AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Calendar No. 732

110TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
110–335

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

R E P O R T

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 3001]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

MAY 12, 2008.—Ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

Calendar No. 732

110TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | SENATE | REPORT 110–335

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 3001]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

MAY 12, 2008.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

42–224 WASHINGTON : 2008

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(110th Congress, 2d Session)

CARL LEVIN, Michigan, *Chairman*

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut
JACK REED, Rhode Island
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
BILL NELSON, Florida
E. BENJAMIN NELSON, Nebraska
EVAN BAYH, Indiana
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York
MARK L. PRYOR, Arkansas
JIM WEBB, Virginia
CLAIRE MCCASKILL, Missouri

JOHN MCCAIN, Arizona
JOHN WARNER, Virginia
JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
LINDSEY O. GRAHAM, South Carolina
ELIZABETH DOLE, North Carolina
JOHN CORNYN, Texas
JOHN THUNE, South Dakota
MEL MARTINEZ, Florida
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi

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

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of the Bill	1
Committee overview	2
Explanation of funding summary	3
Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations	15
Title I—Procurement	15
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	15
Explanation of tables	15
Subtitle B—Army Programs	17
Stryker Mobile Gun System (sec. 111)	42
Procurement of small arms (sec. 112)	42
Budget Items—Army	43
Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list	43
Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter	44
Forward-looking infrared radar systems	44
Grenades Army	44
Radford Ammunition Plant upgrades	45
Bomb line modernization	45
Area Common User System Modernization	45
Army Global Command and Control System	45
Information Technology Upgrades	46
Fido explosives detector	46
Land Warrior	46
Combat Arms Training System	46
Immersive Group Simulation Virtual Training System	47
Joint Fires and Effects Trainer System	47
Laser collective combat advanced training system	47
Urban training center instrumentation	47
Operator driving simulators	47
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	48
Subtitle C—Navy Programs	48
Authority for advanced procurement and construction of components for the *Virginia*-class submarine program (sec. 131)	74
Refueling and complex overhaul of the USS *Theodore Roosevelt* (sec. 132)	74
Budget Items	74
E–2D Advanced Hawkeye	74
H–53 modifications	75
P–3 modifications	75
Common ECM equipment	75
Weapons industrial facilities	76
Grenades Marine Corps	76
Virginia-class submarine advance procurement	76
Littoral combat ship	76
LPD–17 amphibious transport dock	78
LHA(R) advance procurement	79
DDG–51 *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyer modernization program	79
Submarine training device modifications	80
Man overboard indicators	81
Logistics vehicle system replacement	81
Combat casualty care equipment upgrade program	81
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs	82
F–22A fighter aircraft (Sec. 151)	99
Budget Items—Air Force	99
Advanced procurement for the F136 engine	99
C–17A engine spares	100

Page

Title I—Procurement—Continued
Budget Items—Air Force—Continued
Tactical intelligence support 100
Airborne Imaging 101
Wide-Area Airborne Surveillance 102
National-Tactical SIGINT Initiatives 103
B–52 bomber 104
Large aircraft infrared countermeasures system 104
C–130 Avionics Modernization Program 104
Advanced targeting pod 105
Budget request realignments 105
Improved stores ejection cartridge 106
Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile 106
Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellite 106
Intelligence communication equipment 107
Combat training ranges 107
Air Operations Centers 108
Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters 108
Annual long-term plan for the procurement of aircraft for the Navy and the Air Force (sec. 171) 108
Budget Items—Defense-wide 109
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense 118
Standard Missile–3 interceptors 119
Intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance mission equipment package 120
Special operations forces combat assault rifle 120
Special operations visual augmentation systems hand-held imager/long-range 120
M53 Joint Chemical Biological Protective Mask 121
Joint Chemical Agent Detector 121
Joint Biological Standoff Detection System 121
Items of Special Interest 121
Aegis modernization open architecture 121
F/A–18 Hornet and Navy tactical aviation inventory shortfall 123
Light utility helicopter 124
Material handling equipment study 125
Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles 125
Mission packages 126
Operational support aircraft for U.S. Africa Command 126
Shadow unmanned aerial vehicle 127
Ship maintenance and material condition 127
Warfighter Information Network–Tactical 128
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 129
Explanation of tables 129
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 131
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 131
Requirement for plan on overhead nonimaging infrared systems (sec. 211) 131
Advanced battery manufacturing and technology roadmap (sec. 212) . 131
Availability of funds for defense laboratories for research and development of technologies for military missions (sec. 213) 132
Assured funding for certain information security and information assurance programs of the Department of Defense (sec. 214) 132
Requirements for certain airborne intelligence collection systems (sec. 215) 133
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs 133
Review of the ballistic missile defense policy and strategy of the United States (sec. 231) 133
Limitation on availability of funds for procurement, construction, and deployment of missile defenses in Europe (sec. 232) 134
Airborne Laser system (sec. 233) 136
Annual Director of Operational Test and Evaluation characterization of operational effectiveness, suitability, and survivability of the Ballistic Missile Defense System (sec. 234) 136
Independent assessment of boost-phase missile defense programs (sec. 235) 137
Study on space-based interceptor element of ballistic missile defense system (sec. 236) 138

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Subtitle D—Other Matters 139
Modification of systems subject to survivability testing by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (sec. 251) 139
Biennial reports on joint and service concept development and experimentation (sec. 252) 139
Repeal of annual reporting requirement relating to the Technology Transition Initiative (sec. 253) 140
Executive agent for printed circuit board technology (sec. 254) 141
Report on Department of Defense response to findings and recommendations of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Directed Energy Weapons (sec. 255) 142
Assessment of standards for mission critical semiconductors procured by the Department of Defense (sec. 256) 142
Budget Items 143
Army 143
Army basic research programs 159
Network science and technology research center 159
Army materials research 160
Advanced Army energy and power technologies 161
Army aviation technologies 162
Sniper detection systems 162
Army vehicle reliability technologies 162
Unmanned ground vehicle weaponization 163
Standoff explosives detection technologies 163
Soldier positioning technologies 163
Military engineering technologies 163
Combat feeding technologies 164
Army medical research 164
Biosensor controller systems 165
Army medical advanced technology development 165
Army aviation advanced technology development 166
Army combat vehicle technologies 167
Diverse threat sensor development 168
Army training technologies 168
Deactivation of military explosives 168
Army missile and rocket technologies 168
Situational awareness technologies 168
Unique item ID data management research 169
Advanced electronics integration 169
Advanced environmental controls 169
Advanced fuel cell research 169
Radiation hardening initiative 169
High-altitude integration testbed 170
Air and missile defense architecture analysis 170
Stryker active protection system 170
Vibration management enhancement research 170
Next-generation combat helmet development 170
High Mobility Multi-purpose Wheeled Vehicle modernization research 171
Non-Line of Sight-Launch System anti-tamper research 171
Future Combat System 171
Urban training development 172
Extended range sniper rifle research 172
Army test and target development 172
Javelin modernization 173
Global Combat Support System, the Logistics Modernization Program and Product Lifecycle Management Plus 173
Army manufacturing technologies 174
Navy 174
Navy basic research 188
Manufacturing engineering training 188
Navy power projection research 189
Navy force protection research 189
Situational awareness processing technologies 190
Acoustic research and test capabilities 190
Navy electronics research 190

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Budget Items—Continued
Navy—Continued
Advanced technologies for power projection 190
Force protection advanced technology 191
High-integrity Global Positioning System 192
Ground sensor networks 192
Shipboard system component development 192
Advanced submarine system development 193
Facilities improvements 193
Optical interconnect 194
Land attack technology 194
Directed energy 194
Next-generation cruiser 195
Improved towed array handler 196
Submarine electronic chart updates 196
Next-generation Phalanx 196
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system 197
Combat wound tissue transplantation technologies 197
F–35 Joint Strike Fighter competitive propulsion system 197
Navy test and evaluation support 197
Advanced LINAC facility 198
Navy support of the reliable replacement warhead 198
Warfighter enhanced decision making 198
Aviation improvements 199
Broad Area Maritime Surveillance Unmanned Aircraft System 199
Digital manufacturing technologies 199
National Shipbuilding Research Program—Advanced Shipbuilding Enterprise 200
Air Force 200
Air Force basic research programs 215
Air Force materials research 215
Optical components for air vehicles 216
Air Force training technology 216
Air Force aerospace propulsion technology 216
Aerospace sensor technologies 216
Air Force seismic research 217
Cyber attack mitigation technologies 217
Reconfigurable securing computing 217
Propulsion technologies 217
Thin film amorphous solar arrays 218
Integrated targeting devices 218
Optical interconnect for battlefield communications 218
High energy laser weapon systems 218
Global Positioning System III operational control segment 219
Space situational awareness 219
Transformational Communications satellite 219
Operationally Responsive Space 220
B–2 radar modernization program 221
Space-based space surveillance block 10 221
Space-based Infrared Satellite system 221
Third Generation Infrared Surveillance satellite system 222
F135 engine 222
Combat Search and Rescue Replacement Aircraft 223
High speed test track 223
B–52 bomber 223
Air Operations Centers 223
Joint surveillance target attack radar system research and development 224
Weather service research and development 224
C–17 research, development, test, and evaluation 225
Expeditionary Combat Support System 225
Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System 225
Defense-wide 226
Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research 244
In-vitro models for biodefense vaccines 244

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Budget Items—Continued
Defense-wide—Continued
Superstructural particle evaluation 244
Next-generation over-the-horizon radar 244
Chemical agent fate response planning tool 245
Chemical and biological applied research 245
Chemical and biological infrared detector 245
Multivalent Marburg and Ebola vaccine 246
DARPA technology transition 246
Three-dimensional integrated circuit technologies 246
Blast mitigation and protection 246
Comprehensive National Incident Management System 247
Special operations technologies 247
Blast trauma research 247
Blackswift 247
Engineered biological detectors 249
Improved chemical, biological, and radiological filters 249
Raman chemical identification system 249
Command and control gap filler joint capabilities technology demonstration 249
High performance manufacturing technologies 250
Defense Logistics Agency technology programs 250
Superlattice nanotechnology 251
Special warfare domain awareness technologies 251
Weapon of mass destruction exercises 251
Arrow missile defense program 251
Short-range ballistic missile defense 252
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense 252
Ground-based Midcourse Defense 254
Airborne Laser 256
Real-time non-specific viral agent detector 257
Ballistic missile defense sensors 257
Kinetic Energy Interceptor 258
Ballistic missile defense reductions 259
Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) 259
Space Tracking and Surveillance System 260
Multiple Kill Vehicles 261
Space test-bed 262
Missile Defense Agency funding reduction 263
Corrosion control technologies 263
Conflict modeling technologies 263
Prompt global strike 263
Net-enabled command and control 264
Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program 264
Anti-tamper technologies 265
Force transformation directorate 265
Software assurance education and research 266
Status of Operational Readiness and Training Systems 266
Industrial Base Innovation Fund 266
Items of Special Interest 267
Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense funding 267
Agency relocation 267
Executive helicopter program (VH–71A) 268
Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle 270
Global Positioning System 271
Improved commercial imagery integration 271
Title III—Operation and Maintenance 273
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 273
Explanation of tables 273
Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions 305
Expansion of cooperative agreement authority for management of natural resources to include off-installation mitigation (sec. 311) 305
Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for certain costs in connection with Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington (sec. 312) 305

Page

Title III—Operation and Maintenance—Continued
Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions—Continued
Comprehensive program for the eradication of the brown tree snake population from military facilities in Guam (sec. 313) 305
Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot issues 305
Authority to consider depot-level maintenance and repair using contractor furnished equipment or leased facilities as core logistics (sec. 321) 305
Minimum capital investment for certain depots (sec. 322) 306
Subtitle D—Reports 306
Additional information under annual submissions of information regarding information technology capital assets (sec. 331) 306
Subtitle E—Other Matters 306
Mitigation of power outage risks for Department of Defense facilities and activities (sec. 341) 306
Increased authority to accept financial and other incentives related to energy savings and new authority related to energy systems (sec. 342) 307
Recovery of improperly disposed of Department of Defense property (sec. 343) 307
Budget Items 308
Army 308
Computing services 308
Unmanned aircraft systems concept development 308
Shipping containers 309
Life cycle logistics contracting 309
Facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization 309
Second destination transportation 309
Ammunition inspections and warehousing 309
Navy 309
Unobligated Operation and Maintenance balances 309
Overstatements of civilian personnel pay requirements 310
Naval aircraft depot maintenance 310
Damage control management 310
MK 45 gun depot overhaul 310
Marine Corps 311
Marine Corps shelters 311
Mobile corrosion protection Marine Corps 311
Air Force 311
B–52 flying hours 311
F–15 depot maintenance 311
B–52 depot maintenance 311
B–2 depot maintenance 312
Engine trailer life extension program 312
Land mobile radios 312
National Security Space Institute 312
Advanced ultrasonic inspection of aging aircraft structures 312
Defense-wide 312
Expanded prisoner of war/missing in action research in North Korea 312
Defense Security Cooperation Agency 313
Status of Operational Readiness and Training System 313
Defense Readiness Reporting System 313
Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative 314
STARBASE Academies 314
Army Reserve 315
Mobile corrosion protection Army Reserve 315
Army Reserve military technician cost avoidance 315
Army National Guard 315
Aircraft humidity protection 315
Expandable Light Air Mobility Shelters 315
Extended Cold Weather Clothing System 315
Rapid Data Management System 315
Mobile corrosion protection Army National Guard 316
Weapons Skills Trainer 316
Emergency satellite communications 316
Air National Guard 316

Page

Title III—Operation and Maintenance—Continued
Budget Items—Continued
Air National Guard —Continued
Controlled humidity protection 316
Crypto-linguist and intelligence officer initiative 316
Items of Special Interest 316
Assessment of plans for contracting support in combatant command operational plans 316
Combatant Commander Initiative Fund 317
Commercial satellite communications 318
Defense Information Systems Agency working capital fund management 318
Funding for military morale, welfare, and recreation programs 319
Long-range facilities and construction planning at Army ammunition plants and arsenals 320
Standards for deployable shelters 320
Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations 323
Subtitle A—Active Forces 323
End strengths for active forces (sec. 401) 323
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 323
End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411) 323
End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the Reserves (sec. 412) 324
End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413) 324
Fiscal year 2009 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414) 325
Maximum number of Reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415) 325
Increased end strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve and military technicians (dual status) of the Army National Guard (sec. 416) 325
Modification of authorized strengths for Marine Corps Reserve officers on active duty in the grades of major and lieutenant colonel to meet new force structure requirements (sec. 417) 326
Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations 326
Military personnel (sec. 421) 326
Budget Items 326
Military personnel funding changes 326
Military personnel unobligated balances 327
Title V—Military Personnel Policy 329
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy 329
Modification of distribution requirements for commissioned officers on active duty in general and flag officer grades (sec. 501) 329
Modification of limitations on authorized strengths of general and flag officers on active duty (sec. 502) 329
Clarification of joint duty requirements for promotion to general or flag grades (sec. 503) 330
Modification of authorities on length of joint duty assignments (sec. 504) 330
Technical and conforming amendments relating to modification of joint specialty requirements (sec. 505) 330
Eligibility of reserve officers to serve on boards of inquiry for separation of regular officers for substandard performance and other reasons (sec. 506) 330
Modification of authority on Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps (sec. 507) 331
Increase in number of permanent professors at the United States Air Force Academy (sec. 508) 331
Service creditable toward retirement for thirty years or more of service of regular warrant officers other than regular Army warrant officers (sec. 509) 331
Modification of requirements for qualification for issuance of posthumous commissions and warrants (sec. 510) 331
Subtitle B—Enlisted Personnel Policy 331
Increase in maximum period of reenlistment of regular members of the armed forces (sec. 521) 331
Subtitle C—Reserve Component Management 332

Page

Title V—Military Personnel Policy—Continued
Subtitle C—Reserve Component Management—Continued
Modification of limitations on authorized strengths of reserve general and flag officers in active status (sec. 531) 332
Extension to other reserve components of Army authority for deferral of mandatory separation of military technicians (dual status) until age 60 (sec. 532) 332
Increase in mandatory retirement age for certain Reserve officers to age 62 (sec. 533) 332
Authority for vacancy promotion of National Guard and Reserve officers ordered to active duty in support of a contingency operation (sec. 534) 332
Authority for retention of reserve component chaplains and medical officers until age 68 (sec. 535) 332
Modification of authorities on dual duty status of National Guard officers (sec. 536) 333
Modification of matching fund requirements under National Guard Youth Challenge Program (sec. 537) 333
Report on collection of information on civilian skills of members of the reserve components of the armed forces (sec. 538) 333
Subtitle D—Education and Training 333
Authority to prescribe the authorized strength of the United States Naval Academy (sec. 551) 333
Tuition for attendance of certain individuals at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology (sec. 552) 333
Increase in stipend for baccalaureate students in nursing or other health professions under Health Professions Stipend Program (sec. 553) 334
Clarification of discharge or release triggering delimiting period for use of educational assistance benefit for reserve component members supporting contingency operations and other operations (sec. 554) 334
Payment by the service academies of certain expenses associated with participation in activities fostering international cooperation (sec. 555) 334
Subtitle E—Defense Dependents' Education Matters 335
Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the armed forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 561) 335
Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 562) 335
Transition of military dependent students among local educational agencies (sec. 563) 335
Subtitle F—Military Family Readiness 335
Authority for education and training for military spouses pursuing portable careers (sec. 571) 335
Subtitle G—Other Matters 336
Department of Defense policy on the prevention of suicides by members of the armed forces (sec. 581) 336
Relief for losses incurred as a result of certain injustices or errors of the Department of Defense (sec. 582) 336
Paternity leave for members of the armed forces (sec. 583) 337
Enhancement of authorities on participation of members of the armed forces in international sports competitions (sec. 584) 337
Pilot programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the armed forces (sec. 585) 337
Prohibition on interference in independent legal advice by the Legal Counsel to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (sec. 586) 338
Items of Special Interest 338
Enhancing family support for the National Guard and reserve 338
Financial literacy 339
Legislative fellows from the Department of Defense 339
Premium conversion and flexible spending account options for service members 340
Report on implementation of Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program ... 340
Secretary of Defense review of deferment from deployment policy following birth of a child 341
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits 343

Page

Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits—Continued
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 343
Fiscal year 2009 increase in military basic pay (sec. 601) 343
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 343
Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for Reserve forces (sec. 611) 343
Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612) 343
Extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613) 343
Extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays (sec. 614) 344
Extension of authorities relating to payment of referral bonuses (sec. 615) 344
Permanent extension of prohibition on charges for meals received at military treatment facilities by members receiving continuous care (sec. 616) 344
Accession and retention bonuses for the recruitment and retention of psychologists for the armed forces (sec. 617) 344
Authority for extension of maximum length of service agreements for special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service (sec. 618) 344
Incentive pay for members of precommissioning programs pursuing foreign language proficiency (sec. 619) 345
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances 345
Shipment of family pets during evacuation of personnel (sec. 631) 345
Special weight allowance for transportation of professional books and equipment for spouses (sec. 632) 345
Travel and transportation allowances for members of the reserve components of the armed forces on leave for suspension of training (sec. 633) 345
Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits 346
Presentation of burial flag to the surviving spouse and children of members of the armed forces who die in service (sec. 641) 346
Subtitle E—Other Matters 346
Separation pay, transitional health care, and transitional commissary and exchange benefits for members of the armed forces separated under surviving son or daughter policy (sec. 651) 346
Items of Special Interest 346
Aviation career incentive pay 346
Travel allowances for family of service members with serious psychiatric conditions 346
Title VII—Health Care Provisions 349
Subtitle A—TRICARE Program 349
Calculation of monthly premiums for coverage under TRICARE Reserve Select after 2008 (sec. 701) 349
Subtitle B—Other Health Care Authorities 349
Enhancement of medical and dental readiness of members of the armed forces (sec. 711) 349
Additional authority for studies and demonstration projects relating to delivery of health and medical care (sec. 712) 351
Travel for anesthesia services for childbirth for dependents of members assigned to very remote locations outside the continental United States (sec. 713) 351
Subtitle C—Other Health Care Matters 351
Repeal of prohibition on conversion of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions (sec. 721) 351
Items of Special Interest 352
Chiropractic care for members of the armed forces 352
Comptroller General study on medical personnel requirements, shortfalls, and actions needed to resolve medical personnel shortages 353
Mental health and traumatic brain injury 354
Modification of security clearance questionnaire to reduce stigma for seeking mental health care 354
Organ and tissue donor program 355
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters 357
Subtitle A—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs ... 357

Page

Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters—Continued
Subtitle A—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs—Continued
Inclusion of major subprograms to major defense acquisition programs under acquisition reporting requirements (sec. 801) 357
Inclusion of certain major information technology investments in acquisition oversight authorities for Major Automated Information System programs (sec. 802) 357
Configuration steering boards for cost control under major defense acquisition programs (sec. 803) 357
Subtitle B—Acquisition Policy and Management 358
Internal controls for procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense by certain non-defense agencies (sec. 811) 358
Contingency contracting corps (sec. 812) 359
Expedited review and validation of urgent requirements documents (sec. 813) 359
Incorporation of energy efficiency requirements into key performance parameters for fuel consuming systems (sec. 814) 359
Subtitle C—Amendments Relating to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations 360
Multiyear procurement authority for the Department of Defense for the purchase of alternative and synthetic fuels (sec. 821) 360
Modification and extension of pilot program for transition to follow-on contracts under authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 822) 361
Exclusion of certain factors in consideration of cost advantages of offers for certain Department of Defense contracts (sec. 823) 361
Subtitle D—Department of Defense Contractor Matters 361
Database for Department of Defense contracting officers and suspension and debarment officials (sec. 831) 361
Ethics safeguards for employees under certain contracts for the performance of acquisition functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions (sec. 832) 361
Information for Department of Defense contractor employees on their whistleblower rights (sec. 833) 362
Subtitle E—Matters Relating to Iraq and Afghanistan 362
Performance by private security contractors of inherently governmental functions in an area of combat operations (sec. 841) 362
Additional contractor requirements and responsibilities relating to alleged crimes by or against contractor personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 842) 363
Clarification and modification of authorities relating to the Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 843) 364
Comprehensive audit of spare parts purchases and depot overhaul and maintenance of equipment for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 844) 364
Subtitle F—Other Matters 364
Expedited hiring authority for the defense acquisition workforce (sec. 851) 364
Specification of Secretary of Defense as "Secretary concerned" for purposes of licensing of intellectual property for the defense agencies and defense field activities (sec. 852) 365
Repeal of requirements relating to the military system essential item breakout list (sec. 853) 365
Items of Special Interest 365
Contracting officer representatives 365
Database and after-action reports for multiyear contracts 366
Past performance information 366
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management 369
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management 369
Modification of status of Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Chemical and Biological Defense Programs (sec. 901) . 369
Participation of Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense on Defense Business System Management Committee (sec. 902) 369

