them and is willing to provide whatever is needed to win.

We were disappointed that no Republican members of our committee chose to support our amendment. We believe the American people will continue to support the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan where critical U.S. interests are at stake, but only if we are honest about the cost.

JIM COOPER.
TIM RYAN.

○