Page

Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management—Continued
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management—Continued
Repeal of obsolete limitations on management headquarters personnel (sec. 903) 369
General Counsel to the Inspector General of the Department of Defense (sec. 904) 369
Assignment of forces to the United States Northern Command with primary mission of management of the consequences of an incident in the United States homeland involving a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear device, or high-yield explosives (sec. 905) 370
Business transformation initiatives for the military departments (sec. 906) 370
Subtitle B—Space Matters 371
Space posture review (sec. 911) 371
Subtitle C—Defense Intelligence Matters 371
Requirement for officers of the armed forces on active duty in certain intelligence positions (sec. 921) 371
Transfer of management of Intelligence Systems Support Office (sec. 922) 372
Program on advanced sensor applications (sec. 923) 372
Title X—General Provisions 375
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 375
General transfer authority (sec. 1001) 375
Incorporation into Act of tables in the report of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate (sec. 1002) 375
United States contribution to NATO common-funded budgets in fiscal year 2009 (sec. 1003) 376
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 376
Government rights in designs of Department of Defense vessels, boats, craft, and components developed using public funds (sec. 1011) 376
Reimbursement of expenses for certain Navy mess operations (sec. 1012) 376
Subtitle C—Counter-Drug Activities 377
Extension of authority for joint task forces to provide support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities (sec. 1021) 377
Two-year extension of authority for use of funds for unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1022) 378
Subtitle D—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations 378
Procurement by State and local governments of equipment for homeland security and emergency response activities through the Department of Defense (sec. 1031) 378
Enhancement of the capacity of the United States Government to conduct complex operations (sec. 1032) 378
Crediting of admiralty claim receipts for damage to property funded from a Department of Defense working capital fund (sec. 1033) 379
Minimum annual purchase requirements for airlift services from carriers participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (sec. 1034) 379
Termination date of base contract for the Navy-Marine Corps Intranet (sec. 1035) 379
Prohibition on interrogation of detainees by contractor personnel (sec. 1036) 380
Notification of Committees on Armed Services with respect to certain nonproliferation and proliferation activities (sec. 1037) 381
Sense of Congress on nuclear weapons management (sec. 1038) 381
Sense of Congress on Joint Department of Defense-Federal Aviation Administration Executive Committee on Conflict and Dispute Resolution (sec. 1039) 381
Sense of Congress on sale of new outsize cargo, strategic lift aircraft for civilian use (sec. 1040) 382
Subtitle E—Reports 383
Repeal of requirement to submit certain annual reports to Congress regarding allied contributions to the common defense (sec. 1051) 383
Report on detention operations in Iraq (sec. 1052) 383

Page

Title X—General Provisions—Continued
Subtitle E—Reports—Continued
Strategic plan to enhance the role of the National Guard and Reserves in the national defense (sec. 1053) 383
Review of nonnuclear prompt global strike concept demonstrations (sec. 1054) 384
Review of bandwidth capacity requirements of the Department of Defense and the intelligence community (sec. 1055) 384
Subtitle F—Wounded Warrior Matters 385
Modification of utilization of veterans' presumption of sound condition in establishing eligibility of members of the armed forces for retirement for disability (sec. 1061) 385
Inclusion of service members in inpatient status in wounded warrior policies and protections (sec. 1062) 385
Clarification of certain information sharing between the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs for wounded warrior purposes (sec. 1063) 385
Additional responsibilities for the wounded warrior resource center (sec. 1064) 385
Responsibility for the center of excellence in the prevention, diagnosis, mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of traumatic brain injury to conduct pilot programs on treatment approaches for traumatic brain injury (sec. 1065) 386
Center of excellence in the mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of traumatic extremity injuries and amputations (sec. 1066) 386
Three-year extension of Senior Oversight Committee with respect to wounded warrior matters (sec. 1067) 387
Subtitle G—Other Matters 387
Military salute for the flag during the national anthem by members of the armed forces not in uniform and by veterans (sec. 1081) 387
Modification of deadlines for standards required for entry to military installations in the United States (sec. 1082) 387
Items of Special Interest 387
Compliance with Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate 387
Fully interoperable electronic health information for the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs 388
Interagency coordination and participation in post-conflict stability and reconstruction operations 388
National cyber security initiative 389
Nuclear security 391
Nutrition and dietary care for seriously ill and injured service members 391
Recovery care coordinators and medical care case managers for seriously wounded and ill service members 392
Refugee crisis in Iraq 392
United States Africa Command 393
Title XI—Civilian Personnel Matters 395
Department of Defense strategic human capital plans (sec. 1101) 395
Conditional increase in authorized number of Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service personnel (sec. 1102) 395
Enhancement of authorities relating to additional positions under the National Security Personnel System (sec. 1103) 396
Expedited hiring authority for health care professionals of the Department of Defense (sec. 1104) 396
Election of insurance coverage by federal civilian employees deployed in support of a contingency operation (sec. 1105) 396
Permanent extension of Department of Defense voluntary reduction in force authority (sec. 1106) 397
Four-year extension of authority to make lump sum severance payments with respect to Department of Defense employees (sec. 1107) 397
Authority to waive limitations on pay for federal civilian employees working overseas under areas of United States Central Command (sec. 1108) 397
Technical amendment relating to definition of professional accounting position for purposes of certification and credentialing standards (sec. 1109) 398

Page

Title XII—Matters Relating to Foreign Nations 399
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training 399
Increase in amount available for costs of education and training of foreign military forces under Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program (sec. 1201) 399
Authority for distribution to certain foreign personnel of education and training materials and information technology to enhance military interoperability with the armed forces (sec. 1202) 399
Extension and expansion of authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism (sec. 1203) 399
Modification and extension of authorities relating to program to build the capacity of foreign military forces (sec. 1204) 400
Extension of authority and increased funding for security and stabilization assistance (sec. 1205) 401
Four-year extension of temporary authority to use acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend military equipment for personnel protection and survivability (sec. 1206) 401
Authority for use of funds for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities (sec. 1207) 402
Subtitle B—Department of Defense Participation in Bilateral, Multilateral, and Regional Cooperation Programs 403
Availability across fiscal years of funds for military-to-military contacts and comparable activities (sec. 1211) 403
Enhancement of authorities relating to Department of Defense regional centers for security studies (sec. 1212) 403
Payment of personnel expenses for multilateral cooperation programs (sec. 1213) 403
Participation of the Department of Defense in multinational military centers of excellence (sec. 1214) 403
Subtitle C—Other Authorities and Limitations 404
Waiver of certain sanctions against North Korea (sec. 1221) 404
Subtitle D—Reports 404
Extension and modification of updates on report on claims relating to the bombing of the Labelle Discotheque (sec. 1231) 404
Report on utilization of certain global partnership authorities (sec. 1232) 405
Title XIII—Cooperative Threat Reduction With States of the Former Soviet Union 407
Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301) 407
Funding allocations (sec. 1302) 407
Title XIV—Other Authorizations 409
Summary and explanation of tables 409
Subtitle A—Military Programs 412
Working capital funds (sec. 1401) 412
National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1402) 412
Defense Health Program (sec. 1403) 412
Chemical agents and munitions destruction, defense (sec. 1404) 412
Drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, defense-wide (sec. 1405) 412
Defense Inspector General (sec. 1406) 412
Reduction in certain authorizations due to savings from lower inflation (sec. 1407) 412
Subtitle B—Armed Forces Retirement Home 413
Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1421) 413
Subtitle C—Other Matters 413
Responsibilities for chemical demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commissions in Colorado and Kentucky (sec. 1431) 413
Modification of definition of "Department of Defense Sealift Vessel" for purposes of the National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1432) 413
Budget Items 414
LHA(R) advance procurement and research and development 414
Traumatic brain injury and post traumatic stress disorder initiative 414
Department of Defense Inspector General 414
Item of Special Interest 415
Completion of destruction of chemical weapons stockpile 415

Page

Title XV—Authorization of Additional Appropriations for Operations in Afghanistan 417
Overview 417
Explanation of Tables 417
Purpose (sec. 1501) 420
Army procurement (sec. 1502) 420
Navy and Marine Corps procurement (sec. 1503) 420
Air Force procurement (sec. 1504) 420
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1505) 420
Defense-wide activities procurement (sec. 1506) 420
Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1507) 420
Operation and maintenance (sec. 1508) 420
Military personnel (sec. 1509) 421
Working capital funds (sec. 1510) 421
Other Department of Defense programs (sec. 1511) 421
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1512) 421
Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1513) 421
Special transfer authority (sec. 1514) 421
Limitation on use of funds (sec. 1515) 421
Requirement for separate display of budget for Afghanistan (sec. 1516) 422
Title XVI—Authorization of Additional Appropriations for Operations in Iraq . 423
Overview 423
Explanation of Tables 423
Purpose (sec. 1601) 426
Army procurement (sec. 1602) 426
Navy and Marine Corps procurement (sec. 1603) 426
Air Force procurement (sec. 1604) 426
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1605) 426
Defense-wide activities procurement (sec. 1606) 427
Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1607) 427
Operation and maintenance (sec. 1608) 427
Military personnel (sec. 1609) 427
Working capital funds (sec. 1610) 427
Defense Health Program (sec. 1611) 427
Iraq Freedom Fund (sec. 1612) 427
Iraq Security Forces Fund (sec. 1613) 428
Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1614) 428
Limitation on use of funds (sec. 1615) 428
Contributions by the Government of Iraq to large-scale infrastructure projects, combined operations, and other activities in Iraq (sec. 1616) 428
Division B—Military Construction Authorizations 429
Summary and explanation of funding tables 429
Short title (sec. 2001) 446
Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2002) 446
Effective date (sec. 2003) 446
Title XXI—Army 447
Summary 447
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101) 447
Family housing (sec. 2102) 447
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2103) 448
Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104) 448
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2105) 448
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2106) 448
Title XXII—Navy 449
Summary 449
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201) 449
Family housing (sec. 2202) 449
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203) 450
Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204) 450

Page

Title XXII—Navy—Continued
Summary—Continued
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2005 project inside the United States (sec. 2205) 450
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2007 projects inside the United States (sec. 2206) 450
Title XXIII—Air Force 451
Summary 451
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301) 451
Family housing (sec. 2302) 451
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303) 451
Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304) 451
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2006 projects (sec. 2305) 452
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2306) 452
Budget Item 452
Planning and design, Air Force 452
Title XXIV—Defense Agencies 453
Summary 453
Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations 453
Authorized defense agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401) 453
Energy conservation projects (sec. 2402) 453
Authorization of appropriations, defense agencies (sec. 2403) 453
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2007 project (sec. 2404) 454
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2405) 454
Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations 454
Authorized chemical demilitarization program construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2411) 454
Authorization of appropriations, chemical demilitarization construction, defense-wide (sec. 2412) 454
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 1997 project (sec. 2413) 454
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2000 project (sec. 2414) 455
Title XXV—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program 457
Summary 457
Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501) 457
Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502) 457
Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities 459
Summary 459
Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601) 459
Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602) 459
Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603) 459
Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604) 459
Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605) 459
Authorization of appropriations, Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606) 460
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2006 projects (sec. 2607) 460
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 project (sec. 2608) 460
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2008 project (sec. 2609) 460
Budget Items 460
Planning and design, Army National Guard 460
Planning and design, Air National Guard 461

Page

Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities—Continued
Budget Items—Continued
Planning and design, Air Force Reserve 461
Title XXVII—Base Closure and Realignment Activities 463
Summary and explanation of tables 463
Authorization of appropriations for base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account 1990 (sec. 2701) 472
Authorized base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account 2005 (sec. 2702) 472
Authorization of appropriations for base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account 2005 (sec. 2703) 472
Modification of annual base closure and realignment reporting requirements (sec. 2704) 472
Technical corrections regarding authorized cost and scope of work variations for military construction and military family housing projects related to base closures and realignments (sec. 2705) 472
Title XXVIII—Military Construction General Provisions 473
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 473
Increase in threshold for unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2801) 473
Authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects outside the United States (sec. 2802) 473
Improved oversight and accountability for military housing privatization initiative projects (sec. 2803) 473
Leasing of military family housing to Secretary of Defense (sec. 2804) 474
Cost-benefit analysis of dissolution of Patrick Family Housing LLC (sec. 2805) 474
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 475
Participation in conservation banking programs (sec. 2811) 475
Clarification of congressional reporting requirements for certain real property transactions (sec. 2812) 475
Modification of land management restrictions applicable to Utah national defense lands (sec. 2813) 475
Subtitle C—Land Conveyances 476
Transfer of proceeds from property conveyance, Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, Georgia (sec. 2821) 476
Subtitle D—Energy Security 476
Expansion of authority of the military departments to develop energy on military lands (sec. 2831) 476
Subtitle E—Other Matters 476
Report on application of force protection and anti-terrorism standards to gates and entry points on military installations (sec. 2841) 476
Items of Special Interest 477
Defense Access Roads criteria 477
Military construction reprogrammings 478
Title XXIX—War-Related Military Construction Authorizations 481
Summary 481
Subtitle A—Fiscal Year 2008 Projects 484
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2901) 484
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2902) 484
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2903) 484
Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2008 Army projects (sec. 2904) 484
Subtitle B—Fiscal Year 2009 Projects 485
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2911) 485
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2912) 485
Limitation on availability of funds for certain purposes relating to Iraq (sec. 2913) 485

Page

Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations 487
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs 487
Overview 487
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations 510
National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101) 510
Weapons activities 510
Directed stockpile work 510
Campaigns 510
Readiness in the technical base 511
Secure transportation asset 511
Nuclear weapons incident response 511
Safeguards and security 512
Facilities and infrastructure 512
Environmental projects and operations and transformation disposition 512
Stockpile surveillance testing 512
Construction projects 513
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs 513
Nonproliferation and verification research and development 514
Nonproliferation and international security 514
International nuclear materials and cooperation 515
Fissile materials disposition 515
Naval reactors 515
Office of the Administrator 515
Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102) 515
Other defense activities (sec. 3103) 516
Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3104) 516
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 516
Modifications of functions of Administrator for Nuclear Security to include elimination of surplus fissile materials usable for nuclear weapons (sec. 3111) 516
Report on compliance with Design Basis Threat issued by the Department of Energy in 2005 (sec. 3112) 516
Modification of submittal of reports on inadvertent releases of restricted data (sec. 3113) 517
Nonproliferation scholarship and fellowship program (sec. 3114) 517
Review of and reports on Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention program (sec. 3115) 517
Title XXXII—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 519
Authorization (sec. 3201) 519
Legislative Requirements 561
Departmental Recommendations 561
Committee Action 561
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate 561
Regulatory Impact 561
Changes in Existing Law 561

110TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
110–335

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MAY 12, 2008.—Ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 3001]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 2009 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

(1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2009;

(2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2009;

(3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2009;

(4) impose certain reporting requirements;

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

(6) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2009; and

(7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2009.

Committee overview

The United States armed forces have been involved in armed conflict for more than 6 years—6½ years in Afghanistan and 5 years in Iraq. Whether fighting in Afghanistan or Iraq, delivering humanitarian assistance to the victims of natural disasters in Asia or Africa, training foreign national forces to combat terrorism in their own countries, or assisting State and federal agencies responding to emergencies here at home, the men and women of our armed forces, both active and reserve, are serving honorably and courageously to promote and defend our Nation's interests. They do so often at great personal risk and significant sacrifice to themselves and their families.

After more than 6 years of war, our military, particularly our ground forces, are severely stressed. The Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, General Richard A. Cody, in testimony before the Readiness and Management Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on April 1, 2008 stated, "Our readiness, quite frankly, is being consumed as fast as we can build it" and "I've never seen our lack of strategic depth be at where it is today."

Moreover, the requirement for large numbers of forces in Iraq, coupled with an insufficient contribution from North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member nations, has left Afghanistan with a shortage of combatants and trainers. As the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Michael Mullen noted on April 15, 2008, "So until we come down in numbers of brigades in Iraq, the brigade-size requirements in Afghanistan just aren't going to be met. That link is very direct."

To date in this Second Session of the 110th Congress, the Committee on Armed Services has conducted 30 hearings and numerous briefings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 2009 and related defense matters. In order to provide a framework for the consideration of these matters, the committee identified seven priorities to guide its work on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. These priorities are:

1. Provide fair compensation and first rate health care, and improve the quality of life of the men and women in the armed forces (active duty, National Guard and reserves) and their families.
2. Provide our servicemen and women with the resources, training, technology, equipment (especially force protection) and authorities they need to succeed in combat and stability operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.
3. Seek to reduce our Nation's strategic risk by taking action aimed at restoring, as soon as possible, the readiness of the military services to conduct the full range of their assigned missions.
4. Improve the efficiency of Department of Defense programs and activities, and apply the savings toward high-priority programs.
5. Improve the ability of the armed forces to counter nontraditional threats, including terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.
6. Promote the transformation of the armed forces to deal with the threats of the 21st century.
7. Ensure aggressive and thorough oversight of the Department's programs and activities to ensure proper stewardship of taxpayer dollars and compliance with relevant laws and regulations.

Explanation of funding summary

The administration's budget request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 2009 was $542.5 billion for the so-called "base" budget, which excludes the costs of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. This amount includes scorekeeping adjustments by the Congressional Budget Office. The President has also requested an additional $70.0 billion in emergency defense funding for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The combined total requested by the President for the national defense budget function was $612.5 billion.

The following table summarizes both the direct authorizations and the equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2009 defense programs. The columns relating to the authorization request do not include funding for items that are not within the jurisdiction of this committee or that do not require an annual authorization. The table also includes the authorization for spending from the trust fund of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, which is outside the national defense budget function.

Funding for all programs in the national defense function is reflected in the columns related to the budget authority request and the total budget authority implication of the authorizations in this bill. The committee recommends funding for national defense programs totaling $612.5 billion in budget authority, which is consistent with the President's budget request and with the funding levels for national defense in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009 (S. Con. Res. 70) adopted by the Senate on March 13, 2008.

In order to clearly identify the cost of war, funding for operations in Afghanistan is contained in title XV of this Act, and funding for operations in Iraq is contained in title XVI of this Act. Titles XV and XVI authorize funding for personnel, operation and maintenance, procurement, health care, working capital funds, and other costs normally funded in division A of this Act. Titles XV and XVI authorize $69.5 billion for operations in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Title XXIX of this act authorizes an additional $500.0 million for war-related military construction, in particular, for additional warrior transition units to care for injured military personnel, whether such illness or injury resulted from operations in Iraq or Afghanistan or from other operations.

In total, this bill authorizes $70.0 billion in war-related funding, the same amount requested by the President and approved by the Senate in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009.

In accordance with views and estimates of this committee to the Senate Committee on the Budget for fiscal year 2009, the committee bill does not designate any of the funding authorized by this Act as emergency spending. The committee continues to believe that the expected costs of longstanding operations such as those in Iraq and Afghanistan should be included in the budget request and should not be treated as emergencies.

The committee also continues to believe the financial cost of war should be as transparent as possible. In an effort to promote and enhance such transparency, the committee bill allocates funding to operations in Afghanistan and Iraq separately.

The committee notes that on February 8, 2008, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates stated that, "I worry that for many Europeans the missions in Iraq and Afghanistan are confused . . . I think that they combine the two . . . Many of them, I think, have a problem with our involvement in Iraq and project that to Afghanistan, and do not understand the very different—for them—the very different kind of threat." The committee shares this concern, and has included a provision that would require future budget or supplemental requests to allocate funds separately for operations in Afghanistan.

The $70.0 billion requested by the President for these operations in the budget contains no supporting detail at the service, account, or line-item level, nor does it allocate such funding between operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Furthermore, this $70.0 billion is a "placeholder" that does not purport to represent the full cost of these operations during fiscal year 2009. While the committee understands that projecting costs of ongoing operations where force levels are changing cannot be an exact science, the committee does believe that by omitting any supporting details and by not including a realistic estimate of the full year cost of these operations, the budget request failed to fully comply with the requirements of section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

The committee anticipates a future supplemental request for additional funds for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and will consider such a request when it becomes available.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2009 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
DIVISION A					
Title I -- PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,009,835	4,957,435	5,009,835	-52,400	4,957,435
Missile Procurement, Army	2,211,460	2,211,460	2,211,460		2,211,460
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	3,687,077	3,689,277	3,687,077	2,200	3,689,277
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	2,275,791	2,303,791	2,275,791	28,000	2,303,791
Other Procurement, Army	11,367,926	11,861,704	11,367,926	493,778	11,861,704
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	496,300		496,300	-496,300	
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	14,716,774	14,729,274	14,716,774	12,500	14,729,274
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,575,482	3,605,482	3,575,482	30,000	3,605,482
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	12,732,918	13,037,218	12,732,918	304,300	13,037,218
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	1,122,712	1,131,712	1,122,712	9,000	1,131,712
Other Procurement, Navy	5,482,856	5,516,506	5,482,856	33,650	5,516,506
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,512,765	1,495,665	1,512,765	-17,100	1,495,665
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	12,676,496	13,235,286	12,676,496	558,790	13,235,286
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	894,478	895,478	894,478	1,000	895,478
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,536,728	5,556,728	5,536,728	20,000	5,556,728
Other Procurement, Air Force	16,128,396	16,115,496	16,128,396	-12,900	16,115,496
Procurement, Defense-Wide	3,164,228	3,466,928	3,164,228	302,700	3,466,928
Rapid Acquisition Fund	102,045	102,045	102,045		102,045
Defense Production Act Purchases			36,365		36,365
Total PROCUREMENT	**102,694,267**	**103,911,485**	**102,730,632**	**1,217,218**	**103,947,850**
Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION					
RDT&E, Army	10,524,085	10,855,210	10,524,085	331,125	10,855,210
RDT&E, Navy	19,337,238	19,442,192	19,337,238	104,954	19,442,192
RDT&E, Air Force	28,066,617	28,322,477	28,066,617	255,860	28,322,477
RDT&E, Defense-Wide	21,499,229	20,924,729	21,499,229	-574,500	20,924,729
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	188,772	188,772	188,772		188,772
Total RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVALUATION	**79,615,941**	**79,733,380**	**79,615,941**	**117,439**	**79,733,380**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2009 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Title III – OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	31,243,092	31,282,460	31,243,092	39,368	31,282,460
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	34,922,398	34,811,598	34,922,398	-110,800	34,811,598
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,597,254	5,607,354	5,597,254	10,100	5,607,354
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	35,902,487	35,244,587	35,902,487	-657,900	35,244,587
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	26,091,864	25,926,564	26,091,864	-165,300	25,926,564
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,642,341	2,642,641	2,642,341	300	2,642,641
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,311,085	1,311,085	1,311,085		1,311,085
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	213,131	213,131	213,131		213,131
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,142,892	3,142,892	3,142,892		3,142,892
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	5,875,546	5,909,846	5,875,546	34,300	5,909,846
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	5,879,576	5,883,926	5,879,576	4,350	5,883,926
US Court of Appeals, Armed Forces	13,254	13,254	13,254		13,254
Environmental Restoration, Army	447,776	447,776	447,776		447,776
Environmental Restoration, Navy	290,819	290,819	290,819		290,819
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	496,277	496,277	496,277		496,277
Environmental Restoration, Defense-wide	13,175	13,175	13,175		13,175
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	257,796	257,796	257,796		257,796
Cooperative Threat Reduction	414,135	434,135	414,135	20,000	434,135
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster & Civic Aid	83,273	83,273	83,273		83,273
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	9,101	9,101	9,101		9,101
Scorekeeping Adjustments:					
Disposal of DoD Real Property			16,993		16,993
Lease of DoD Real Property			3,517		3,517
DoD Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery/Other			761		761
Total OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	**154,847,272**	**154,021,690**	**154,868,543**	**-825,582**	**154,042,961**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2009 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Title IV -- MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel (direct appropriations)		114,896,340	114,896,340	-744,300	114,152,040
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Accruals			10,350,593		10,350,593
Mandatory Spending: Current Law			3,901,000		3,901,000
Total MILITARY PERSONNEL		**114,896,340**	**129,147,933**	**-744,300**	**128,403,633**
Title XIV -- OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS					
Subtitle A -- Military Programs					
Defense Working Capital Funds	198,150	198,150	198,150		198,150
Defense Commissary Working Capital Fund	1,291,084	1,291,084	1,291,084		1,291,084
Defense Coalition Support Fund	22,000		22,000	-22,000	
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,962,253	1,608,553	1,962,253	-353,700	1,608,553
Defense Health Program	23,615,202	24,802,202	23,615,202	1,187,000	24,802,202
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction	1,485,634	1,485,634	1,485,634		1,485,634
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	1,060,463	1,060,463	1,060,463		1,060,463
Office of the Inspector General	247,845	273,845	247,845	26,000	273,845
Inflation savings (Section 1407)		-1,048,000		-1,048,000	-1,048,000
Stockpile transaction fund transfer	-1,300,000	-1,300,000	-1,300,000		-1,300,000
Subtitle C -- Civil Programs					
Armed Forces Retirement Home (non-defense)	63,010	63,010	63,010		63,010
Total OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**28,645,641**	**28,434,941**	**28,645,641**	**-210,700**	**28,434,941**
Title XV -- AFGHANISTAN-RELATED WAR COSTS					
Aircraft Procurement, Army		250,000		250,000	250,000
Missile Procurement, Army		12,500		12,500	12,500
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army		375,000		375,000	375,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army		87,500		87,500	87,500

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2009 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Other Procurement, Army		1,100,000		1,100,000	1,100,000
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund		750,000		750,000	750,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy		25,000		25,000	25,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy		12,500		12,500	12,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps		75,000		75,000	75,000
Other Procurement, Navy		25,000		25,000	25,000
Procurement, Marine Corps		250,000		250,000	250,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force		400,000		400,000	400,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force		12,500		12,500	12,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force		12,500		12,500	12,500
Other Procurement, Air Force		150,000		150,000	150,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide		62,500		62,500	62,500
Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund		100,000		100,000	100,000
RDT&E, Army		15,000		15,000	15,000
RDT&E, Navy		15,000		15,000	15,000
RDT&E, Air Force		15,000		15,000	15,000
RDT&E, Defense-Wide		15,000		15,000	15,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army		9,000,000		9,000,000	9,000,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy		500,000		500,000	500,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps		1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force		500,000		500,000	500,000
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide		688,750		688,750	688,750
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve		12,500		12,500	12,500
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve		7,500		7,500	7,500
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve		10,000		10,000	10,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve		3,750		3,750	3,750
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard		75,000		75,000	75,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard		12,500		12,500	12,500

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2009 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Military Personnel, Army		500,000		500,000	500,000
Military Personnel, Navy		25,000		25,000	25,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps		62,500		62,500	62,500
Military Personnel, Air Force		25,000		25,000	25,000
Military Personnel, Army Reserve		25,000		25,000	25,000
Military Personnel, Navy Reserve		7,500		7,500	7,500
Military Personnel, Marine Corps Reserve		5,000		5,000	5,000
Military Personnel, Army National Guard		100,000		100,000	100,000
Defense Health Program		155,000		155,000	155,000
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense		150,000		150,000	150,000
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund		3,000,000		3,000,000	3,000,000
Defense Working Capital Funds		250,000		250,000	250,000
TOTAL TITLE XV, AFGHANISTAN		**19,875,000**		**19,875,000**	**19,875,000**
Title XVI – IRAQ-RELATED WAR COSTS					
Aircraft Procurement, Army		750,000		750,000	750,000
Missile Procurement, Army		37,500		37,500	37,500
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army		1,125,000		1,125,000	1,125,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army		262,500		262,500	262,500
Other Procurement, Army		3,300,000		3,300,000	3,300,000
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund		2,250,000		2,250,000	2,250,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy		75,000		75,000	75,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy		37,500		37,500	37,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps		225,000		225,000	225,000
Other Procurement, Navy		75,000		75,000	75,000
Procurement, Marine Corps		750,000		750,000	750,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force		400,000		400,000	400,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force		37,500		37,500	37,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force		37,500		37,500	37,500

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2009 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Other Procurement, Air Force		450,000		450,000	450,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide		187,500		187,500	187,500
Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund		500,000		500,000	500,000
RDT&E, Army		35,000		35,000	35,000
RDT&E, Navy		35,000		35,000	35,000
RDT&E, Air Force		35,000		35,000	35,000
RDT&E, Defense-Wide		35,000		35,000	35,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army		27,000,000		27,000,000	27,000,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy		1,500,000		1,500,000	1,500,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps		3,000,000		3,000,000	3,000,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force		1,500,000		1,500,000	1,500,000
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide		1,811,250		1,811,250	1,811,250
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve		37,500		37,500	37,500
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve		22,500		22,500	22,500
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve		30,000		30,000	30,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve		11,250		11,250	11,250
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard		225,000		225,000	225,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard		37,500		37,500	37,500
Military Personnel, Army		1,500,000		1,500,000	1,500,000
Military Personnel, Navy		75,000		75,000	75,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps		187,500		187,500	187,500
Military Personnel, Air Force		75,000		75,000	75,000
Military Personnel, Army Reserve		75,000		75,000	75,000
Military Personnel, Navy Reserve		22,500		22,500	22,500
Military Personnel, Marine Corps Reserve		15,000		15,000	15,000
Military Personnel, Army National Guard		300,000		300,000	300,000
Defense Health Program		460,000		460,000	460,000

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2009 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Iraq Security Forces Fund		200,000		200,000	200,000
Iraq Freedom Fund		150,000		150,000	150,000
Defense Working Capital Funds		750,000		750,000	750,000
TOTAL TITLE XVI, IRAQ		**49,625,000**		**49,625,000**	**49,625,000**
Total, Titles XV and XVI	**70,000,000**	**69,500,000**	**70,000,000**	**-500,000**	**69,500,000**
DIVISION B					
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	4,615,920	4,647,520	4,615,920	31,600	4,647,520
Military Construction, Navy	3,096,399	3,125,629	3,096,399	29,230	3,125,629
Military Construction, Air Force	934,892	1,062,064	934,892	127,172	1,062,064
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	1,783,998	1,766,798	1,783,998	-17,200	1,766,798
Chemical Demilitarization Construction	134,278	144,278	134,278	10,000	144,278
NATO Security Investment Program	240,867	240,867	240,867		240,867
Military Construction, Army National Guard	539,296	634,407	539,296	95,111	634,407
Military Construction, Army Reserve	281,687	281,687	281,687		281,687
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	57,045	57,045	57,045		57,045
Military Construction, Air National Guard	34,374	156,124	34,374	121,750	156,124
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	19,265	26,615	19,265	7,350	26,615
Total MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	**11,738,021**	**12,143,034**	**11,738,021**	**405,013**	**12,143,034**
FAMILY HOUSING					
Family Housing Construction, Army	678,580	678,580	678,580		678,580
Family Housing Operations, Army	716,110	716,110	716,110		716,110
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Marine Corps	382,778	382,778	382,778		382,778
Family Housing Operations, Navy & Marine Corps	376,062	376,062	376,062		376,062
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	395,879	395,879	395,879		395,879
Family Housing Operations, Air Force	599,465	599,465	599,465		599,465
Family Housing Operations, Defense-Wide	49,231	49,231	49,231		49,231
Homeowners Assistance Program	4,500	4,500	4,500		4,500

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2009 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	850	850	850		850
Total FAMILY HOUSING	**3,203,455**	**3,203,455**	**3,203,455**		**3,203,455**
Base Realignment and Closure IV	393,377	393,377	393,377		393,377
Base Realignment and Closure 2005	9,065,386	9,065,386	9,065,386		9,065,386
Subtotal Base Closure	**9,458,763**	**9,458,763**	**9,458,763**		**9,458,763**
Subtotal Non War-Related Funding	**24,400,239**	**24,805,252**	**24,400,239**	**405,013**	**24,805,252**
Title XXIX - War-Related Military Construction					
Military Construction, Army		450,000		450,000	450,000
Military Construction, Navy		50,000		50,000	50,000
Subtotal War-Related Military Construction		**500,000**		**500,000**	**500,000**
TOTAL DIVISION B	**24,400,239**	**25,305,252**	**24,400,239**	**905,013**	**25,305,252**
Other Discretionary Programs					
Mandatory Programs			-645,000		-645,000
TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	**460,140,350**	**575,740,078**	**588,700,919**	**-40,912**	**588,660,007**
DIVISION C					
Energy Delivery and Reliability	7,622		7,622	-7,622	
National Nuclear Security Administration					
Weapons Activities	6,618,079	6,610,701	6,618,079	-7,378	6,610,701
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,247,048	1,799,056	1,247,048	552,008	1,799,056
Naval Reactors	828,054	828,054	828,054		828,054
Office of the Administrator	404,081	404,081	404,081		404,081
Total National Nuclear Security Adminstration	**9,097,262**	**9,641,892**	**9,097,262**	**544,630**	**9,641,892**
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,297,256	5,297,256	5,297,256		5,297,256

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2009 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Other Defense Activities	1,313,461	826,453	1,313,461	-487,008	826,453
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	247,371	197,371	247,371	-50,000	197,371
Total DOE/NNSA Discretionary Authorizations	**15,962,972**	**15,962,972**	**15,962,972**		**15,962,972**
Mandatory Programs:					
Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation			1,155,000		1,155,000
Total Department of Energy/NNSA	**15,962,972**	**15,962,972**	**17,117,972**		**17,117,972**
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	25,499	28,969	25,499	3,470	28,969
Formerly Used Sites Remedial Action Program			130,000		130,000
DIVISION C/Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	**15,988,471**	**15,991,941**	**17,273,471**	**3,470**	**17,276,941**
DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES					
Discretionary Programs			6,201,000		6,201,000
Mandatory Programs			317,000		317,000
DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)			**6,518,000**		**6,518,000**
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	**476,128,821**	**591,732,019**	**612,492,390**	**-37,442**	**612,454,948**
NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS					
Armed Forces Retirement Home	63,010	63,010	63,010		63,010
Total Non-Defense Authorizations	**63,010**	**63,010**	**63,010**		**63,010**
TOTAL AUTHORIZATIONS	**476,191,831**	**591,795,029**	**612,555,400**	**-37,442**	**612,517,958**
Memo: Base Budget National Defense Total	**406,128,821**	**521,732,019**	**542,492,390**	**-37,442**	**542,454,948**
Memo: War-Related Total (Titles XV, XVI and XXIX)	**70,000,000**	**70,000,000**	**70,000,000**		**70,000,000**
Total National Defense Authorizations	**476,128,821**	**591,732,019**	**612,492,390**	**-37,442**	**612,454,948**

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Explanation of tables

The following tables provide the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title I of this Act. The tables also display the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2009 budget request for procurement programs, and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts.

These tables are incorporated by reference into this Act as provided in section 1002 of this Act. The Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorization
Title I - PROCUREMENT			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,009,835	-52,400	4,957,435
Missile Procurement, Army	2,211,460		2,211,460
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	3,687,077	2,200	3,689,277
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	2,275,791	28,000	2,303,791
Other Procurement, Army	11,367,926	493,778	11,861,704
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	496,300	-496,300	
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	14,716,774	12,500	14,729,274
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,575,482	30,000	3,605,482
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	1,122,712	9,000	1,131,712
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	12,732,918	304,300	13,037,218
Other Procurement, Navy	5,482,856	33,650	5,516,506
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,512,765	-17,100	1,495,665
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	12,676,496	558,790	13,235,286
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,536,728	20,000	5,556,728
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	894,478	1,000	895,478
Other Procurement, Air Force	16,128,396	-12,900	16,115,496
Procurement, Defense-Wide	3,164,228	302,700	3,466,928
National Guard and Reserve Equipment			
Rapid Acquisition Fund	102,045		102,045
TOTAL PROCUREMENT	102,694,267	1,217,218	103,911,485

Subtitle B—Army Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIRCRAFT						
	FIXED WING						
001	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA)	7	264,160			7	264,160
002	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT						
	ROTARY WING						
003	ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELICOPTER	28	358,841	-8	-75,000	20	283,841
	Reduce aggressive ramp up of production rate				[-75,000]		
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		80,010				80,010
005	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	36	224,518			36	224,518
006	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	63	925,852			63	925,852
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		137,175				137,175
008	CH-47 HELICOPTER (MYP)	16	443,519			16	443,519
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
010	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING	1	2,381			1	2,381
011	DRUG INTERDICTION						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
012	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)		119,057				119,057
013	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)(ARL)		23,297				23,297
014	AH-64 MODS		607,969				607,969
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		29,373				29,373
016	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS		674,586				674,586

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		49,619				49,619
018	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		14,921				14,921
019	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS		577				577
020	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS		10,866		3,000		13,866
	Additional forward looking infrared (FLIR) systems				[3,000]		
021	KIOWA WARRIOR		13,722				13,722
022	AIRBORNE AVIONICS		174,978		11,300		186,278
	Additional avionics navigation equipment – Army UFR				[11,300]		
023	GATM (Global Air Traffic Management)		79,223				79,223
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
024	SPARE PARTS (AIR)		6,875				6,875
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
025	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		56,906				56,906
026	ASE INFRARED CM		433,941				433,941
	OTHER SUPPORT						
027	AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL						
028	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,028		249		5,277
	Avionic support equipment – Army UFR				[249]		
029	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		103,882				103,882
030	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		40,697		2,440		43,137
	Aircrew integrated systems – Army UFR				[2,440]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
031	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		122,775		5,493		128,268
	Air traffic control equipment- Army UFR				[5,493]		
032	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		2,536		116		2,652
	Additional avionics & airborne instrumentation equipment – Army UFR				[116]		
033	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		2,442				2,442
034	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS		109		2		111
	Additional high frequency radio equipment – Army UFR				[2]		
	TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**5,009,835**		**-52,400**		**4,957,435**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	OTHER MISSILES						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
001	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	108	512,086			108	512,086
002	PATRIOT/MEADS CAP SYSTEM SUMMARY		31,049				31,049
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (SLAMRAAM)		40,468				40,468
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
004	HELLFIRE	372	48,629			372	48,629
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM						
005	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	605	259,326			605	259,326

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
006	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	1,586	85,988			1,586	85,988
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
008	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	1,938	247,213			1,938	247,213
009	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS	4,014	25,300			4,014	25,300
010	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	57	246,041			57	246,041
011	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM						
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
	MODIFICATIONS						
012	PATRIOT MODS		524,500				524,500
013	JAVELIN MISSILE MODS						
014	ITAS/TOW MODS		137,109				137,109
015	MLRS MODS		1,872				1,872
016	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		16,408				16,408
017	HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
018	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		24,901				24,901
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
019	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		6,442				6,442
020	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)		10				10
021	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		4,118				4,118

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	TOTAL - MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**2,211,460**				**2,211,460**
	PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS & TRACKED COMBAT						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD						
002	BRADLEY PROGRAM	21	171,989			21	171,989
003	BRADLEY TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)		4,386				4,386
004	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES						
005	STRYKER VEHICLE	119	1,174,947			119	1,174,947
006	FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS: (FCS)	6	128,419			6	128,419
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		26,164				26,164
008	FCS SPIN OUTS		161,879				161,879
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		14,788				14,788
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
010	CARRIER, MOD						
011	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	6	33,426			6	33,426
012	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		311,925				311,925
013	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		28,913				28,913
014	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	39	132,701			39	132,701
015	ARMORED BREACHER VEHICLE	11	34,713			11	34,713
016	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)						
017	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	11	40,464			11	40,464

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
018	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		341,569				341,569
019	SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2						
020	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	29	351,179			29	351,179
021	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)						
022	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		7,136				7,136
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
023	HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119	90	118,431			90	118,431
024	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM)	5,900	61,334			5,900	61,334
025	MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL	6,167	99,881			6,167	99,881
026	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM)	5,150	22,134			5,150	22,134
027	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM)	785	17,328			785	17,328
028	MORTAR SYSTEMS	165	15,500			165	15,500
029	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE		223				223
030	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	9,342	31,756			9,342	31,756
031	XM110 SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM (SASS)	508	7,407			508	7,407
032	M4 CARBINE	88,964	151,055			88,964	151,055
033	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS)	7,135	9,097			7,135	9,097
034	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS						
035	FUTURE HANDGUN SYSTEM (FHS)	5,000	3,468			5,000	3,468
036	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)	38	113,205			38	113,205
	MODIFICATION OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT						
037	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS		7,654				7,654

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
038	M4 CARBINE MODS		16,796				16,796
039	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS						
040	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		7,088				7,088
041	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		21,128				21,128
042	PHALANX MODS						
043	M119 MODIFICATIONS		964				964
044	M16 RIFLE MODS		1,181				1,181
045	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M		3,763				3,763
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
046	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		2,187				2,187
047	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		6,545				6,545
048	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		3,104				3,104
049	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		1,250		2,200		3,450
	Additional small arms – Army UFR				[2,200]		
050	REF SMALL ARMS						
051	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF WTCV, ARMY		**3,687,077**		**2,200**		**3,689,277**

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	AMMUNITION						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION						
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		197,130				197,130
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		59,181				59,181
003	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		6,276				6,276
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		183,813				183,813
005	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES						
006	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		14,742				14,742
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		79,066				79,066
008	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		293,322				293,322
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
009	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		17,055				17,055
010	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		58,521				58,521
011	CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES		117,601				117,601
	TANK AMMUNITION						
012	CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES		15,829				15,829
013	CTG, TANK, 120MM, ALL TYPES		151,015				151,015
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
014	CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES		2,741				2,741
015	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES		42,153				42,153
016	CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES		85,030				85,030

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
017	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982		34,220				34,220
018	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL		43,338				43,338
	ARTILLERY FUZES						
019	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES		19,969				19,969
	MINES						
020	MINES, ALL TYPES		4,846				4,846
021	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES		2,606				2,606
022	ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES		52,000				52,000
	ROCKETS						
023	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		28,020				28,020
024	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		142,521				142,521
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		28,886				28,886
026	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		71,608		7,000		78,608
	Program increase (Grenades all types)				[7,000]		
027	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		89,357				89,357
028	CARTRIDGE, IMPULSE, BBU-35/B						
029	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		20,027				20,027
030	SIMULATOR, HOSTILE FIRE, XM34						
031	SIMULATOR, TARGET HIT, XM35 (WHITE STAR)						
032	FLARE, AIRCRAFT, COUNTERMEASURE, XM216						
033	ALL OTHER (AMMO)						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	MISCELLANEOUS						
034	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		15,228				15,228
035	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		21,193				21,193
036	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		2,806				2,806
037	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,996				6,996
038	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		10,598				10,598
039	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		12,564				12,564
040	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		100				100
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
041	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		187,388		21,000		208,388
	Radford AAP upgrades				[20,000]		
	Bomb line modernization				[1,000]		
042	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		5,085				5,085
043	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES		5,619				5,619
044	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL		144,327				144,327
045	ARMS INITIATIVE		3,014				3,014
	RE-ESTIMATE OF GUARANTEED LOAN						
046	RE-ESTIMATE OF GUAR LOAN						
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**2,275,791**		**28,000**		**2,303,791**

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		88,428				88,428
002	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:		62,345				62,345
003	SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS		47,476				47,476
004	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)		946,734				946,734
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)		944,687		80,700		1,025,387
	Additional palletized loading systems - Army UFR				[80,700]		
006	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING		19,378				19,378
007	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		923,348		43,100		966,448
	Additional heavy equipment transporter system (HETS) – Army UFR				[43,100]		
008	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	202	195,385			202	195,385
009	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY		182,367				182,367
010	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916		14,870				14,870
011	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV		213,341				213,341
012	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM						
013	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		32,219				32,219
014	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)		511				511
015	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL	3	218			3	218

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
016	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	3	595			3	595
017	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	8	280			8	280
018	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		3,380				3,380
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMM-JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
019	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM						
020	JOINT COMBAT IDENTIFICATION MARKING SYSTEM		12,910				12,910
021	WIN-T - GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK		287,605		-42,000		245,605
	Area Common User System modernization program reduction				[-42,000]		
022	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		4,114				4,114
	COMM-SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
023	SECOMP-I						
024	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM		88,286				88,286
025	SHF TERM		298		15,000		15,298
	Super high frequency terminals – Army UFR				[15,000]		
026	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)		807				807
027	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)		92,311		16,500		108,811
	Additional defense advanced GPS receivers – Army UFR				[16,500]		
028	SMART-T (SPACE)		85,286				85,286

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
029	SCAMP (SPACE)		993				993
030	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS		35,385				35,385
031	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		6,075		4,000		10,075
	Tactical satellite equipment upgrades – Army UFR				[4,000]		
	COMM-C3 SYSTEM						
032	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		33,513		-4,722		28,791
	Net-enabled command capability program reduction				[-4,722]		
	COMM-COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS						
033	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (EPLRS)		36,077				36,077
034	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		8,570				8,570
035	SINCGARS FAMILY		84,888				84,888
036	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS - OPA2		4,073				4,073
037	MULTI-PURPOSE INFORMATIONS OPERATIONS		7,801				7,801
038	BRIDGE TO FUTURE NETWORKS						
039	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING		7,828				7,828
040	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT	125	18,000			125	18,000
041	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		7,545				7,545
042	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)		16,155				16,155
043	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY		48,436		22,800		71,236
	Commercial, off-the-shelf tactical radios equipment – Army UFR				[22,800]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
044	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)		38,281		1,400		39,681
	Medical communication & combat casualty care equipment – Army UFR				[1,400]		
	COMM-INTELLIGENCE COMMUNICATIONS						
045	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,500				1,500
	INFORMATION SECURITY						
046	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)		34,774				34,774
047	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP		76,570				76,570
	COMM-LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
048	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		9,167				9,167
049	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		35,120				35,120
050	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)						
051	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		28,736				28,736
	COMM-BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
052	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		278,999				278,999
053	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		6,726				6,726
054	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD		231,336		3,000		234,336
	Information technology upgrades				[3,000]		
055	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM		33,317				33,317
	ELECT EQUIP-NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)						
56	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)		[ ]				[ ]
57	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)		[ ]				[ ]

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
058	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (MIP)		58,333				58,333
059	JTT/CIBS-M (MIP)		11,377				11,377
060	PROPHET GROUND (MIP)		114,085				114,085
061	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYS (TUAS)MIP		316,598				316,598
062	SMALL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (SUAS)		30,023				30,023
063	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (MIP)		26,802				26,802
064	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP)						
065	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (MIP)						
066	DCGS-A (MIP)		177,973				177,973
067	TROJAN (MIP)		10,409				10,409
068	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)		2,423				2,423
069	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)		37,632				37,632
070	SEQUOYAH FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM		6,358				6,358
071	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP)		27,731				27,731
	ELECT EQUIP-ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
072	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR		46,397				46,397
073	WARLOCK	38				38	
074	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY		993		25,000		25,993
	Triton III				[25,000]		
075	CI MODERNIZATION (MIP)		1,297				1,297

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	ELECT EQUIP-TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
076	SENTINEL MODS		33,142				33,142
077	NIGHT VISION DEVICES		465,592		28,800		494,392
	Additional night vision devices - Army UFR				[28,800]		
078	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE	41	210,766			41	210,766
079	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT		416,866		52,500		469,366
	Additional driver vision enhancement systems – Army UFR				[52,500]		
080	RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS		3,440				3,440
081	COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR (C-RAM)						
082	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP		447				447
083	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS)						
084	ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE		2,579				2,579
085	PROFILER	8	12,517			8	12,517
086	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		16,342				16,342
087	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)		231,651				231,651
088	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER		150,094				150,094
089	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32		2,269				2,269
090	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		21,037				21,037
091	COUNTERFIRE RADARS		107,061				107,061
092	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - MIP						
093	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM		1,987				1,987

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	ELECT EQUIP-TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
094	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS		196,245				196,245
095	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY		53,908				53,908
096	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT		36,829				36,829
097	FAAD C2		7,489				7,489
098	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS		57,674				57,674
099	KNIGHT FAMILY		100,709				100,709
100	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		2,101		5,900		8,001
	Life cycle software support – Army UFR				[5,900]		
101	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY		83,530		5,900		89,430
	Additional automatic identification equipment – Army UFR				[5,900]		
102	TC AIMS II		31,879		5,900		37,779
	Additional transportation coordinator's automated information for movement system equipment (TC AIMS) - Army UFR				[5,900]		
103	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS)		11,059				11,059
104	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER		4,809				4,809
105	DATA PRODUCTS		30,077				30,077
106	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		123,009				123,009
107	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)		67,960		300		68,260
	Additional logistics automation systems – Army UFR				[300]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
108	MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE		25,869				25,869
	ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION						
109	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM		30,137				30,137
110	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		13,481				13,481
111	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		105,343				105,343
112	CSS COMMUNICATIONS		36,744		5,900		42,644
	Combat service support communications equipment – Army UFR				[5,900]		
113	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		42,462				42,462
	ELECT EQUIP-AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)						
114	AFRTS						
115	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)		6,677				6,677
116	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)		12,613				12,613
	ELECT EQUIP-MODS TACTICAL SYS/EQ						
117	WEAPONIZATION OF UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM		15,124				15,124
	ELECT EQUIP-SUPPORT						
118	ITEMS UNDER $5M (SSE)		6,517				6,517
119	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		514				514
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
120	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	35	1,085			35	1,085
121	MASK, ACFT						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
122	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION		58,426				58,426
123	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)		16,814				16,814
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
124	TACTICAL BRIDGING	19	93,930			19	93,930
125	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON		147,270				147,270
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
126	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-		46,007				46,007
127	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM		46,783		6,000		52,783
	Fido explosives detector				[6,000]		
128	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD		58,437				58,437
129	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT		3,192				3,192
130	AERIAL DETECTION		12,773				12,773
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
131	HEATERS AND ECU'S		12,996				12,996
132	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES		7,002				7,002
133	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		9,898				9,898
134	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)						
135	LAND WARRIOR				102,000		102,000
	Program increase				[102,000]		
136	FORCE PROVIDER						
137	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		70,847		5,400		76,247
	Additional field feeding systems – Army UFR				[5,400]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
138	PARACHUTE & AERIAL DEL SYS		63,420				63,420
139	MOBILE INTEGRATED REMAINS COLLECTION		17,803				17,803
140	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)		32,602				32,602
141	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CSS EQ)						
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
142	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		1,285				1,285
143	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		61,545				61,545
	WATER EQUIPMENT						
144	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS		51,164		1,200		52,364
	Additional water purification systems – Army UFR				[1,200]		
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
145	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		62,336		4,300		66,636
	Additional combat medical support equipment – Army UFR				[4,300]		
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
146	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS		57,994				57,994
147	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)		1,329				1,329
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
148	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		37,698		1,000		38,698
	Additional graders – Army UFR				[1,000]		
149	SKID STEER LOADER (SSL) FAMILY OF SYSTEM		19,943		3,000		22,943
	Additional skid steer loaders – Army UFR				[3,000]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
150	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING				1,000		1,000
	Additional scrapers – Army UFR				[1,000]		
151	DISTR, WATER, SP MIN 2500G SEC/NON-SEC		6,555		1,000		7,555
	Additional water distributors – Army UFR				[1,000]		
152	MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING		31,525		1,000		32,525
	Additional engineer mission module water distributors – Army UFR				[1,000]		
153	LOADERS		27,988		2,000		29,988
	Additional loaders – Army UFR				[2,000]		
154	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR		9,565				9,565
155	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED		33,727		2,000		35,727
	Additional tractors – Army UFR				[2,000]		
156	CRANES				1,000		1,000
	Additional cranes – Army UFR				[1,000]		
157	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING		7,906				7,906
158	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) FOS		54,508		8,000		62,508
	Additional high mobility engineer excavators - Army UFR				[8,000]		
159	CONST EQUIP ESP		44,703		1,000		45,703
	Additional construction equipment - Army UFR				[1,000]		
160	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)		17,030		4,000		21,030
	Additional equipment – Army UFR				[4,000]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT						
161	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	1	168,846			1	168,846
162	HARBORMASTER COMMAND AND CONTROL CENTER		17,615				17,615
163	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS						
164	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		7,803				7,803
	GENERATORS						
165	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		217,749		44,600		262,349
	Additional tactical electric generators – Army UFR				[44,600]		
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
166	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)		45,000				45,000
167	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM		48,981				48,981
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
168	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT		16,508				16,508
169	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		218,614		32,900		251,514
	Combat Arms Training System				[6,000]		
	Immersive group simulation				[6,000]		
	Joint fires and effects trainer				[5,000]		
	Laser collective combat training				[8,000]		
	Urban training center instrumentation				[2,900]		
	Operator driving simulators				[5,000]		
170	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER		60,676				60,676

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
171	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER		23,106				
	(AVCAT)						23,106
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)						
172	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT		9,689				9,689
173	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)		46,296				46,296
174	GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIPMENT		22,377				22,377
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
175	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		20,190				20,190
176	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		104,774				104,774
177	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT		4,123				4,123
178	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)		45,741				45,741
179	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		3,107				3,107
180	BUILDING, PRE-FAB, RELOCATABLE						
181	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		24,201				24,201
182	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3		10,826		2,400		13,226
	Additional spares – Army UFR				[2,400]		
183	MA8975		2,624				2,624
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	OPA2						
184	INITIAL SPARES - C&E		36,334				36,334
	OPA3						
185	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,636				2,636
	TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**11,367,926**		**493,778**		**11,861,704**
	JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK						
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT						
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		196,300		-196,300		
	Transfer to Title XV and Title XVI				[-196,300]		
	FORCE TRAINING						
003	TRAIN THE FORCE						
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
004	OPERATIONS		300,000		-300,000		
	Transfer to Title XV and Title XVI				[-300,000]		
	TOTAL - JOINT IED DEFEAT FUND		**496,300**		**-496,300**		

Stryker Mobile Gun System (sec. 111)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, through the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E), to ensure that the Stryker Mobile Gun System (MGS) is subject to testing to confirm the efficacy of any actions taken to mitigate operational effectiveness, suitability, and survivability deficiencies identified in Initial Operational Test and Evaluation and Live Fire Test and Evaluation. The provision would also require the Secretary of the Army to provide quarterly updates to the congressional defense committees on the status of the corrective measures and expand section 117(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to future fiscal years.

In January 2007, the Army decided to deploy the Stryker MGS with the Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT) that was deploying to Iraq. This was done despite the DOT&E's concern that planned operational and live fire ballistic test and evaluation were not complete and were not yet adequate to support a final assessment of MGS crew and system survivability, operational effectiveness, and operational suitability.

In response to the Army's decision, Public Law 110–181 included a provision prohibiting the obligation or expenditure of funds for the procurement of the Stryker MGS until 30 days after the Secretary of the Army certifies to Congress that the Stryker MGS is operationally effective, suitable, and survivable for its anticipated deployment missions or until the Secretary of Defense waives the limitation on MGS funding by determining that further procurement of the Stryker MGS is in the national security interest of the United States.

In February 2008, DOT&E provided a report to Congress on the results of the operational and live fire ballistic test and evaluation events. The report confirmed the January 2007 concerns of DOT&E's early fielding report and concluded that the Stryker MGS continues to have problems associated with its survivability, operational effectiveness, and operational suitability. More specifically, the February 2008 report cited mission equipment package failures, 'fightability' shortfalls, and, even more troubling, unique survivability shortfalls that place MGS crews at greater risk than crews in other Stryker variants.

The committee remains troubled by the Army's decision to deploy low-rate initial production models to Iraq, and believes that no more Stryker MGS's should be deployed until the Army takes the actions necessary to make the Stryker MGS operationally effective, suitable, and survivable. For this reason, the provision recommended by the committee would extend the limitation in section 117(a) on the procurement of additional Stryker MGS units until appropriate action is taken.

Procurement of small arms (sec. 112)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit, within 90 days of enactment of this act, a report on the small arms Capabilities Based Assessment conducted by the Army's Training and Doctrine Command. This assessment is overdue. The Army had indicated to the committee

that it would complete the small arms Capabilities Based Assessment by August 2007 and failed to do so. Accordingly, the committee recommends withholding authority to obligate more than 75 percent of the aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2009 and available for the Guardrail Common Sensor until the report has been delivered.

In the event that the Capabilities Based Assessment identifies gaps in current small arms capability that require a new individual weapon, the committee recommends that the acquisition of such weapons should result from a full and open competition. The committee further recommends that the Secretary of Defense submit a report on the feasibility and advisability of conducting a full and open competition for carbine-type rifles.

Budget Items—Army

Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list

The Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list for fiscal year 2009 addresses Army National Guard equipment shortfalls required to accomplish its dual responsibilities—to the States for crisis response and homeland security and to the nation for the defense of the United States and its interests. The items requested such as communications equipment, vehicles, driver vision enhancement equipment, night vision goggles, and water purification equipment will significantly enhance the Guard's ability to respond to contingencies at home.

The committee welcomes this clear and substantial commitment on the part of the Army to restore and improve the homeland defense capabilities and readiness of the National Guard. Accordingly, the committee recommends a total increase in Army procurement of $391.2 million for dual-purpose equipment in support of National Guard readiness.

The specific account increases are as follows—the committee recommends an increase of $369.5 million in Other Procurement, Army, which includes: $28.8 million for additional night vision devices; $15.0 million for super high frequency terminals; $4.0 million for tactical satellite equipment upgrades; $5.9 million for life cycle software support; $5.9 million for additional automatic identification systems; $5.9 million for additional transportation coordinator's automated information for movement system equipment; $5.9 million for combat service support communications equipment; $1.2 million for additional water purification systems; $22.8 million for commercial off-the-shelf tactical radio equipment; $52.5 million for additional driver vision enhancement systems; $5.4 million for additional field feeding systems; $43.1 million for additional heavy equipment transporter systems; $300,000 for additional logistics automation systems; $1.4 million for medical communication and combat casualty care equipment; $4.3 million for additional combat medical support equipment; $16.5 million for additional defense advanced Global Positioning System receivers; $2.4 million for additional spares; $1.0 million for additional graders; $3.0 million for additional skid steer loaders; $1.0 million for additional scrapers; $1.0 million for additional water distributors; $1.0 million for additional engineer mission module water distributors; $2.0 million for

additional loaders; $2.0 million for additional tractors; $1.0 million for additional cranes; $8.0 million for additional high mobility engineer excavators; $1.0 million for construction equipment; $80.7 million for additional palletized loading systems; and $44.6 million for additional tactical electric generators.

The committee also recommends an increase of $19.6 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army, which includes: $11.3 million for additional avionics navigation equipment; $249,000 for avionics support equipment; $2.4 million for aircrew integrated systems; $5.5 million for air traffic control equipment; $116,000 for additional avionics and airborne instrumentation equipment; and $2,000 for high frequency radio equipment.

In addition, the committee recommends an increase of $2.2 million in weapons and tracked combat vehicles for additional small arms.

Each of the committee's recommended increases is reflected in title I of the Army procurement tables.

Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter

The budget request included $358.8 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) for the Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter (ARH). The committee appreciates the operational necessity of replacing the aging OH–58D Kiowa Warrior and replacing combat losses from the force structure. The committee has in the past supported the Army's efforts to get the ARH program on track. However, the committee believes that the Army is pursuing an overly ambitious ARH development and fielding program, given performance problems by the contractor. Decisions regarding the acquisition approach and schedule for the ARH program have been delayed by at least half a year, with no change in the procurement program. The committee also notes that the Defense Acquisition Board will meet in July 2008 to consider another restructuring of this program. Such an ambitious program exposes the Army to significant cost, performance, and schedule risk, and may not result in fielding this capability to the warfighter any sooner.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $75.0 million in APA for procurement of ARH.

Forward-looking infrared radar systems

The budget request included $10.9 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army for utility helicopter modifications. This funding will procure and field a number of safety modifications for the UH–60 Blackhawk helicopter. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for the procurement of additional forward-looking infrared radar systems for the UH–60 Blackhawk helicopters.

Grenades Army

The budget request included $71.6 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA) for grenades. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PAA for the procurement of additional grenades.

Radford Ammunition Plant upgrades

The budget request included $187.4 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA) for the provision of industrial facilities. The committee is encouraged by the Army's commitment to its ammunition plants and supports plans to accelerate repair or modernization of these facilities to improve efficiency, safety, and reduce environmental risk. The committee is particularly concerned about modernization at Radford Army Ammunition Plant. Radford is the sole North American provider for many of the propellants and explosives used in munitions. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PAA for production, safety, and environmental upgrades at Radford Army Ammunition Plant.

Bomb line modernization

The budget request included $187.4 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA) for the provision of industrial facilities, but provided no funds for bomb line modernization at the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, Oklahoma. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PAA for bomb line modernization.

Area Common User System Modernization

The budget request included $85.3 million in Other Procurement, Army for the Warfighter Information Network—Tactical (WIN–T) Area Common User System Modernization (ACUS–Mod) program. This program is intended to provide ongoing and planned modifications, upgrades, and recapitalization of the Mobile Subscriber Equipment (MSE) and Tri-Service Tactical (TRI–TAC) communications systems.

According to the Army, there are currently 19 units with MSE and TRI–TAC equipment and each of these units is currently developing a disposition and turn-in plan for their equipment. However, some limited equipment purchases are required to support the single shelter switch, battlefield video teleconference, secure tactical fax, and tropo-scatter radio systems currently deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Given the rapidly declining number of units using the equipment provided by the ACUS–Mod program, the committee recommends a decrease of $42.0 million, leaving more than 50 percent of the funding for the limited equipment purchases needed to support deployed equipment.

Army Global Command and Control System

The budget request included $33.5 million in Other Procurement, Army for the Army Global Command and Control System (GCCS) program. The committee recommends a reduction of $4.7 million. Given constrained resources and the current fielding schedule for GCCS—Army, the committee believes procurement of Net-Enabled Command Capability equipment is not required at this time. Additional concerns about the GCCS—Army program are discussed in title II of this Act.

Information Technology Upgrades

The budget request included $231.3 million in Other Procurement, Army for the Installation Information Infrastructure Modernization program (I3MP). The committee notes that high bandwidth connectivity provides military users with enhanced capabilities for data, voice, and video communications. These capabilities enable military organizations to better support deployed forces and other Department of Defense activities. The committee recommends an additional $3.0 million for hardware enhancements to the Defense Information System Network, especially to increase network geographic diversity and alternative data pathways.

Fido explosives detector

The budget request included $46.8 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for ground standoff mine detection systems, but provided no funds for the Fido explosives detector. The Fido explosives detector is deployed and in use by units in Iraq to counter improvised explosive devices and land mines. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in OPA for additional Fido explosives detectors.

Land Warrior

The budget request did not include any funds in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Land Warrior system. The committee remains concerned that the Army has terminated this program despite significant investment, its promising test results, and its performance in combat.

Last year the Department of Defense Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) assessed Land Warrior during tests with the 4th Battalion, 9th Infantry, a Stryker unit preparing to deploy to Iraq. The Director, in a carefully worded report to this committee, determined that the system was "on track" to be operationally effective and suitable, even though it had not completed its Initial Operational Test. DOT&E also indicated that the system's test items could deploy to Iraq with the 4th Battalion, 9th Infantry, the Army approved the plan, and the battalion is using the system effectively today.

In testimony to the committee this year, the Army indicated that it will move forward with the program based on the test results and the feedback from the soldiers of the 4th Battalion, 9th Infantry. Additionally, the Army included in its fiscal year 2008 supplemental appropriation request sufficient funding to outfit a brigade combat team with Land Warrior equipment.

The committee is encouraged by the Army's action and recommends accelerating the procurement of the system to include enough equipment to outfit a second brigade combat team preparing to deploy to Iraq or Afghanistan. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $102.0 million in OPA for additional Land Warrior systems.

Combat Arms Training System

The budget request included $218.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for non-system training devices. The Army is upgrading the Combined Arms Training System (CATS). Funds au-

thorized would be used to upgrade 1,900 fielded systems and procure additional simulated weapons. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in OPA for CATS.

Immersive Group Simulation Virtual Training System

The budget request included $218.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for non-system training devices, but provided no funding for the Immersive Group Simulation Virtual Training System (IGS–VTS). The IGS–VTS is a fully immersive, interactive virtual reality platform that supports soldier vehicle training. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in OPA for the IGS–VTS.

Joint Fires and Effects Trainer System

The budget request included $3.1 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Call for Fire Trainer (CFFT), but included no funds for the Joint Fires and Effects Trainer System (JFETS) project. JFETS is a next-generation, virtual reality call for fire training simulation. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in OPA for JFETS.

Laser collective combat advanced training system

The budget request included $218.6 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (PAAF) for non-system training devices, but included no funds for the laser collective combat advanced training system. This is a comprehensive laser-based marksmanship training system and is currently in use by units for urban operations, reflexive fire training, close-quarters marksmanship, and movement to contact drills. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in OPA for the laser collective combat advanced training system.

Urban training center instrumentation

The budget request included $218.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for non-system training devices. The committee notes that the Army's readiness and rotation training strategies call for units to accomplish more of their mission training and rehearsals at their local training areas and facilities. The Army is using several technologies to increase the flexibility and value of local training ranges and facilities including the Deployable Range Package, the Homestation Instrumentation System, and the Integrated Military Operations in Urbanized Terrain Training System. The committee recommends an increase of $2.9 million in OPA for the instrumentation of a regional urban operations training center.

Operator driving simulators

The budget request included $218.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for non-system training devices. Additional driving simulators would allow deploying soldiers to maximize their training time while providing a realistic experience without risk to personnel or equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in OPA for operator driving simulators.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

The budget request included a total of $496.3 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (JIEDDF), of which $306.3 million was for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) attack the network line of operation, $88.3 million was for the JIEDDO train the force line of operation, and $101.7 million was for the JIEDDO staff and infrastructure line of operation.

The committee recommends a transfer of $496.3 million in the JIEDDF to titles XV and XVI of this Act. The committee remains supportive of JIEDDO, but believes that JIEDDO's expenses are war-related and should be accounted for in the appropriate war-related accounts in titles XV and XVI of this Act.

Improvised Explosive Devices (IED) are the weapon of choice for terrorist organizations throughout the world because they provide high profile, lethal attacks that attract attention, provide propaganda, and expose vulnerabilities.

The committee understands the Department of Defense is currently reviewing the JIEDDO mandate to determine how best to leverage JIEDDO's capability to counter a future unknown threat, recognizing that the enemy's current weapon of choice is the IED and that this threat will evolve. The committee welcomes this initiative by the Department and expects that the Department will be able to develop a more clear path forward for JIEDDO in the fiscal year 2010 budget submission.

JIEDDO has been able to stand up quickly an organization capable of responding to the various IED threats that U.S. forces face in Iraq and Afghanistan, but the committee is concerned that JIEDDO's expanding budget, manpower, and associated responsibilities have surpassed the Department's ability to adequately oversee the activities of JIEDDO in a manner that ensures no duplication of effort and the most effective delivery of equipment and capabilities to the warfighter.

The Government Accountability Office and the Defense Science Board have raised similar concerns. If JIEDDO is to continue to implement material solutions across all Department components, the Department must reevaluate JIEDDO's authorities and determine whether JIEDDO should be a permanent organization and where it should be subordinated.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
001	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)		3,401				3,401
002	EA-18G	22	1,604,800			22	1,604,800
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		46,831				46,831
004	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	23	1,868,688			23	1,868,688
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		42,616				42,616
006	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER	8	1,602,084			8	1,602,084
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		258,814				258,814
008	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	30	2,133,401			30	2,133,401
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		87,000				87,000
010	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	20	474,141			20	474,141
011	MH-60R	18	470,455			18	470,455
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		79,215				79,215
013	MH-60S (MYP)	31	1,045,004			31	1,045,004
014	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		140,759				140,759
015	MMA ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		110,568				110,568
016	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	3	496,374	-1	-165,500	2	330,874
	Defer one aircraft to reflect radar development delays				[-165,500]		
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		92,749				92,749

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
018	C-40A	2	154,994			2	154,994
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
019	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK						
020	JPATS	44	289,253			44	289,253
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
021	KC-130J	2	119,545			2	119,545
022	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		33,932				33,932
023	F-5						
024	VTUAV	3	55,337			3	55,337
025	OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
026	EA-6 SERIES		33,436				33,436
027	AV-8 SERIES		51,093				51,093
028	ADVERSARY						
029	F-18 SERIES		450,909				450,909
030	H-46 SERIES		34,636				34,636
031	AH-1W SERIES		6,375				6,375
032	H-53 SERIES		56,381		8,000		64,381
	Integrated mechanical diagnostics health & usage management system (IMDS)				[8,000]		
033	SH-60 SERIES		72,493				72,493

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
034	H-1 SERIES		8,901				8,901
035	EP-3 SERIES		72,370				72,370
036	P-3 SERIES		297,896		160,000		457,896
	Critical P-3 life sustainment improvements				[160,000]		
037	S-3 SERIES						
038	E-2 SERIES		11,489				11,489
039	TRAINER A/C SERIES		26,160				26,160
040	C-2A		22,120				22,120
041	C-130 SERIES		6,468				6,468
042	FEWSG		671				671
043	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		17,952				17,952
044	E-6 SERIES		88,894				88,894
045	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		31,819				31,819
046	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		14,113				14,113
047	T-45 SERIES		67,666				67,666
048	POWER PLANT CHANGES		28,219				28,219
049	JPATS SERIES		8,892				8,892
050	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		7,190				7,190
051	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		66,425		10,000		76,425
	AN/AAR-47 hostile fire improvements				[10,000]		
052	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		148,940				148,940

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
053	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		10,786				10,786
054	ID SYSTEMS		12,032				12,032
055	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		41,473				41,473
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
056	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,229,135				1,229,135
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
057	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		442,390				442,390
058	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		11,068				11,068
059	WAR CONSUMABLES		62,256				62,256
060	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		27,870				27,870
061	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		36,539				36,539
062	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,756				1,756
063	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**14,716,774**		**12,500**		**14,729,274**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
001	TRIDENT II MODS	24	1,093,168			24	1,093,168
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
002	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,496				3,496

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
003	TOMAHAWK	207	281,096			207	281,096
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
004	AMRAAM	147	146,830			147	146,830
005	SIDEWINDER	205	57,497			205	57,497
006	JSOW	496	149,144			496	149,144
007	SLAM-ER						
008	STANDARD MISSILE	70	227,958			70	227,958
009	RAM	90	74,287			90	74,287
010	HELLFIRE	1,068	95,358			1,068	95,358
011	AERIAL TARGETS		83,313				83,313
012	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		9,478				9,478
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
013	ESSM	86	85,061			86	85,061
014	HARM MODS		42,735				42,735
015	STANDARD MISSILES MODS		77,360				77,360
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
016	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,266		30,000		33,266
	Accelerate facility restoration program				[30,000]		
017	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON		479,680				479,680
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		27,776				27,776

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
019	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		43,708				43,708
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.						
020	SSTD						
021	ASW TARGETS		8,929				8,929
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
022	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	120	77,782			120	77,782
023	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS		61,545				61,545
024	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		3,506				3,506
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
025	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		36,002				36,002
026	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		9,872				9,872
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
027	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,442				3,442
	OTHER WEAPONS						
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
028	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		13,619				13,619
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
029	CIWS MODS		167,967				167,967
030	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		21,082				21,082
031	GUN MOUNT MODS		60,061				60,061

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
032	LCS MODULE WEAPONS		2,786				2,786
033	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS		45,168				45,168
034	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		8,618				8,618
	OTHER						
035	MARINE CORPS TACTIAL UNMANNED AERIAL		20,532				20,532
036	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
037	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		53,360				53,360
	TOTAL - WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**3,575,482**		**30,000**		**3,605,482**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE						
	PROC AMMO, NAVY						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		168,437				168,437
002	JDAM	169	9,306			169	9,306
003	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		32,250				32,250
004	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		18,916				18,916
005	PRACTICE BOMBS		39,419				39,419
006	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		46,644				46,644
007	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS						
008	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		79,805				79,805

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
009	JATOS		3,178				3,178
010	MK 258 MOD 1		967				967
011	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		20,959				20,959
012	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		15,780				15,780
013	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		35,111				35,111
014	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		45,129				45,129
015	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		10,464				10,464
016	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,207				3,207
	PROC AMMO, MC						
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
017	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		108,436				108,436
018	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES						
019	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES						
020	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		17,677				17,677
021	.50 CALIBER						
022	40 MM, ALL TYPES		60,433				60,433
023	60MM, ALL TYPES		44,846				44,846
024	81MM, ALL TYPES		54,879				54,879
025	120MM, ALL TYPES		87,500				87,500
026	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		2,300				2,300
027	9 MM ALL TYPES						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
028	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		39,038		9,000		48,038
	Program increase (Grenades all types)				[9,000]		
029	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		26,087				26,087
030	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		117,213				117,213
031	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE						
032	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		18,974				18,974
033	FUZE, ALL TYPES		3,460				3,460
034	NON LETHALS		2,158				2,158
035	AMMO MODERNIZATION		5,644				5,644
036	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,495				4,495
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		**1,122,712**		**9,000**		**1,131,712**
	SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY						
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
001	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM		2,712,251				2,712,251
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		1,214,188				1,214,188
003	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	1	2,107,040			1	2,107,040
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		1,316,548		79,000		1,395,548
	Additional funds to smooth ramp up to 2 boats per year				[79,000]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
005	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	1	606,561			1	606,561
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		21,389				21,389
007	SSN ERO						
008	SSBN ERO	1	221,823			1	221,823
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		39,363				39,363
010	DDG 1000	1	2,502,803			1	2,502,803
011	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		50,980				50,980
012	DDG-51						
013	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	2	920,000		-123,000	2	797,000
	Fully fund two ships to cost cap in FY 09, reflecting government furnished material (GFM) from cancelled ships				[-123,000]		
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
014	LPD-17		103,216		-103,216		
	Transfer to SCN 15				[-103,216]		
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				273,216		273,216
	Transfer from SCN 14				[103,216]		
	Advance procurement for additional ship in FY 10				[170,000]		
016	LHA REPLACEMENT				178,300		178,300
	Transfer from National Defense Sealift Fund				[348,300]		
	Reflect delays in LHA (R) program				[-170,000]		
017	INTRATHEATER CONNECTOR	1	174,782			1	174,782

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM						
018	SPECIAL PURPOSE						
019	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS						
020	OUTFITTING		429,587				429,587
021	SERVICE CRAFT		36,317				36,317
022	LCAC SLEP	6	110,918			6	110,918
023	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		165,152				165,152
	TOTAL - SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY		**12,732,918**		**304,300**		**13,037,218**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
001	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE		7,973				7,973
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		9,405				9,405
003	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT		38,800				38,800
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
004	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		47,549				47,549
	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
005	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
	PERISCOPES						
006	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP		69,078				69,078

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
007	DDG MOD		165,496		25,000		190,496
	Planning, engineering & procurement for service life extension alterations				[25,000]		
008	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		8,293				8,293
009	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		6,345				6,345
010	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		27,923				27,923
011	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		22,686				22,686
012	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		199,904				199,904
013	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		41,132				41,132
014	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		9,953				9,953
015	DSSP EQUIPMENT		5,733				5,733
016	CG MODERNIZATION		232,370				232,370
017	LCAC		174				174
018	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT		11,991				11,991
019	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		136,156				136,156
020	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS		6,598				6,598
021	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM		15,212				15,212
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT						
022	REACTOR POWER UNITS						
023	REACTOR COMPONENTS		236,693				236,693
	OCEAN ENGINEERING						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
024	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		6,549				6,549
	SMALL BOATS						
025	STANDARD BOATS		17,839				17,839
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
026	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		5,689				5,689
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT						
027	OPERATING FORCES IPE		51,631				51,631
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
028	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		70,694				70,694
029	LCS MODULES		131,241				131,241
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT						
030	LSD MIDLIFE		90,675				90,675
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
031	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP RADARS						
032	RADAR SUPPORT	2	10,503			2	10,503
	SHIP SONARS						
033	SPQ-9B RADAR		9,281				9,281
034	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	3	117,685			3	117,685
035	SSN ACOUSTICS		284,153				284,153
036	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3	15,578			3	15,578

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
037	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		13,858				13,858
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
038	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		20,857				20,857
039	SSTD		10,058				10,058
040	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		44,997				44,997
041	SURTASS		26,675				26,675
042	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER		25,188				25,188
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
043	AN/SLQ-32		29,280				29,280
044	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS						
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
045	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		83,408				83,408
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
046	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		103,597				103,597
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
047	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM						
048	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY		34,561				34,561
049	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT		25,923				25,923
050	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM		31,283				31,283
051	ATDLS		14,206				14,206
052	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		49,024				49,024
053	SHALLOW WATER MCM		7,355				7,355

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
054	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)		10,893				10,893
055	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV		4,178				4,178
056	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		4,106				4,106
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
057	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT		29,791				29,791
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
058	MATCALS		17,409				17,409
059	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		7,944				7,944
060	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM		18,787				18,787
061	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM		29,066				29,066
062	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		8,238				8,238
063	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM		10,799				10,799
064	FACSFAC						
065	ID SYSTEMS		34,560				34,560
066	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)		9,512				9,512
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
067	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT		9,031				9,031
068	TADIX-B		5,309				5,309
069	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE		6,209				6,209
070	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS		67,133				67,133
071	RADIAC		9,840				9,840
072	GPETE		5,521				5,521

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
073	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY		4,558				4,558
074	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		8,384				8,384
075	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		48,930				48,930
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
076	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS		9				9
077	PORTABLE RADIOS		14,352				14,352
078	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		333,335				333,335
079	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M		35,647				35,647
080	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT		3,139				3,139
081	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		76,761				76,761
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
082	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		122,003				122,003
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						
083	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		2,376				2,376
084	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		1,293				1,293
085	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		8,563				8,563
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
086	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		101,153				101,153
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT						
087	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		16,716				16,716
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT						
088	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		16,846				16,846

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
089	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SONOBUOYS						
090	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES		112,603				112,603
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
091	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		64,396				64,396
092	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		8,308				8,308
093	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		12,761				12,761
094	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT		46,362				46,362
095	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		24,742				24,742
096	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		1,603				1,603
097	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		17,673				17,673
098	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		39,363				39,363
099	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		35,117				35,117
100	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,335				13,335
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
101	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM		1,695				1,695
102	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT		8,244				8,244
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
103	HARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
104	NATO SEASPARROW		12,270				12,270
105	RAM GMLS		23,492				23,492
106	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM		46,687				46,687
107	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		85,424				85,424
108	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		61,976				61,976
109	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS		5,644				5,644
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
110	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP		118,814				118,814
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
111	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS		98,010				98,010
112	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,374				5,374
113	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,622				4,622
114	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		9,199				9,199
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
115	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		46,546				46,546
116	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,535				3,535
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE						
117	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM		38,077				38,077
118	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		9,822				9,822
119	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		33,583		3,800		37,383
	Standardize metrics assessment of readiness & training				[3,800]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
120	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		1,966				1,966
121	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		829				829
122	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		12,167				12,167
123	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		16,289				16,289
124	TACTICAL VEHICLES		29,686				29,686
125	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		14,041				14,041
126	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		5,418				5,418
127	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		22,379				22,379
128	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES		1,116				1,116
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
129	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		14,971				14,971
130	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		9,247				9,247
131	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		6,216				6,216
132	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		74,103				74,103
	PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	TRAINING DEVICES						
133	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		16,764				16,764
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
134	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		43,175		4,850		48,025
	Man overboard indicators (MOBI)				[4,850]		
135	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,018				2,018

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
136	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,493				6,493
137	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,646				1,646
138	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		[ ]				[ ]
139	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,116				13,116
140	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		13,510				13,510
141	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		24,244				24,244
142	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		144,863				144,863
143	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		35,600				35,600
144	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
145	SPECIAL PROGRAM		[ ]				[ ]
	PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS						
146	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT						
	OTHER						
147	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
148	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		251,765				251,765
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		18,314				18,314
	TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**5,482,856**		**33,650**		**5,516,506**

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	AAV7A1 PIP		5,441				5,441
002	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE						
003	LAV PIP		64,526				64,526
004	M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS		14,706				14,706
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
005	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		22,102				22,102
006	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER		2,500				2,500
007	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		109,460				109,460
008	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5		24,220				24,220
	WEAPONS						
009	MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM						
	OTHER SUPPORT						
010	MODIFICATION KITS		11,165				11,165
011	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		24,223				24,223
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT						
	GUIDED MISSILES						
012	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		12,569				12,569
013	JAVELIN						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	OTHER SUPPORT						
014	MODIFICATION KITS		4,925				4,925
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS						
015	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		14,883				14,883
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
016	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		35,188				35,188
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
017	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		34,665				34,665
018	MODIFICATION KITS						
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
019	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		9,661				9,661
020	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		77,978				77,978
	RADAR AND EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
021	RADAR SYSTEMS		32,516				32,516
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
022	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,654				2,654
023	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		49,838				49,838
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
024	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		24,868				24,868
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
025	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		106,499				106,499

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
026	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		15,816				15,816
027	RADIO SYSTEMS		95,845				95,845
028	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		40,639				40,639
029	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		15,527				15,527
	SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
030	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		1,201				1,201
031	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		13,691				13,691
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
032	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	7	2,666			7	2,666
033	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS						
034	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT		944				944
035	LIGHTWEIGHT PRIME MOVER						
036	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP		324,578		-25,000		299,578
	Program reduction & realignment				[-25,000]		
037	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		27,619				27,619
038	TRAILERS		8,424				8,424
	OTHER SUPPORT						
039	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,046				4,046
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
040	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		5,131				5,131
041	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		9,571				9,571

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
042	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		19,067				19,067
043	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		16,501				16,501
044	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,239				13,239
045	EOD SYSTEMS		28,568				28,568
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
046	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		12,589				12,589
047	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		11,813				11,813
048	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		30,758				30,758
049	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		5,867				5,867
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
050	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		6,623		7,900		14,523
	Combat casualty care equipment upgrades				[7,900]		
051	TRAINING DEVICES		57,476				57,476
052	CONTAINER FAMILY		4,050				4,050
053	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		22,461				22,461
054	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)		7,987				7,987
055	BRIDGE BOATS						
056	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		2,907				2,907
	OTHER SUPPORT						
057	MODIFICATION KITS						
058	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		8,114				8,114

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
059	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		14,460				14,460
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		**1,512,765**		**-17,100**		**1,495,665**

Authority for advanced procurement and construction of components for the *Virginia*-class submarine program (sec. 131)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the multiyear authority provided in section 121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The provision would modify section 121 to permit the Secretary of the Navy to enter into one or more contracts on the *Virginia*-class submarine program, for which authorization to enter a multiyear procurement contract was granted under section 121, that could include advance construction activities if he determines that such action would yield greater cost savings or construction efficiencies.

The Navy believes that having such an option available could help achieve greater cost savings and production efficiencies as the program increases throughput to a rate of two boats per year in fiscal year 2011.

Refueling and complex overhaul of the USS *Theodore Roosevelt* (sec. 132)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide a one-time exemption to the normal full funding policy to allow for contracting of a 3-year incrementally-funded aircraft carrier refueling complex overhaul (RCOH) from the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) account. This language would provide the Navy with the authority to commence the refueling overhaul in fiscal year 2009. The Navy informs the committee that this would help level the workload at the shipyard and avoid an overhead increase of approximately $50.0 million across the future-years defense program. The Department of Defense has requested that this be a one-time authorization, not one to be extended into future years.

Budget Items

E–2D Advanced Hawkeye

The budget request included $496.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) for three E–2D Advanced Hawkeye aircraft. The E–2D aircraft will provide improved airborne early warning and surveillance capability to support carrier strike groups in naval, joint, and coalition operations. In fiscal year 2008, the administration requested—and the Congress authorized and appropriated—funding for three research and development E–2D aircraft. The committee notes that the E–2D program has experienced several delays in aircraft production over the past year due to development difficulties with the advanced radar. Those delays threaten to postpone the Milestone C decision for low rate initial production, currently scheduled for the end of the second quarter of fiscal year 2009, which would reduce the need for production effort funded by the fiscal year 2009 budget. Accordingly, the committee recommends the Navy decrease their planned procurement of low rate initial production of E–2D aircraft in fiscal year 2009 by one aircraft.

The committee recommends a reduction of $165.5 million in APN for the E–2D Advanced Hawkeye aircraft.

H–53 modifications

The budget request included $56.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) for modifications of H–53 helicopters, of which $2.9 million is for the Integrated Mechanical Diagnostics Health and Usage Management System (IMDS). Since 2001, the Marines have been equipping the fleet of H–53 helicopters with the IMDS. The systems flying have already provided a significant improvement in aircraft readiness rates and ability to maintain the aircraft to support high tempo operations, while simultaneously improving the accuracy of the fleet health and material status reporting. The replacement for the current CH–53, the CH–53K, is years away from achieving initial operational capability, so buying additional IMDS kits would still make a significant contribution to the readiness of the fleet.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for the procurement of additional IMDS systems.

P–3 modifications

The budget request included $152.7 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) for continuation of the Special Structural Inspection-Kits (SSI–K) program, which replaces fatigue-limited airframe structural components to enable the airframe to fully reach its designed service life.

Analysis that was conducted as part of the ongoing fatigue life management program determined that an area of the P–3 wing surface not included in the SSI–K program, designated as Zone 5, has much worse predicted fatigue than previously estimated. These results caused the Navy to ground 39 of 130 mission aircraft in December 2007, and to initiate long-term mitigation efforts to correct the critical deficiencies.

Due to the emergent nature of this P–3 sustainment issue, the budget request does not include funding for Zone 5 kit material and installation. The Chief of Naval Operations has identified the correction of this critical operational and safety of flight issue as the Navy's top unfunded priority. The committee recommends an increase of $160.0 million in APN to fund P–3 wing crack repair kits.

Common ECM equipment

The budget request included $66.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), common electronic countermeasures (ECM) equipment, but included no funds to procure upgrades for the AN/AAR–47 missile warning system to incorporate hostile fire indications capability. This system improvement would provide aircrews with warning of anti-aircraft artillery, rocket-propelled grenade, or small arms fire. This capability would undoubtedly assist Navy and Marine Corps aircrews in avoiding or exiting dangerous environments. The committee believes that the Department of the Navy should be fielding this capability as a priority for aircraft potentially exposed to such situations.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in APN to begin fielding the hostile fire indications capability for the AN/AAR–47 missile warning system.

Weapons industrial facilities

The budget request included $3.3 million for various activities at government-owned, contractor-operated weapons industrial facilities. The committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million to accelerate the facilities restoration program at the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory.

Grenades Marine Corps

The budget request included $39.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC) for grenades. The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PANMC for the procurement of additional grenades.

***Virginia*-class submarine advance procurement**

The budget request included approximately $1.3 billion for advance procurement for the *Virginia*-class submarine program, including $596.8 million for economic order quantity (EOQ) procurement of long lead material in conjunction with the current multiyear procurement program.

Congress approved the Navy's request to enter into a multiyear procurement contract in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), and added $588.0 million to help accelerate increasing the attack submarine program to a rate of two boats per year. At that time, the Navy planned to increase production to a rate of two boats per year in fiscal year 2012.

This year, as a part of the fiscal year 2009 request, the Navy plans to accelerate that production increase to fiscal year 2011. The Navy has also identified that additional EOQ funding in fiscal year 2009 and additional authority to conduct advance construction activities would help achieve greater cost savings and production efficiencies, and reduce the span time for construction as the program increases throughput to a rate of two boats per year in fiscal year 2011.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase for EOQ funding of $79.0 million. The committee also recommends a provision (described elsewhere) that would give the Navy authority to contract for advance construction activities for which authorization to enter a multiyear procurement contract was granted under section 121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Littoral combat ship

The budget request included $920.0 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) for the construction of two Littoral Combat Ships (LCS). The Navy intends this to be a relatively smaller, more affordable vessel that carries modular payloads. The Navy concept is that on one day, an LCS might be configured to operate as an anti-submarine vessel. However, as mission needs change, it could rapidly change the whole mission payload within a day or so, and operate in an anti-surface warfare or mine warfare mode.

Each of the two prime contractor teams had contracts to build two ships. The prime contractors have teamed with smaller shipyards in both cases in order to keep LCS costs lower than would

be possible in one of the major yards that normally build Navy ships.

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

The Navy entered into negotiations with the LCS–1 team to sign up to a fixed price contract on the two ships or face outright cancellation on the second ship. The Navy terminated the contract for LCS–3 for the convenience of the government. As a result of that termination, the government will take delivery of some sizeable inventory of equipment and material for the cancelled LCS–3.

The second contractor team had a contract to build two LCS vessels of another design (LCS–2 and LCS–4). The Navy awarded this contract almost a year later, so LCS–2 was roughly 1 year behind the LCS–1. The Navy went ahead with activities leading to the start of construction on LCS–4, despite internal warnings that the second contractor would face similar cost and schedule problems as those faced by the first contractor. Late last year, the same poor performance and fixed priced negotiation scenario also played out on the LCS–2 and LCS–4. This led the Navy to also cancel the LCS–4, again with the result that the government will take delivery of some sizeable inventory of equipment and material for the cancelled LCS–4.

Section 125 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) places a cost ceiling on LCS contracts of $460.0 million per ship, a dollar value provided by the Navy. Congress also authorized and appropriated one LCS in fiscal year 2008.

The Navy has not awarded the one LCS approved in the fiscal year 2008 budget. The Navy's acquisition strategy, which has been extremely fluid, is to award this ship, plus the two ships from the fiscal year 2009 program later this calendar year. The Navy's intent is that the award be a limited competition, with each yard assured of being awarded at least one ship.

The total funding provided in fiscal year 2007 and prior budgets for the six previously authorized Littoral Combat Ships totals $1,639.0 million. The Navy has determined that $1,162.0 million of these funds is required for construction, test, trials, outfitting, and post-delivery of LCS–1 and LCS–2. The remaining $477.0 million funding is allocated against the terminated ships, LCS–3 and LCS–4, including material purchased for those ships prior to termination. Within the remaining funding allocated against the terminated ships, sufficient funding should also be available for LCS class design to ensure that the follow-on ships commence production with "clean," producible drawings and planning products. Presuming the Navy maintains stable design requirements, the availability of clean drawings and planning products should ensure healthy learning curve performance in production. This learning curve performance, in conjunction with material purchased in prior

years (from the terminated ships), should more than offset the effects of one year's escalation for ships purchased in 2009.

The fiscal year 2008 budget has resources sufficient to award one LCS within the cost cap to either shipyard, when taking into account the inventory of equipment and material available from that shipyard's cancelled ship. The Navy would provide this equipment and material to the shipyard that wins the fiscal year 2008 ship as government furnished material (GFM). The value of this GFM would count against the cost cap.

Under their plan, the Navy would also award at least one of the two ships in the fiscal year 2009 budget to the other shipyard. The Navy would likewise provide the GFM from that shipyard's cancelled ship to offset the cost of that one ship. Similarly, the value of this GFM would count against the cost cap on this ship as well.

The fiscal year 2009 budget request, however, would fund both ships to the full cost cap and not take the value of this GFM for the second cancelled ship into account. This means that the budget request of $920.0 million includes more funding than can be placed on contract without violating the cost cap, unless the Navy were to withhold the GFM for the second shipyard.

The committee believes that the Navy should apply the GFM to both contractors' vessels as soon as a second ship is purchased from either yard. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $123.0 million to take that GFM into account. This will leave sufficient funds in the Navy's hands to award two ships in fiscal year 2009, with both ships fully funded to the congressional cost cap of $460.0 million.

LPD–17 amphibious transport dock

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 included $103.2 million to provide for LPD–17 program close out costs, but included no funding for the tenth ship of the USS San Antonio (LPD–17) class amphibious ship program, LPD–26.

The Navy's 2008 report to Congress on the long-range plan for construction of naval vessels calls for assuming additional risk in the expeditionary warfare force, by reducing expeditionary force size, including reducing the LPD–17 class from a total of 12 to nine ships. The Navy would instead extend the service of some existing vessels as an interim measure, with no real long-term plan to solve the problem.

The committee is concerned that this plan does not provide the total number of amphibious ships needed to support the Department of the Navy's two Marine Expeditionary Brigade lift requirements for forcible entry operations. In testimony before Congress in fiscal years 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008, Marine Corps leadership stated that a class of no less than 10 LPD–17 ships was required to meet Marine Corps forcible entry requirements, with acceptable risk. The Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have both identified procurement of LPD–26 in 2009 as a top unfunded priority for both services.

The committee is aware that construction for LPD–26 would have commenced in fiscal year 2009 under the previous schedule. However, with delays in other shipbuilding programs within the contractor's facilities, and with the fact that the contractor has re-

cently had to subcontract significant work on earlier LPD–17s with other vendors, it should be possible to procure LPD–26 in fiscal year 2010 without incurring significant cost growth or jeopardizing industrial base stability.

Therefore, the committee recommends: (1) an increase of $170.0 million for advance procurement; and (2) a transfer of the $103.2 million from program close out costs to advance procurement. In total, including funding provided in fiscal year 2008, the committee recommends $323.2 million for advance procurement for LPD–26.

LHA(R) advance procurement

The fiscal year 2009 budget request for the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF) included $348.3 million for advance procurement for the first Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future) (MPF(F)), based on the design of amphibious assault replacement ships. These vessels are designated as the MPF(F) LHA(R).

The committee does not agree with funding development and procurement for amphibious assault ships within the NDSF and has included a provision (described elsewhere) that would clarify what programs will be included in the NDSF.

The Navy and the contractor have recently informed the committee that there will be significant schedule delays and cost increases for the LHD–8 amphibious assault ship. These problems, and the continuing struggles to regain and retain staffing and achieve productivity levels experienced before the Hurricane Katrina disaster, do not bode well for making expected progress on the LHA–6 amphibious assault ship, the next large amphibious ship to be built by the contractor. LHA–6 is intended to be the basis for the design of the MPF(F) LHA(R).

Based on all these factors, the committee does not believe that the Navy can or should apply all of the requested advance procurement funds in the MPF(F) LHA(R) in fiscal year 2009. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $170.0 million for MPF(F) LHA (R) advance procurement.

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

The budget request included $165.5 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for the DDG–51 modernization program. This program upgrades the 62 ships of the DDG–51 class with key technologies to provide improved warfighting capability while reducing operating and support cost. This is planned to be a 20-year modernization program that will cost roughly $10.0 billion.

The Secretary of the Navy's fiscal year 2008 report to Congress on the long-range plan for construction of naval vessels identified the requirement to extend the service life of the DDG–51 class to 40 years in order to meet surface combatant force structure requirements. However, additional planning and funding to accomplish this extended service life is not included in the budget request.

The committee views the Navy's plan to operate the DDG–51 class for a full 40 years to be very high risk, based on recent history of 20–25 year service life for surface combatants. Additional fiscal year 2009 DDG–51 modernization procurement funding

would support critical planning, engineering, and procurement activities for service life extension alterations. The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in OPN for the DDG–51 modernization program.

The 2008 Navy report to Congress on DDG modernization indicated that the Navy staff had reviewed a concept that would achieve favorable results for each of the program attributes outlined in the report. The Navy report identified using the multi-ship, multi-option (MSMO) contracts as the preferred approach for conducting the DDG modernization. The MSMO contracts are contracts for maintenance efforts on Navy ships that are conducted in the ships' homeport area.

It is not apparent to the committee that the Navy seriously evaluated conducting the modernization program at the shipyards where the DDG–51s were built, or a so-called "building yard" approach. Further, upon reviewing the Navy's basis for determining that MSMO contracts would be more suitable for executing the DDG modernization program, the committee cannot find that the Navy has established measures of effectiveness and appropriate cost control mechanisms to maximize the benefits promised by MSMO contract maintenance strategies.

The magnitude of this investment, coupled with the critical need for this modernization effort, warrants a more thorough assessment of the considerations leading to the Navy's selection of an acquisition strategy.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a DDG–51 modernization acquisition strategy report to the congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2010 budget request. The report should include a plan to execute a pilot project that would accomplish the full scope of DDG–51 hull, mechanical and electrical, and combat system maintenance and modernization in a single availability executed at one of the building yards. Such plan shall include a detailed quantitative and qualitative assessment of each of the acquisition strategy and availability execution considerations addressed by the Navy's 2008 report on DDG modernization. The report shall also provide a quantitative and qualitative comparison of this building yard plan with the Navy's plan to execute DDG modernization within a MSMO contract framework. The report shall include a plan for strengthening the Navy's MSMO contract strategy by:

(1) establishing a correlation between MSMO solicitation/award criteria and actual DDG–51 modernization program scope of work;

(2) incorporating performance benchmarks, metrics, and incentives that enable the Navy to measure performance and control cost consistent with the discipline required of a major defense acquisition program; and

(3) ensuring viable strategies are available to leverage the benefits of competition across the 5-year duration of the sole-source, cost-plus MSMO environment.

Submarine training device modifications

The budget request included $33.6 million to procure submarine training device modifications, but included no funding for fielding

any system that would provide commanders and sailors with instant, continuous, and long-term feedback regarding performance. The committee is aware that industry has developed standardized metrics systems that could be used to assess readiness and training proficiency. Such technology would be interfaced with simulators and instrumented ranges to automatically measure individual and crew performance as thousands of tactical events are performed during a single day of training. Having such systems would provide rapid, objective feedback to sailors regarding the accuracy and consistency of their tactical assessments and provide frequent and objective assessments to force commanders, so that they can spot trends and underperformers before an incident occurs.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.8 million to expand the use of performance measurement systems by completing definition of metrics and algorithms and installing hardware and software in training sites.

Man overboard indicators

The budget request included $43.2 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for command support equipment, but no funding to procure man overboard indicators (MOBI).

The Navy has tested a one-per-person MOBI transmitter. Additionally, at least two expeditionary strike groups recommended the Navy procure MOBI transmitters for each embarked sailor, marine, and airman. The committee understands that a large majority of ship commanding officers having MOBI systems installed have requested additional MOBI transmitters in order to protect all embarked personnel. In addition, the U.S. Navy Safety Center has recommended that each embarked sailor and marine be afforded MOBI protection.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.9 million for the procurement of additional MOBI systems.

Logistics vehicle system replacement

The budget request included $324.6 million in Procurement, Marine Corps for the Logistics Vehicle System Replacement (LVSR). The LVSR will provide the Marine Corps with a replacement vehicle system for the current fleet of LVS's, which are approaching the end of their service life.

The committee supports the LVSR program, but is concerned the Marine Corps' current plan for procurement is too aggressive given the number of engineer change proposals and other manufacturing issues that have been discovered during the low-rate initial production process. Further, the committee is concerned that the Marine Corps inadequately pursued unit cost reductions from the manufacturer given the 3-year window during which the Marine Corps intends to procure these systems. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $25.0 million in funding for fiscal year 2009.

Combat casualty care equipment upgrade program

The budget request included $6.6 million in Procurement, Marine Corps, for Field Medical Equipment, but no funds for the combat casualty care equipment upgrade program (CCCEUP), now com-

pleting its fifth year of operation. The CCCEUP provides lightweight, compact, field medical equipment for the Marine Corps and Navy corpsmen delivering combat casualty care. This equipment and the medical care it supports are designed specifically to reduce preventable combat deaths and speed recovery of the wounded.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.9 million for the CCCEUP program.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
001	F-35	8	1,673,787			8	1,673,787
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		136,904		35,000		171,904
	F136 engine advance procurement				[35,000]		
003	F-22A	20	3,054,197			20	3,054,197
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				497,000		497,000
	Advance procurement or line close down costs				[497,000]		
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
005	C-17A (MYP)		367,554		-48,800		318,754
	Purchasing spares ahead of need				[-40,000]		
	USAF-requested transfer to APAF 34				[-8,800]		
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
006	C-130J				25,000		25,000
	USAF-requested transfer from APAF 31				[25,000]		
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		96,000				96,000
008	HC/MC-130 RECAP	6	507,677			6	507,677
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		80,000				80,000
010	KC-X ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		61,660		-61,660		
	USAF-requested transfer to PE 65221F (RDAF 83)				[-61,660]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
011	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT		5,439				5,439
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
012	JPATS		33,196		-5,542		27,654
	USAF-requested correction of JPATS (T-6) spares adjustment				[-5,542]		
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	HELICOPTERS						
013	CSAR-X ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		15,000		-15,000		
	Reflect delays in acquisition program				[-15,000]		
014	V22 OSPREY	6	409,027			6	409,027
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		14,266				14,266
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
016	C-29A FLIGHT INSPECTION ACFT	1	31,877			1	31,877
017	C-40						
018	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C		2,435				2,435
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
019	TARGET DRONES		70,576				70,576
020	GLOBAL HAWK	5	658,319		31,000	5	689,319
	UAV NAS radar				[31,000]		
021	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		53,832				53,832

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
022	MQ-1	38	378,703		31,000	38	409,703
	UAV NAS radar				[31,000]		
023	MQ-9	9	161,439			9	161,439
	MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
024	B-2A		330,392		18,500		348,892
	B-2 radar - transfer from PE 64204F (RDAF 61)				[18,500]		
025	B-1B		71,774				71,774
026	B-52		41,699		57,600		99,299
	SAASM				[18,100]		
	CONNECT				[22,800]		
	AWI				[16,700]		
027	F-117						
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
028	A-10		144,077				144,077
029	F-15		12,326				12,326
030	F-16		273,694				273,694
031	F-22A		327,046				327,046
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
032	C-5		485,484				485,484
033	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		97,600				97,600

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
034	C-17A		331,535		8,800		340,335
	USAF-requested transfer from APAF 5				[8,800]		
035	C-21		11,001		-10,249		752
	USAF-requested transfer to APAF 40				[-10,249]		
036	C-32A		11,373				11,373
037	C-37A		2,407				2,407
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
038	GLIDER MODS		121				121
039	T-6		21,122		-367		20,755
	USAF-requested correction of JPATS (T-6) spares adjustment				[-367]		
040	T-1		25		10,249		10,274
	USAF-requested transfer from APAF 35				[10,249]		
041	T-38		59,934				59,934
042	T-43		2,269				2,269
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
043	KC-10A (ATCA)		1,899				1,899
044	C-12		468				468
045	C-20 MODS		1,535				1,535
046	VC-25A MOD		60,875				60,875
047	C-40		9,911				9,911

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
048	C-130		422,814		-7,800		415,014
	Accelerate LAIRCM upgrades for C-130 aircraft				[15,000]		
	Accelerate LAIRCM upgrades for AFSOC C-130 aircraft				[2,200]		
	Reduce C-130 AMP overhead growth				[-25,000]		
049	C130J MODS		59,350		-25,000		34,350
	USAF-requested transfer to APAF 6				[-25,000]		
050	C-135		134,188				134,188
051	COMPASS CALL MODS		24,605				24,605
052	DARP		106,989				106,989
053	E-3		86,468				86,468
054	E-4		28,098				28,098
055	E-8		30,657				30,657
056	H-1		13,200				13,200
057	H-60		17,250				17,250
058	GLOBAL HAWK MODS		103,939				103,939
059	OTHER AIRCRAFT		151,932				151,932
060	MQ-1 MODS		148,532				148,532
061	MQ-9 MODS		24,590				24,590
062	CV-22 MODS		22,621				22,621
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
063	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		257,001				257,001

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIP						
064	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP		104,861				104,861
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
065	B-1						
066	B-2A						
067	B-2A		36,783				36,783
068	B-52						
069	C-5		18,210				18,210
070	C-21		19,025		-19,025		
	USAF-requested transfer to APAF 75				[-19,025]		
071	C-130						
072	EC-130J		5,382				5,382
073	F-15		20,189				20,189
074	F-16		13,623				13,623
075	T-6		8,841		-8,841		
	USAF-requested correction of JPATS (T-6) spares adjustment				[-8,841]		
076	OTHER AIRCRAFT		48,593				48,593
077	T-1				19,025		19,025
	USAF-requested transfer from APAF 75				[19,025]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
078	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		24,380				24,380
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
079	WAR CONSUMABLES		80,622				80,622
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
080	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		521,357		27,900		549,257
	Litening targeting pod upgrades				[27,900]		
081	DEPOT MODERNIZATION						
82	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
83	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
84	OTHER SPECIAL PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
	CLASSIFIED PGMS						
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES SOF						
085	CANCELLED ACCT ADJUSTMENTS						
	DARP						
086	DARP		21,028				21,028
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		10,913				10,913
	TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**12,676,496**		**558,790**		**13,235,286**

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
001	ROCKETS		29,436				29,436
	CARTRIDGES						
002	CARTRIDGES		150,815		1,000		151,815
	Improved stores ejection cartridges				[1,000]		
	BOMBS						
003	PRACTICE BOMBS		24,590				24,590
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		149,695				149,695
005	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON						
006	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	3,647	105,719			3,647	105,719
007	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER						
	FLARE, IR MJU-7B						
008	CAD/PAD		38,190				38,190
009	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		3,246				3,246
010	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		4,618				4,618
011	MODIFICATIONS		1,235				1,235
012	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		2,477				2,477
	FUZES						
013	FLARES		304,159				304,159
014	FUZES		72,133				72,133

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	WEAPONS						
	SMALL ARMS						
015	SMALL ARMS		8,165				8,165
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		**894,478**		**1,000**		**895,478**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT-BALLISTIC						
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		26,658				26,658
	OTHER MISSILES						
	TACTICAL						
002	JASSM	260	240,295	-145	-80,000	115	160,295
	Reflect delays in program certification				[-80,000]		
003	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	275	77,223			275	77,223
004	AMRAAM	281	294,746			281	294,746
005	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	642	63,585			642	63,585
006	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	2,612	133,209			2,612	133,209
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
007	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION		2,408				2,408

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE MISSILES						
	CLASS IV						
008	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		42				42
009	AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15						
010	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC						
011	MM III MODIFICATIONS		296,354				296,354
012	AGM-65D MAVERICK		256				256
013	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		10,150				10,150
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	MISSILES AND REPAIR PARTS						
014	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		26,923				26,923
	OTHER SUPPORT						
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
015	ADVANCED EHF		16,564				16,564
016	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				100,000		100,000
	Advance procurement of AEHF 4				[100,000]		
017	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)		22,492				22,492
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
019	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		17,407				17,407
020	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		108,043				108,043
021	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		2,400				2,400

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
022	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM		1,250				1,250
023	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		99,788				99,788
024	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)						
025	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE)						
026	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	4	1,205,278			4	1,205,278
027	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)		5,756				5,756
028	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	2	1,664,043			2	1,664,043
029	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		54,000				54,000
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
030	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS						
031	DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM		158,966				158,966
32	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
033	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		212,515				212,515
34	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM		[ ]				[ ]
35	OTHER PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		796,377				796,377
	TOTAL - MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**5,536,728**		**20,000**		**5,556,728**

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
001	ARMORED VEHICLE						
002	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		17,662				17,662
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES						
003	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		23,002				23,002
004	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)						
005	CAP VEHICLES		889				889
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
006	HMMWV, ARMORED						
007	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES		30,597				30,597
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
008	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		27,020				27,020
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
009	HALVERSEN LOADER						
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
010	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU		23,051				23,051
011	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000(VEHICLES)		39,984				39,984
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT						
012	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (BPA						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS						
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT (COMSEC)						
013	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		137,914				137,914
014	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		1,557				1,557
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
015	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2,671				2,671
016	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		15,441		3,500		18,941
	Eagle Vision one meter SAR upgrades				[3,500]		
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
017	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS		9,832				9,832
018	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		47,224				47,224
019	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMEN		68,502				68,502
020	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		29,377				29,377
021	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		53,739				53,739
022	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		13,662				13,662
023	DRUG INTERDICTION SPT		950				950
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
024	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		100,052		1,900		101,952
	NextGen OTHR risk reduction				[1,900]		
025	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS		16,148				16,148
026	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		10,475				10,475
027	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		57,728				57,728

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
028	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		55,315		10,700		66,015
	Unmanned threat emitter (UMTE) modernization				[10,700]		
029	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N		1				1
030	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		7,754				7,754
031	GCSS-AF FOS		55,783				55,783
032	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM		22,525				22,525
033	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS		35,050		-29,000		6,050
	AOC				[-29,000]		
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
034	BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE		337,190				337,190
035	USCENTCOM		42,677				42,677
	DISA PROGRAMS						
036	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE		80,405				80,405
037	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE		25,526				25,526
038	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE		27,626				27,626
039	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE		65,383				65,383
040	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE		101,983				101,983
041	MILSATCOM SPACE		106,323				106,323
042	SPACE MODS SPACE		23,121				23,121
043	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM		29,232				29,232
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
044	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		293,153				293,153

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
045	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER		26,878				26,878
046	RADIO EQUIPMENT		13,463				13,463
047	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)						
048	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		7,423				7,423
049	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		135,808				135,808
050	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000						
	MODIFICATIONS						
051	COMM ELECT MODS		33,258				33,258
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP						
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIPMENT						
052	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		18,626				18,626
	DEPOT PLANT AND MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP						
053	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		21,573				21,573
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
054	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		17,038				17,038
055	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT						
056	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		6,483				6,483
057	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT		3,021				3,021
058	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		26,459				26,459
059	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (BASE S)		14,237				14,237
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
60	PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
061	DARP RC135		22,924				22,924
062	DISTRIBUTED GROUND SYSTEMS		251,805				251,805
63	SELECTED ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
064	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		410,370				410,370
065	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		15,805				15,805
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
066	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		25,616				25,616
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		13,041,085				13,041,085
	TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**16,128,396**		**-12,900**		**16,115,496**

F–22A fighter aircraft (Sec. 151)

As described elsewhere in this report, the budget request included $497.0 million for structural repairs to the F–15 that were added to the aircraft maintenance budget in case they would be needed to correct problems that might have emerged after investigations and inspections following a mishap in November 2007. Since that time, the Air Force has determined that these additional funds are not necessary for completing the repairs required to: (1) correct F–15 structural problems; and (2) return them to flying status.

The committee recommends a provision that would provide $497.0 million Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) for either (1) advance procurement for F–22A aircraft in fiscal year 2010; or (2) winding down the production line for F–22A aircraft. The next President of the United States would have to decide which alternative would be in the best interests of the Nation and submit a certification of that decision to the congressional defense committees before any of these funds could be spent.

The budget request included $3,054.2 million in APAF for building 20 F–22A aircraft. The budget request did not include funding for either: (1) advance procurement to continue F–22A production after fiscal year 2009; or (2) funding to support government liability for costs of closing the production line.

The 20 F–22A aircraft in the fiscal year 2009 budget would complete the currently approved program to buy 183 F–22A aircraft. The committee heard conflicting testimony from Department of Defense officials about whether 183 F–22A aircraft are sufficient to meet the needs of the Department. The budget request reflects the view that 183 aircraft are enough to meet warfighting requirements. The Air Force maintains that it needs to have 381 F–22A aircraft to meet warfighting requirements, provide support to homeland defense missions, and have sufficient aircraft to provide squadrons for 10 Air Expeditionary Forces (AEFs) and, thereby, support a peacetime rotation base for the AEFs.

The committee also heard testimony from the Secretary of Defense, with which the Secretary of the Air Force concurred, that he would prefer to leave the question of continuing F–22A production after fiscal year 2009 in a neutral position for the next administration.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $497.0 million, for either: (1) advance procurement to continue F–22A production after fiscal year 2009; or (2) funding to support government liability for costs of closing the production line, as decided by the next President.

Budget Items—Air Force

Advanced procurement for the F136 engine

The budget request included $136.9 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) for advanced procurement for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program. In section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), Congress explicitly directed the Department of Defense to (1) develop a competitive propulsion system for the JSF aircraft; and

(2) continue competition for the propulsion system throughout the production phase of the JSF program.

In order to follow through on that direction and begin competition with the F–135 engine in 2012, the Department of Defense must begin funding for long lead items for the F–136 production line in 2009.

Therefore, the committee recommends in increase of $35.0 million in APAF for long lead items for the F–136 engine.

C–17A engine spares

The budget request included $367.6 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for the C–17A aircraft, including $114.6 million for engine spares. The funding stream for engine spares over the past 3 years has shown little consistency, going from a level of $76.0 million in fiscal year 2007 to zero in fiscal year 2008, and $114.6 million this year.

The committee is aware that the operating forces have lodged few complaints over the availability of spares, nor have mission capability or effectiveness rates suffered in recent years. The committee believes that funding to the fiscal year 2007 level should be more than adequate, at least until the Air Force can provide adequate supporting documentation of the need for additional spares.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $40.0 million for C–17 engine spares.

Tactical intelligence support

The Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) forces operating in Iraq and Afghanistan, in cooperation with the intelligence community, have developed sophisticated capabilities to identify, find, track, and kill or capture high-value individuals. Whereas traditional force-on-force military campaigns require techniques to find and attack large mechanized formations, irregular warfare requires these new "man-hunting" capabilities.

Army and Marine Corps ground forces have requirements similar to JSOC's in their counter-insurgency operations. Over time, some of the systems as well as tactics, techniques, and procedures developed by and for JSOC have begun to migrate from JSOC to Army and Marine Corps ground forces. This process includes specialized support from national intelligence agencies. Also, the Army and Marine Corps themselves have acquired innovative capabilities to conduct effective counter-insurgency operations.

For example, the services have deployed "human terrain teams" to enhance their understanding of the local social and cultural environment. Biometric signature and forensic data collection capabilities and effective reach-back to national-level databases and processing are more widespread and well-received by tactical elements. More national human intelligence (HUMINT) and signals intelligence (SIGINT) databases are for the first time being pushed forward to support tactical unit operations with greater speed and frequency. Meanwhile, these capabilities are linked with airborne and ground-based intelligence capabilities that further enable the detection, identification, location, and tracking of high-value targets.

The committee believes there is an urgent requirement to enhance and increase access to this man-hunting capability to all Army and Marine Corps ground forces in harm's way. Consequently, the committee recommends a series of actions to initiate, accelerate, or eliminate bottlenecks that impede fielding of special-purpose equipment and capabilities, much of them classified. Specific recommendations are outlined below, but full explanations are provided only in the classified annex to this report.

Airborne Imaging

Requirements for airborne full-motion video (FMV) platforms are escalating rapidly as a result of demonstrated operational successes. The Department of Defense (DOD) appears to have responded belatedly and without appropriate focus to this requirement. The committee believes that DOD has focused almost exclusively on trying to accelerate fielding of the Predator, Army Warrior, Reaper, and Shadow unmanned aerial systems (UAS). Despite a sustained Air Force effort to surge the Predator system, however, UAS likely will be unable to meet operational requirements in the near term, for reasons discussed below.

The committee believes that manned aircraft could be acquired and modified rapidly from the commercial sector, which would allow DOD to meet operational requirements until the UAS programs can catch up to demand. At that point, commercial contracts could be terminated, or the manned aircraft systems could be transferred to Iraqi security forces. The committee believes that DOD could have chosen to pursue this approach as an expedient through war-related supplemental funding.

The committee notes that the Commander of Special Operations Command (SOCOM) has requested that Congress provide funds for approximately five 24-hour orbits of primarily manned aircraft in the fiscal year 2008 supplemental. This request, while commendable, would satisfy one-quarter to one-third of the immediate requirement. The committee is concerned that DOD has not explained why it is not seeking more of what SOCOM has requested. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to address this issue in the next war-related supplemental funding request.

The major medium- and long-endurance UAS programs cannot be adequately accelerated in part because of shortages of operators and looming training limitations, as noted in the Conference Report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The Department is now addressing the operator shortage by requesting funds for more training capacity, examining whether rated pilots are required to control these UAS, and investigating whether the Air Force needs to establish a career field for UAS pilots. The other major training-related problem is the lack of capabilities and procedures to operate UAS in the National Airspace (NAS).

The committee is deeply concerned that DOD is unprepared to meet Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements to operate in the NAS. The committee appreciates that DOD UAS programs are growing larger and faster than anyone anticipated, and are being used in unexpected locations and missions. However, the major programs have been in the acquisition system for 15 years,

and many observers, including congressional committees, warned DOD repeatedly of the risk of deferring resolution of this challenge.

The Air Force is operating Global Hawk UAS from Beale Air Force Base under Temporary Flight Restrictions. Developmental test and acceptance flights for the Army Sky Warrior and the Reaper cannot be conducted at night at El Mirage Flight Operations Facility in California. The Army is fielding Shadow UAS systems to many Guard and reserve units across the United States that do not have access to restricted airspace for training.

These problems require prompt and vigorous action. The committee recommends that DOD and the FAA create a joint committee between the DOD and the Federal Aviation Administration at the level of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD/AT&L) and the Associate Administrator for Aviation safety. Such a committee could serve as the focal point for dispute resolution and policy development. The committee directs the Deputy Secretary of Defense to seek an agreement with the Administrator of the FAA to create an executive committee to implement the memorandum of agreement signed in September 2007 for Operation of Unmanned Aircraft Systems in the National Airspace System.

The committee also recommends funding to accelerate the highest priority UAS airspace integration needs. The committee recommends $31.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), RQ–4 Global Hawk (Line 20) and $31.0 million in APAF MQ–1 Predator (Line 22) for two ground-based radars for Beale Air Force Base, and El Mirage Flight Operations facility, respectively, to provide enhanced ground-based collision-avoidance capabilities to mitigate restrictions on terminal flight operations. The committee also recommends $10.0 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E), Air Force, PE 35219F, to accelerate development of critical sense-and-avoid capabilities for Global Hawk and the Predator/Sky Warrior UAS. Finally, the committee recommends $15.0 million in RDT&E, Defense-wide, PE 64400D8Z, to begin the development for the major UAS programs of modeling and simulation tools, and standards, that will provide the foundation for gaining routine UAS access to the national and international airspace.

Wide-Area Airborne Surveillance

One objection to buying many more airborne FMV platforms is that they are an inefficient means of surveillance. FMV cameras have a narrow field-of-view, requiring one platform for every specific target or mission. In areas where the target density permits, it would be more efficient to use camera systems that can cover large areas. The Army Constant Hawk and Marine Corps Angel Fire systems are current examples of wide-area collection systems. The DOD leadership requested funds for the Air Force to acquire a combined, enhanced system, currently called Wide-Area Airborne Surveillance (WAAS), to image a larger area than Constant Hawk or Angel Fire, enable night operations, real-time support to ground forces, provide a forensic capability, and support many simultaneous targeting and surveillance missions. It could cue and hand off targets to FMV platforms for prosecution.

The committee strongly supports this initiative for many reasons, including its potential to reduce the requirement for UAS with FMV and to make the latter more effective. However, the WAAS system likely will not be available in useful numbers for 2 years or more, and therefore cannot serve as a near-term solution for U.S. Central Command's airborne FMV deficiency.

The Air Force intends to field the WAAS system on the Reaper, or MQ–9, UAS. The committee understands that it may require less time and cost to field the WAAS system on the Sky Warrior, or Predator–1C. The committee is also aware that there are several proposals under consideration to field WAAS capabilities on other platforms, such as the Shadow UAS. The committee directs the Deputy Secretary of Defense to examine these issues and provide an assessment and recommendation to the committee by June 15, 2008 to help inform decisions in conference on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009.

National-Tactical SIGINT Initiatives

The National Security Agency (NSA), with Special Operations Command and the Army, has developed special capabilities against modern signals encountered in Iraq and elsewhere. These capabilities are now engineered for fielding as tactical systems, on ground vehicles, and on airborne platforms. NSA and the Army are fielding the Triton III system on Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles to support maneuver forces. A program called Final e-Curfew provides more advanced area-collection capabilities against the same target set from fixed locations. These systems work in conjunction with databases pushed forward to tactical echelons.

These systems should be fielded rapidly. The committee recommends authorization of $25.0 million above the request in Other Procurement, Army, line 74, to accelerate Triton III procurement and installation on the MRAP vehicles. The committee understands that the Army's needs for Triton III procurement exceed the amount recommended for authorization. The committee urges the Army and Office of the Secretary of Defense to include the balance of the requirement in the next war-related supplemental spending request. The committee also recommends an authorization of $25.0 million in PE 35885G, NSA's Tactical Cryptologic Activities, for development and acquisition of Final e-Curfew systems for the Army and Marine Corps units in Iraq.

Special SIGINT capabilities are also more widely available for manned and unmanned aircraft deployment. The Air Force is planning to field these capabilities as an adjunct to the Airborne Signals Intelligence Program (ASIP)–2C configuration on the Reaper and Predator, and the Army is planning to build similar capabilities, under the Tactical SIGINT Program, for the Sky Warrior/MQ–1C UAS. The committee is concerned that the Army and the Air Force are developing very similar systems to meet similar requirements and concepts of operation. At the same time, the committee is concerned that neither service is planning to incorporate certain fundamental collection capabilities, as described in the classified annex to this report. The committee understands that these advanced capabilities will cost more and will consume a larger portion of the payload of such potential platforms as the Reaper, Pred-

ator, and Sky Warrior, but believes that these tradeoffs must be seriously considered. The committee is also concerned that the Air Force's preferred platform choice is the Reaper even though it will be more difficult to collect against the targets of interest from that platform's higher altitude.

Accordingly, the committee directs that the Deputy Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the USD/AT&L, the Joint Staff, and the Director of NSA, to review requirements and determine whether the Army and Air Force should pursue a single, joint airborne UAS SIGINT program, and whether this development should include the advanced collection capability described in the classified annex to this report. The committee requests that the Deputy Secretary report to the committee by June 15, 2008 to help inform decisions in conference on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009.

B–52 bomber

The budget request included $41.7 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force line 26 for the B–52 bomber, of which $32.4 million is for combat network communications technology (CONECT) and $7.3 million is for advanced weapons integration (AWI). No funds were included for the selective availability anti-spoofing module (SAASM). The committee recommends an additional $18.1 million for the SAASM, $22.8 million for CONECT, and $16.7 million for AWI, for a total of $57.6 million. The Air Force failed to include adequate funding in the budget request to meet the requirements of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to maintain 76 B–52 bombers in a common configuration and included this funding on the Air Force unfunded priorities list.

Large aircraft infrared countermeasures system

The budget request included $59.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for procurement of aircraft installation kits for the large aircraft infrared countermeasures (LAIRCM) system for various C–130 aircraft. The LAIRCM system provides protection against man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS) which are widely available and have been used by adversaries in Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom against both military and commercial aircraft. Additional funding for LAIRCM, including funding for nonrecurring engineering and kit production for Special Operations Command (SOCOM), is included on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million to accelerate LAIRCM upgrades for C–130 aircraft, in general, and an increase of $2.2 million to accelerate LAIRCM upgrades for SOCOM AC–130 and MC–130 aircraft.

C–130 Avionics Modernization Program

The budget request included $422.8 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) for the C–130 Modifications Program, including $149.1 million for the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP). The C–130 AMP effort suffered a Nunn-McCurdy breach in February 2007, which caused the Department of Defense

to significantly restructure and recertify the program in June 2007. While the committee remains supportive of the program, we have concerns over the unexplained growth in overhead on the program.

The committee recommends a reduction of $25.0 million in APAF for the C–130 AMP Modification Program.

Advanced targeting pod

The budget request included $521.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF, line 78) for miscellaneous production charges, including $49.9 million for the procurement of advanced targeting pods (ATPs), also known as precision attack systems. Advanced targeting pods provide targeting capability for use with precision guided munitions on fighter, bomber, and attack aircraft. The ATP is currently in use by both the active and reserve components of the Air Force. The Air Force Chief of Staff included $170.0 million for buying new ATPs and upgrading existing ATPs in his unfunded priorities list.

The Air Force and the contractor team for the Litening ATP program have devised a spiral enhancement kit for existing Litening ATPs that will provide:

(1) a new fourth generation forward looking infrared sensor;

(2) a new fourth generation charged coupled device (CCD) camera that enables targeting acquisition and identification;

(3) a C-Band video downlink capability which will provide exceptional standoff capability outside of most surface-to-air threats at twice the distance of the earlier Litening ATPs; and

(4) a laser spot tracker and a laser target imaging processor which yield much improved performance for targeting at long ranges using precision weapons.

The committee recommends an increase of $27.9 million for the procurement of spiral upgrade kits for Litening ATPs.

Budget request realignments

The Air Force requested that Congress make several realignments in their budget to correct various errors in their submission of the Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) documentation. The table below reflects these adjustments:

[insert at the end of budget items for APAF]

CHANGES TO CORRECT SUBMISSION ERRORS

(In millions)

Item	Account	Line item	Amount
C–130J	APAF	49	−$25.0
C–130J	APAF	6	+$25.0
JPATS	APAF	12	−$5.5
JPATS	APAF	39	−$0.4
JPATS	APAF	75	−$8.8
JPATS	APAF	63	+$14.7
(Adjustment to APAF line 63 already reflected in the budget request)			
C–17	APAF	5	−$8.8
C–17	APAF	34	+$8.8
C–21	APAF	35	−$10.2
T–1	APAF	40	+$10.2
C–21	APAF	70	−$19.0
T–1	APAF	75	+$19.0
KC–X	APAF	10	−$61.7

CHANGES TO CORRECT SUBMISSION ERRORS—Continued

(In millions)

Item	Account	Line item	Amount
KC–X	RDAF	83	+$61.7

Improved stores ejection cartridge

The budget request included $150.8 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (PAAF) for cartridges, but provided no funds for improved stores ejection cartridges. Funds provided will update the ejection cartridge currently used on numerous aircraft platforms by all branches of the military for various payload ejection applications, including, but not limited to, the F–15, F–16, A–10, and B–52 aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PAAF for improved stores ejection cartridges.

Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile

The budget request included $240.3 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force (MPAF) for the Joint Air-to-Surface Stand off Missile (JASSM). The JASSM program announced a Nunn-McCurdy breach in February 2007. Following a review of the program, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD (AT&L)) declined to certify the program, delaying the decision until at least May 2008. As part of the effort leading to recertification, the Air Force has been conducting JASSM flight tests, but those tests have drawn concern from the Office of the Director of Test and Evaluation (DOT&E). According to DOT&E, flight tests have not occurred in a predicted way, leading to serious questions about configuration control.

The committee continues to recognize that JASSM was designed to meet a needed capability. The Air Force anticipates that it will be able to ramp up production once the USD (AT&L) recertifies the missile under Nunn-McCurdy rules. The Air Force plan is to increase production from 115 missiles in fiscal year 2008 to 260 missiles in 2009. However, given the questions and concerns over this program, the committee believes that such an increase in quantities is unwarranted at this time.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $80.0 million in MPAF for JASSM.

Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellite

The budget request included $16.5 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force for advanced procurement and launch support for the third Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) satellite but no funds for the fourth AEHF satellite. The committee recommends an additional $100.0 million for advanced procurement, parts obsolescence, test equipment, and spares for the fourth AEHF.

In fiscal year 2008 $125.0 million was appropriated for advanced procurement for the fourth AEHF satellite, with direction to fully fund the fourth AEHF in the fiscal year 2009 budget request. The Milstar satellites, the predecessors to AEHF, have lasted longer than expected and the Air Force has determined that it can wait until the 2010 budget request to include full funding for the fourth

AEHF satellite. As a result, the technical, schedule, and cost risks associated with further extending the production break between the third and fourth AEHF satellites will further increase the cost of the fourth AEHF satellite.

The committee notes that the Air Force is currently studying whether a fifth AEHF satellite might be needed. This study will not be completed until June 2008.

Intelligence communication equipment

The budget request included $15.4 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF), for intelligence communication equipment, including $6.9 million for the "Chief of Staff Innovation Program." In fiscal year 2008, this program is called "Eagle Vision." Eagle Vision is a family of systems that provide commercial imagery data to operational commanders for mission planning, rehearsal, visualization, and intelligence support purposes. Eagle Vision is composed of a data acquisition segment (DAS) and a data integration segment (DIS). Funds requested for fiscal year 2009 are to support procurement of imagery ingestion capability upgrades as well as Eagle Vision DAS and DIS upgrades. These upgrades will provide improved processing capability, additional satellite capabilities, and baseline upgrades.

Commercially available synthetic aperture radar (SAR) data at 1 meter resolution could significantly improve surveillance and search and rescue operations, since this data is unclassified, and is releasable to State and local responders or, with proper authorization, releasable to foreign governments. The data intensive SAR image will require an upgrade to the Eagle Vision communications and image archive and processing system not included in the budget request. The committee is aware that such an upgrade to the Eagle Vision system is available. Such systems deployed with Air National Guard will allow the Eagle Vision systems to respond to military contingencies and maritime surveillance, and search and rescue operations, or to natural or man-made disasters.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million to begin fielding the SAR upgrades for the Eagle Vision system.

Combat training ranges

The budget request included $55.3 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF) for making improvements at combat training ranges. These improvements are aimed at increasing the capability to support realistic air-to-air, air-to-ground, ground-to-air, and electronic warfare training, along with the ability to record and playback events for aircrew debriefing and analysis.

The unmanned threat emitter (UMTE) modernization program will provide affordable and realistic threats, with sufficient threat density, typical of today's adversarial combat environment. This UMTE effort will upgrade performance capabilities and extend the service life of existing UMTE range assets by providing fully reactive, programmable, high-fidelity threat simulators, electronic attack receivers, automatic video tracking, and mobility to support time-critical targeting exercises. The committee understands that the Air Force's current threat emitters are inadequate to train F/A–22s, Joint Strike Fighters.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.7 million in OPAF for UMTE.

Air Operations Centers

The budget request included $35.1 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF) line 33 for Air Operations Centers (AOCs), including $29.0 million for fielding additional AOCs, increment 10.1. The committee recommends a reduction of $29.0 million in OPAF for the fielding of AOCs.

The Air Force plans to build between 12 to 30 AOCs in the coming years, with five main regional sites, and many more "tailored" sites. The justification for the total number of sites is not clear. The recent addition of a requirement for an AOC for the newly created U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) is a case in point. For the foreseeable future, AFRICOM will be headquartered in Germany. U.S. European Command already has a fully operational AOC for Europe, which is only partially used. Moreover, the proliferation of AOCs has created manning shortages in the AOCs across all regions. While the committee recognizes the value of the AOC that is currently fully manned and operated in the U.S. Central Command area of operations, little justification has been made as to why each numbered air force requires its own command facility, especially as reach-back command and control continues to rapidly evolve.

Finally, increment 10.1 of the AOCs was not developed as a service oriented architecture, even though that is the future approach for command and control within the Department of Defense. The committee recommends the Air Force take a pause in fielding increment 10.1 and fundamentally rethink its AOC fielding and operating strategy.

Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters

Annual long-term plan for the procurement of aircraft for the Navy and the Air Force (sec. 171)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual long-term plan for procurement of aircraft for the Departments of the Navy and Air Force. The provision would require that the plan project procurement, inventories, retirements, and losses for the following 30-year period.

Aircraft that would be covered by the plan would include fighter aircraft, attack aircraft, bomber aircraft, strategic lift aircraft, intratheater lift aircraft, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance aircraft, tanker aircraft, and any other major support aircraft designated by the Secretary.

The committee received testimony over the past 2 years about shortfalls of fighter/attack aircraft within the Navy and Marine Corps projected for the middle of the next decade, and, this year, received testimony about shortfalls of fighter aircraft within the Air Force projected for the year 2024.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense and Congress need long-term projections so that the two organizations can focus attention on potential shortfalls, gaps, or mismatches well be-

fore the full range of options are foreclosed. This annual report should help in that effort.

Budget Items—Defense-wide

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND						
	MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND						
001	MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND						
	TOTAL - MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND						
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS						
001	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		105,946				105,946
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MDA						
001a	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MDA				257,000		257,000
	THAAD long lead (transfer from RDDW 72)				[65,000]		
	THAAD long lead				[75,000]		
	THAAD radar long lead				[40,000]		
	SM-3 long lead				[20,000]		
	SM-3 long lead (transfer from RDDW 81)				[57,000]		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
2	INTEL SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPS		[ ]				[ ]
3	CYBER SECURITY -- CCP		[ ]				[ ]
4	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		[ ]				[ ]
5	CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM		[ ]				[ ]

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
006	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM		4,505				4,505
7	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM		[ ]				[ ]
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS						
008	WHS MOTOR VEHICLES						
009	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		26,649				26,649
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
010	INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
011	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		54,934				54,934
012	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM						
013	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM		10,973				10,973
014	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,788				2,788
015	TELEPORT PROGRAM		15,062				15,062
016	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		121,296				121,296
017	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		36,765				36,765
018	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK (DISN)		90,328				90,328
019	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE		1,894				1,894
020	SR. LEADERSHIP CMD CONT						
021	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM		7,952				7,952
022	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		19,100				19,100
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA						
23	DIA SUPPORT TO CENTCOM INTELIGENCE		[ ]				[ ]
24	INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS		[ ]				[ ]

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
25	COMBATANT COMMAND OPERATIONS		[ ]				[ ]
26	DIA SUPPORT TO SOUTHCOM INTEL ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
27	DIA SUPPORT TO PACOM MANAGEMENT HQ		[ ]				[ ]
28	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFO OPS		[ ]				[ ]
29	DIA SUPPORT TO PACOM INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
30	DIA SUPPORT TO EUCOM INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
31	INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
32	DEFENSE HUMINT INTELLIGENCE		[ ]				[ ]
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
033	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		8,789				8,789
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
034	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,523				1,523
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
035	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		25,897				25,897
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA						
036	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		19,214				19,214
	NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY						
37	NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL - INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM						
38	DEFENSE GEOSPATIAL - INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM						
	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						
039	VEHICLES						
040	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		5,621				5,621

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS						
041	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA						
042	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,498				1,498
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA						
043	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		2,149				2,149
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DTSA						
044	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		436				436
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA						
045	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA		689				689
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT						
046	A - WEAPON SYSTEM COST	3	11,158			3	11,158
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
047	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		51,950				51,950
048	MC-130H AIR REFUELING SYSTEM						
049	MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM		63,667				63,667
050	MH-60 SOF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		98,163				98,163
051	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	6	39,172			6	39,172
052	SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION		36,286				36,286
053	SOF U-28		7,659				7,659
054	MC-130H, COMBAT TALON II						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
055	CV-22 SOF MOD	6	162,971			6	162,971
056	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION						
057	C-130 MODIFICATIONS		47,018				47,018
058	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		1,347				1,347
	SHIPBUILDING						
059	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)		5,760				5,760
060	MK8 MOD1 SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE		7,061				7,061
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
061	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT		67,083				67,083
062	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION		5,540				5,540
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
063	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS		67,220				67,220
064	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		54,122		13,300		67,422
	ISR mission equipment package				[13,300]		
065	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		15,689		4,400		20,089
	MK 17 rifle				[4,400]		
66	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
067	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS		1,265				1,265
068	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES		12,484				12,484
069	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		18,795				18,795
070	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		3,272				3,272
71	SPECIAL PROGRAM		[ ]				[ ]

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
072	TACTICAL VEHICLES		3,702				3,702
073	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS		34,151				34,151
074	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS		21,593				21,593
075	MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT		11,722				11,722
076	UNMANNED VEHICLES		27,194				27,194
77	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM GDIP		[ ]				[ ]
078	SOF AUTOMATION SYSTEMS		55,248				55,248
079	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES		15,862				15,862
080	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE		25,892				25,892
081	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL		15,455				15,455
082	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR		30,201		5,000		35,201
	Hand-held imager / long range				[5,000]		
083	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS		33,966				33,966
084	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT		13,450				13,450
085	DRUG INTERDICTION						
086	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		15,331				15,331
087	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		315,443		5,000		320,443
	M53 joint chemical biological protective mask				[5,000]		
088	PSYOP EQUIPMENT		64,778				64,778
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
	CBDP						
089	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION		88,565				88,565

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
090	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION		80,211				80,211
091	DECONTAMINATION		22,299				22,299
092	JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM		38,702				38,702
093	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION		37,784				37,784
094	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE		199,610		18,000		217,610
	Joint chemical agent detector (JCAD)				[10,000]		
	Joint bio standoff detection system (JBSDS)				[8,000]		
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		671,379				671,379
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		**3,164,228**		**302,700**		**3,466,928**
	RAPID ACQUISITION FUND						
001	JOINT RAPID ACQUISITION CELL		102,045				102,045
	TOTAL - RAPID ACQUISITION FUND		**102,045**				**102,045**
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	ARMY RESERVE						
001	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	NAVY RESERVE						
002	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	MARINE CORPS RESERVE						
003	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	AIR FORCE RESERVE						
004	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT						
	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
005	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
006	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	TOTAL - NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense

The budget request included no funds for procurement of long lead items for Fire Units 3 and 4 of the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system. The committee recommends an increase of $140.0 million in a new defense-wide procurement funding line for procurement of long lead items for the interceptors and ground equipment for THAAD Fire Units 3 and 4. Of this additional amount, $65.0 million would be transferred from research and development (R&D) funds requested in PE 63881C for THAAD.

Section 223(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required the Department of Defense to request any long lead procurement funding for THAAD Fire Units 3 and 4, and for Standard Missile–3 interceptors, in the fiscal year 2009 budget request using procurement funds, rather than R&D funds. In addition, section 223(c) of that act prohibits the use of fiscal year 2009 R&D funds for procurement of long lead items for THAAD Fire Units 3 and 4.

THAAD is a high priority near-term missile defense system intended to provide our regional combatant commanders with the capability they need today to protect our forward-deployed forces, allies, and other friendly countries against many hundreds of existing short- and medium-range ballistic missiles. The budget request for THAAD included a planned 1-year delay in the delivery of Fire Units 3 and 4, and an 18-month production gap in THAAD interceptors. After congressional objections were raised to this planned delay, the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) decided it would reallocate $65.0 million of fiscal year 2009 funding for the THAAD system for long lead procurement of interceptors for Fire Unit 3. However, contrary to the law, MDA plans to use R&D funds to procure long lead items for Fire Unit 3.

The committee disagrees with MDA's plan to use R&D funds for procurement of long lead items for Fire Unit 3, because it would be contrary to the law and contrary to the intent of Congress in requiring the use of procurement funds for such activity. Therefore, the committee recommends establishing a new defense-wide procurement funding line for MDA missile defense procurement activities. The committee expects MDA and the Department of Defense to comply with the requirements of section 223 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 in executing any long lead procurement funding for THAAD Fire Units 3 and 4.

The committee notes that the Joint Capabilities Mix (JCM) study, conducted by the Joint Staff, concluded that the United States needs about twice as many THAAD and Standard Missile–3 interceptors as the number currently planned, to meet just the minimum operational requirements of regional combatant commanders to defend our forward-deployed forces, allies, and other friendly nations against short- and medium-range ballistic missiles that exist today. To meet even these minimum operational requirements, MDA would have to increase substantially its plans and budgets for THAAD procurement. The committee expects MDA to adjust its plans accordingly.

The committee is concerned that MDA has not planned or budgeted any funds in fiscal year 2009 for procuring a THAAD radar. This would create a gap in THAAD radar production and cause a

schedule disconnect between fire unit delivery and radar delivery. Therefore, the committee also recommends an increase of $40.0 million in the new missile defense procurement funding line for long lead procurement of the THAAD radar for Fire Unit 3, to avoid a production gap and a schedule disconnect. The committee urges MDA to synchronize the THAAD fire unit and radar production and delivery schedules.

Standard Missile–3 interceptors

The budget request included no procurement funds for long lead procurement of Standard Missile–3 (SM–3) interceptors for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system. Contrary to the law, the budget request included $57.0 million in research and development (R&D) funds in PE 63892C for long lead procurement of SM–3 Block IA missiles. The committee recommends transferring the requested $57.0 million in R&D funds to a new defense-wide procurement funding line for procurement of long lead items for SM–3 interceptors, consistent with the law. The committee also recommends an increase of $20.0 million in the new Procurement, Defense-wide line for long lead procurement of an additional 15 SM–3 interceptor missiles.

Section 223(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required the Department of Defense to request any long lead procurement funding for SM–3 interceptors, and THAAD Fire Units 3 and 4, in the fiscal year 2009 budget request using procurement funds, rather than R&D funds. In addition, section 223(c) of that act prohibits the use of fiscal year 2009 R&D funds for procurement of long lead items for SM–3 interceptors and THAAD Fire Units 3 and 4.

The committee is deeply disappointed that the Department of Defense chose not to comply with the requirements of section 223 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), and directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to jointly provide a report to the congressional defense committees by no later than October 1, 2008, providing a detailed explanation of the reasons the Department chose not to comply with the law, and an explanation of the Department's plans to comply with the law.

The committee notes that the Joint Capabilities Mix (JCM) study, conducted by the Joint Staff, concluded that U.S. combatant commanders need about twice as many SM–3 and THAAD interceptors as currently planned to meet just their minimum operational requirements for defending against the many hundreds of existing short- and medium-range ballistic missiles. The committee is deeply disappointed that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has not planned or budgeted to acquire more than a fraction of the SM–3 interceptors needed to meet the warfighters' minimum operational needs, and that it does not plan to fund additional procurement beyond fiscal year 2010. The committee believes that achieving at least the JCM levels of upper tier interceptors in a timely manner should be the highest priority for MDA, and expects the Agency to modify its plans and budgets to meet our combatant commanders' current operational needs. In section 223 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007

(Public Law 109–364), Congress specified the Aegis BMD system and its SM–3 interceptor as a high priority near-term program for the Department to focus on. As the JCM study makes clear, the Department has failed to do so.

To address these concerns, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in the new defense-wide procurement funding line for long lead procurement of an additional 15 SM–3 missiles to start to address the need to meet the requirements identified in the JCM analysis. As described elsewhere in this report, the committee also recommends increases of $80.0 million for increasing the production rate of the SM–3 missile, reducing schedule risk for the SM–3 Block IB missile, and for improving the capability of the Aegis BMD system to conduct engagements using offboard sensors, known as "engage on remote," and to engage missiles in the ascent phase of midcourse flight.

Intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance mission equipment package

The budget request included $54.1 million for Special Operations Forces (SOF) Intelligence, but no funding for a classified intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance mission equipment package to modify existing classified air assets. This equipment is critical to enabling operators to fix, find, and target terrorists. It is also the Commander of the U.S. Special Operations Command's fifth highest priority item for funding, in the event that additional funds are available for the Special Operations Command.

The committee recommends an increase of $13.3 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, SOF Intelligence Systems, for a special operations forces intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance mission equipment package to modify existing classified air assets.

Special operations forces combat assault rifle

The budget request included $2.7 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for the special operations forces (SOF) Combat Assault Rifle program, which provides the SOF operator a highly reliable, accurate, and sustainable family of weapons, to include the MK17 sniper support rifle, suppressors, the operator tool kit, and spare weapons systems to support the MK16 and MK17. However, the Commander, Special Operations Command identified a $4.4 million shortfall in funding for the MK17 sniper support rifle.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.4 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, small arms and weapons, for the Special Operations Command.

Special operations visual augmentation systems hand-held imager/long-range

The budget request included $30.2 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for the special operations forces (SOF) visual augmentation, lasers and sensor systems. However, no funding was included for the special operations visual augmentation systems hand-held imager/long-range. These relatively new, hand-held imagers are thermal imagers that significantly improve the ability of special operators to track targets under conditions where existing technology does not allow them to do so. The Commander of the U.S. Special

Operations Command has identified a $15.4 million shortfall in funding for these hand-held imagers.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, SOF visual augmentation, lasers and sensor systems, for the Special Operations Command.

M53 Joint Chemical Biological Protective Mask

The budget request did not include funding in the Defense-wide, Procurement, special operations forces operational enhancements account for the M53 Joint Chemical Biological Protective Mask (JCBPM). The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for M53 JCBPM in this account.

United States Special Operations Command (SOCOM) has a validated requirement for 14,601 JCBPMs, but only 58 percent of that requirement was procured with available funding from the Joint Program Executive Officer-Chemical and Biological Defense. Additional funding for this program would allow the purchase of the remaining 42 percent of the JCBPMs that is required by SOCOM.

Joint Chemical Agent Detector

The budget request included $200.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW) for chemical and biological contamination avoidance, including $38.1 million for procurement of the Joint Chemical Agent Detector (JCAD). The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PDW for procurement of additional JCAD units. The JCAD is an automatic, lightweight chemical agent detector, identifier, and warning unit that is significantly more effective, smaller, and less expensive than other fielded chemical agent detectors. It is replacing older, less effective systems, including the M8 Chemical Agent Alarm system that contains a radioactive source. It is important to equip U.S. forces with this greatly improved JCAD system for operational and force protection purposes.

Joint Biological Standoff Detection System

The budget request included $199.6 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW) for chemical and biological defense contamination avoidance, but included no funds for the Joint Biological Standoff Detection System (JBSDS). Standoff detection of biological warfare agents is the highest priority technology objective in the chemical and biological defense program, and also one of the most challenging. The JBSDS is the first U.S. standoff early warning biological detection system. It has completed initial operational testing, and is capable of detecting and warning of biological threats at distances of several kilometers, before exposure occurs. It is thus a good choice for force protection at high threat overseas military facilities. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PDW to continue low-rate initial procurement of additional JBSDS units, pending a final decision on full-rate production.

Items of Special Interest

Aegis modernization open architecture

The Navy has been on a path to transition surface ship systems to an open business model, commonly referred to as Open Architec-

ture (OA), for approximately 6 years. The goal of employing OA systems is to bring to bear competition and innovation to achieve improved performance and affordability through use of modular designs, allowing public access to design specifications, reusing software code, mandating common interface standards, and achieving seamless interoperability between system hardware and software applications.

The committee concurs with the Navy's determination that OA is both a business imperative and a critical enabler for modernizing the Surface Navy. However, the Navy's overall progress in transitioning to OA is falling short of expectations in the extent to which the Navy is opening up the Aegis combat system for the DDG–51 modernization program. The Senate Report accompanying S. 1547 (S. Rept. 110 77) directed the Navy to outline its plan and progress with implementing OA. The Navy's OA report provides valuable insight regarding the strategy for implementing OA. However, the Navy has not outlined a program plan that ensures alignment between system development schedules, development contracts, Navy budget, program management structure, and the Aegis modernization program.

The committee's concerns with delays to OA implementation are compounded by the revelation this year of significant shortfalls to Aegis combat systems engineering funding through the future-years defense program.

The committee understands that the Navy intends to continue with a sole source contract to develop improvements in the Aegis combat system for a 5-year period commencing in fiscal year 2009. This decision is driven by schedule pressures. The Navy has assessed that the Aegis combat system is insufficiently "open" to enable competition for Aegis modernization development efforts in the time remaining before the first ship installation, scheduled in 2012. The decision also reflects the challenges associated with performing the tasks necessary to open this complex combat system for competition under prior sole source development contracts.

The committee is concerned that, absent a rigorous program plan that provides for steady, incremental progress at opening the Aegis combat system, in lock-step with contracts governing the system development, the Navy will continue to fall short of the progress required to achieve the objectives for OA.

Therefore, the committee directs that no greater than 50 percent of the amounts authorized for fiscal year 2009 for the surface combatant combat system engineering program (PE 64307N) may be obligated under a sole source contract, until 30 days after submission by the Secretary of the Navy of a detailed program plan for implementing OA for the Aegis combat system. The program plan shall be included in subsequent quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on Naval Open Architecture, and shall include methodology and scheduling for incrementally opening the Aegis combat system. The plan must provide for measuring discrete progress toward achieving a full open system commensurate with introduction of the 2012 Aegis baseline (formerly referred to as "COTS Refresh 3").

It is the committee's intent that, following consultation with the Navy regarding the details of this plan, the Navy will: (1) establish

future benchmarks to govern the transition from sole source to competitive development during the period 2010 to 2013; and (2) transfer the lessons learned from this initiative to remaining surface ship combat system development programs.

F/A–18 Hornet and Navy tactical aviation inventory shortfall

The committee is concerned that the Navy is facing a sizeable gap in aircraft inventory as older F/A–18A–D Hornets retire before the aircraft carrier variant (F–35C) of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) is available. Compounding this problem is the higher-than-predicted use of Hornets in ongoing operations and the challenges of meeting Marine Corps/Navy tactical aircraft integration obligations. The committee similarly raised this issue in the committee report accompanying S. 1547 (S. Rept. 110–77) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008.

This year, the committee again received testimony from the Navy of a projected shortfall in Navy tactical aviation. The Navy has indicated that, under current assumptions, it will experience a shortfall of 69 tactical aircraft in the year 2017, a number that swells to 125 when requirements of the United States Marine Corps are included. The committee believes that the Navy's projection of this shortfall may be, however, based on a series of questionable assumptions.

Regardless, the acknowledgement that the Navy will be short, at minimum, the equivalent of a full carrier air wing and an additional half of a carrier air wing of aircraft is troubling to the committee. Navy aircraft carriers are among the nation's most important power projection platforms. With shortfalls as large as the Navy is projecting, we could be faced with drastically reducing the number of aircraft available on short notice to the combatant commanders, either because we have deployed under-strength air wings, or because we did not deploy the carrier at all because of these aircraft shortages.

The committee understands that the Navy is preparing a comprehensive tactical aviation plan to be delivered to the committee late summer, 2008. The committee eagerly awaits the results of that plan. Last year the committee directed the Congressional Budget Office to report on the strike fighter gap, with that report due this fall. Finally, as discussed elsewhere in this report, the committee has asked for a Department of Defense 30–year aviation plan, the first of which is to be delivered with the defense budget next February. These three plans should serve to inform the continuing debate over the looming strike fighter shortfall.

The committee notes the Navy has testified about its confidence in the F/A–18E/F Super Hornet and its commitment to a long-term mix of Super Hornet aircraft and the future F–35C variant. Navy plans indicate that F/A–18–E/F Super Hornets will remain in the fleet until at least 2040. While the Navy has programmed the purchase of 89 F/A–18E/F in its future-years defense program (FYDP) (40 in fiscal year 2010, 27 in fiscal year 2011, and 22 in fiscal year 2012), it has not positioned itself to potentially increase its purchase of F/A–18 E/Fs in order to address the projected carrier aircraft shortfall. In the near term, the Navy has no satisfactory alternative to the F/A–18E/F for filling the gap.

Therefore, the committee believes that a multiyear procurement (MYP) of additional F/A–18E/F aircraft may be helpful in closing whatever gap in capability is borne out by the plans described above. Needless to say, the committee expects that any MYP contract the Navy enters into, including one for this program, will fully comply with the requirements of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). That section lays out a framework that allows the services to decide on which major weapons it seeks to buy under a multiyear contract, deliberatively and timely.

Subject to the outcome of the plans described above, the Navy should explore all available options in determining how to address the anticipated tactical aircraft shortfall, although options to resolve the Navy tactical aircraft shortfall must be viewed realistically. Projections of the shortfall are already predicated on extending the maximum number of F/A–18A–D fleet aircraft to what virtually all observers have acknowledged is the extreme limit, a level of 10,000 total flight hours. Further, the shortfall assumes achieving an initial operational capability for the F–35C in 2015.

The committee is particularly concerned that a failure to establish the conditions for an MYP on the F/A–18E/F by fiscal year 2010, should the Navy ultimately decide to purchase additional F/A–18E/F aircraft to address the tactical aircraft shortfall, could lead to the loss of "substantial savings" to the government. If the Navy were to proceed with annual purchases of F/A–18E/F aircraft to close the tactical aircraft shortfall but not position itself to do so with an MYP, the taxpayer may be deprived of "substantial savings," within the meaning of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, as amended. The committee understands that the two previous MYP contracts that the Navy executed on this program obtained that level of savings—a savings that exceed 10 percent of the total costs of carrying out the program through annual contracts. The first MYP resulted in an estimated savings of $700.0 million. The second MYP resulted in an estimated savings of $1.1 billion. This suggests that the Navy could achieve significant savings on a third MYP.

The committee remains supportive of the 5th generation F–35, Joint Strike Fighter. This provision should in no way be misconstrued as a lack of support for the F–35. In fact, the Department of Defense's current FYDP funding and quantities for the F–35C program should not be affected if the Navy decides to pursue an F/A–18E/F multiyear contract unless changes to the F–35C program are being made for purposes other than to facilitate purchases of F/A–18E/F aircraft.

Light utility helicopter

The committee understands that the Army's Light Utility Helicopter (LUH) is a commercial off the shelf procurement program that will begin fielding to the National Guard in June 2008. The committee notes that the Army's current procurement plan buys fewer aircraft per fiscal year in 2009, 2010, and 2011. The committee believes that the LUH program may benefit from an accelerated procurement strategy. The committee, therefore, directs the

Secretary of the Army to reevaluate the acquisition strategy for the LUH to determine if an accelerated procurement plan could realize significant economic order quantity unit cost savings, allow the Army to retire aging and more expensive H–1 and H–58 model helicopters, and free up UH–60 Blackhawks for the global war on terror and medium helicopter operations. The Secretary shall provide the congressional defense committees with the results of this reevaluation not later than September 30, 2008.

Material handling equipment study

The committee understands that the U.S. Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) has previously identified significant shortfalls in Air Force material handling equipment (MHE) capable of deploying and operating in austere expeditionary environments. In response, Congress increased funding for the Halvorsen Air Cargo Loader for a number of years.

The committee is concerned that ongoing attrition of older MHE units, increased Army combat end strength potentially requiring increased through put, and procurement of additional strategic and theater lift aircraft including the JCA and KC–X tanker with increased cargo capacity may serve to further exacerbate the operational requirements versus availability of MHE.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, to conduct a comprehensive analysis of current and future MHE requirements across the Air Force, Army, and National Guard, and report to Congress on the findings of the study with the budget request for fiscal year 2010.

Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) included over $17.2 billion for the procurement of more than 15,000 Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles. At the beginning of April 2008, according to the MRAP Joint Program Office, over 3,500 MRAP vehicles had been delivered to the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility—3,368 to Iraq and 154 to Afghanistan. The committee commends the Department of Defense and industry for working together to deliver rapidly to theater this urgently needed piece of equipment.

The committee notes that in the coming months and years, the Department will need to develop a plan to incorporate these vehicles into the tactical wheeled vehicle fleets of the military services and develop a sustainment plan for the eventual transition of these vehicles from contractor logistic support to government support. Further, the Department must begin to account for the full cost of maintaining the different manufacturer variants and to develop as many efficiencies as possible.

The Government Accountability Office has noted that developmental testing of the MRAP continues and that significant engineering change proposals are necessary to address a variety of issues. The committee intends to monitor closely how the Department works to incorporate these changes in the coming months, and the committee expects that the Department will place a high

priority on any force protection and warfighter safety items that may be discovered in the ongoing developmental testing.

The committee also encourages the Department to continue to pursue aggressively force protection technologies that will ensure that our military forces remain the best equipped in the world. The committee continues to monitor a number of ongoing research efforts, including active protection systems, reactive armor, and other add-on armor kits for the existing legacy fleet.

Mission packages

The Navy has embarked on a program to develop modular counter-mine, anti-surface, and anti-submarine warfare systems, referred to as mission packages, to be deployed on the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS). The Navy envisions fielding 60 mission packages, which Navy commanders could interchange across the 55-ship LCS class as operational requirements dictate. This total system capability of the LCS program has been identified by the Chief of Naval Operations as a top priority for operations in the littorals. The committee similarly views the capability provided by a family of LCS mission packages as a key component of the maritime strategy. The committee is, therefore, concerned by the delays to mission package initial operational capability, deployment, and full operational capability caused by delays to the LCS construction program.

The Navy has designed the LCS mission packages with modularity and with open architecture. Having done this, the Navy should be able to deploy this capability on other ship classes. Such an expanded concept of operations would provide opportunities to employ mission packages more rapidly, and against threats and in operational scenarios perhaps not envisioned today.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to evaluate alternatives for employing LCS mission packages on other ship classes of the battle force, and to provide a report on his findings to the congressional defense committees with submission of the 2010 budget request. The report shall outline the feasibility, cost, and impacts associated with integrating mine countermeasures and anti-submarine mission packages on other surface combatant and amphibious force ship classes, and provide an assessment of the operational utility afforded by being able to deploy mission packages across the broader battle force.

Operational support aircraft for U.S. Africa Command

The committee is concerned that the Commander of U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) lacks the necessary air support to execute effectively his mission in a continent comprised of 53 countries, spanning a geographic area larger than the United States, China, and Western Europe combined.

The Air Force has requested a C–37B and a C–40 aircraft for AFRICOM on its unfunded priorities list. The committee considers AFRICOM's operational airlift capability a high priority. The committee requests that the Air Force support the AFRICOM Combatant Commander's requirement with existing assets and, in the future, include these items in its regular budget request.

Shadow unmanned aerial vehicle

The budget request included $316.6 million in Other Procurement, Army for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV). The Army originally submitted a budget request $194.5 million higher in this PE than what was approved for submission to Congress. Included in this amount was $162.4 million for improvements to the Shadow vehicle. The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USDI) cut this amount due to a misunderstanding that the funds were intended to procure many more Shadow units, well beyond the approved procurement objective. The funds were in fact intended to field a heavy fuel engine, a tactical common data link, a laser designator, better cold-weather performance, and improved launch and recovery capabilities for the Shadow UAV.

The committee believes that these proposed improvements are needed not only for better combat performance; all but the laser designator are also important for gaining routine access to national airspace for training and support to domestic emergencies. The committee recommends that the USDI reconsider his position and identify resources for reprogramming to initiate these improvements in fiscal year 2009.

Ship maintenance and material condition

The Navy has determined that a battle force of no less than 313 ships, operating within the framework of the Fleet Response Plan (FRP), is necessary to meet the requirements of the National Security Strategy. The FRP provides the framework for managing training, maintenance, and material readiness to ensure the Navy's ability to command the seas in major combat operations. Successful execution of the FRP relies upon individual unit readiness, which, in turn, relies upon the most fundamental ability to self-assess and maintain material condition. This is particularly critical as today's 280-ship Navy falls well short of the Chief of Naval Operations' requirement for 313 ships.

Chapter 633 of title 10, United States Code, establishes the requirement for a Board of Officers, commonly referred to as the Board of Inspection and Survey, or INSURV, to examine naval vessels. The committee is concerned that recent INSURV reports have found that certain front line ships of the Navy are unfit for combat operations. When forward-deployed mine countermeasure ships were unable to get underway in 2006, the Navy attacked the material issues to restore these ships to high readiness. However, subsequent reports of serious degradation to amphibious ships, and more recently, the determination that two Aegis combatants are "unfit for combat operations," raises concern that there are systemic issues associated with organic level maintenance and self-assessment that jeopardize the Navy's ability to meet its objectives under the FRP.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2010 budget which addresses ship material condition and readiness. The report shall include underway material inspection findings and trends of the INSURV board during 2003–2008, with an analysis of the cause for any downward trends and the actions underway to improve upon these trends. Further, the report shall spe-

cifically address the factors surrounding any ships found to be seriously degraded or unfit for combat operations. The report shall also address the Navy's findings with regard to unit level ability to self-assess and maintain material condition readiness.

In view of the current emphasis by the Navy to reduce shipboard manning, the report shall include the Navy's plan for maintaining material readiness for the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS), which the Navy currently intends to deploy for extended durations. To support these extended deployments, the Navy intends to utilize rotating crews, consisting of substantially less than 50 percent of current combatant crew manning levels. The LCS plan shall include a description of maintenance requirements, performing organizations, budget requirements, and any consideration by the Navy to outsource LCS maintenance.

Warfighter Information Network–Tactical

The committee continues to follow closely the test and evaluation activities associated with the Warfighter Information Network–Tactical (WIN–T) program. Following a fiscal year 2007 Nunn-McCurdy unit cost breach, WIN–T is currently being restructured, and will be fielded in four increments. The first increment absorbs the former Joint Network Node–Network (JNN–N) program and provides the Army an initial battlefield networking capability down to the Army's battalion level. Follow-on increments will provide the Army with greater data capacity and more agile on-the-move capabilities. Increment 3 is intended to provide the Army with full interoperability with the Future Combat System (FCS).

The committee continues to recognize the importance of this program to the Army's overall modernization efforts. However, the committee shares the concerns raised by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) regarding the risk involved in pursuing an Initial Operational Test and Evaluation (IOT&E) without proper documentation and test resourcing. Now that the Army has completed its WIN–T Overarching Acquisition Strategy Report with accompanying Increment 1 Annex, the committee believes the Army must complete its WIN–T Increment 1 Test and Evaluation Master Plan and IOT&E test plan with certification by DOT&E. Further, the committee believes it is critical that the Army test systems that are procured under the WIN–T Increment 1 contract, not equipment procured under the JNN–N contract. Additionally, the committee emphasizes that, for both WIN–T Increment 1 and 2 operational testing, the Army must use field representative units engaged in a full spectrum operations scenario.

Further, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisitions, Technology, and Logistics and the DOT&E, to report, no later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, on the Army's: (1) initial operational test plan, as approved by the DOT&E for WIN–T Increment 1 as well as Test and Evaluation Master Plans for WIN–T Increments 1,2, and 3; (2) current plans to develop a baseline for WIN–T Increment 3; (3) timeline and details for a memorandum of agreement on requirements stability between FCS and WIN–T program offices; and (4) plans for completing an independent life cycle cost estimate for WIN–T Increment 3.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Explanation of tables

The following tables provide the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title II of this Act. The tables also display the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2009 budget request for research and development programs, and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts.

These tables are incorporated by reference into this Act as provided in section 1002 of this Act. The Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	10,524,085	331,125	10,855,210
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	19,337,238	104,954	19,442,192
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	28,066,617	255,860	28,322,477
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	21,499,229	-574,500	20,924,729
Operational Test & Evaluation	188,772	0	188,772
TOTAL RDT&E	79,615,941	117,439	79,733,380

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Requirement for plan on overhead nonimaging infrared systems (sec. 211)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a comprehensive plan to conduct and support research, development, and demonstration of technologies that could evolve into the next generation of overhead nonimaging systems. The plan would also include an explanation of how such systems would be tested, including any flight or on-orbit testing as well as how and when the technologies would transition to an acquisition program. In addition, the provision would prohibit appropriation of more than 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the third generation infrared surveillance program until the plan is submitted to the congressional defense committees.

Advanced battery manufacturing and technology roadmap (sec. 212)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a detailed roadmap for the development of advanced battery technologies, and a domestic manufacturing base and assured supply chain to meet current and future military requirements. The committee notes that the Defense Science Board Task Force on DOD Energy Strategy has highlighted the importance of advanced battery technologies in meeting military vehicle power and portable power requirements. The committee also notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) expends significant resources on the procurement of legacy batteries, and makes some investments in next-generation battery technologies.

The committee believes that advanced battery technologies can play a key role in improving system performance and reducing operating and system life cycle costs. However, the committee is concerned about the Department's ability to access reliable, trusted sources of advanced battery technologies, especially given the diminishing domestic manufacturing base for these systems. The committee believes that the roadmap required by this section will serve to better coordinate service and agency efforts in battery technologies and directly tie investments to specific capability gaps, technological opportunities, and military requirements. The committee directs that the roadmap be developed in cooperation with each of the military departments, the defense and automotive industries, academia, and the Department of Energy, to ensure that future investments, programs, and plans are well coordinated and that technological and manufacturing capabilities serve dual-use purposes where applicable and advantageous to the Department.

Availability of funds for defense laboratories for research and development of technologies for military missions (sec. 213)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish mechanisms through which laboratory directors would be able to set aside up to 3 percent of funding available to their laboratories to support defense missions. The funds would be available for the purposes of investing in innovative in-house research projects, promoting transition of laboratory-developed technologies into operational systems, or for science and engineering workforce enhancement activities. The committee believes that the funds to be used under the authority of this provision should be a portion of those that are currently directly appropriated funds; are funds derived from work for other Department of Defense organizations, other federal agencies, and non-federal organizations; or from other sources of laboratory revenue.

The committee notes that the Department of Energy laboratories have had a similar authority, known as the Laboratory Directed Research and Development program. This authority is generally viewed as a necessary tool to support innovative research at those laboratories and retain and recruit the finest scientific talent, which helps ensure that the laboratories remain world class research institutions. Over the years, a number of independent groups, including the Defense Science Board, National Research Council, and Naval Research Advisory Committee have recommended similar authority for Department of Defense laboratories. The committee feels that this authority, if properly used, can help revitalize the defense laboratories and enable them to better support departmental missions and remain technically on par with their private sector, international, and other federal peers.

Assured funding for certain information security and information assurance programs of the Department of Defense (sec. 214)

The National Security Agency (NSA) and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Network and Information Integration (ASD/NII) have attempted for a number of years to persuade the Office of Management and Budget to establish a budget line item for information assurance anticipatory development within the Department of Defense (DOD). While these efforts have not been successful, the committee believes that the arguments in favor of such a program are compelling.

The information technology (IT) industry is the most vibrant and rapidly evolving industry in the world. The Department attempts to acquire or make use of these commercial IT advances to achieve efficiencies and improved operational effectiveness. However, DOD cannot effectively adopt this technology if it cannot be used securely, yet the Department has no appropriate mechanism for keeping pace with the march of technology development.

There is, for example, an outstanding requirement for a very high speed Internet Protocol encryption capability, but NSA has almost no resources with which to respond. The executive branch recently had to launch a satellite that lacked encryption for a key wideband downlink. The Advanced Extremely High Frequency Sat-

ellite program was delayed because of a belated encryption subsystem development effort. These types of requirements can be anticipated and, with modest funding, security solutions can be developed to match acquisition schedules.

The committee recommends a provision that would impose a permanent 1 percent tax on the Department's information systems security program, other information assurance programs, and the non-National Intelligence Program-funded cyber security initiative to finance this new program.

The committee directs that the program be executed by NSA's Information Assurance Directorate unless otherwise specified by the ASD/NII. The ASD/NII shall review and approve expenditures under this program. The committee urges the administration to vitiate the need for this statute-based funding mechanism by submitting its own budget request for this activity.

Requirements for certain airborne intelligence collection systems (sec. 215)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that, by October 1, 2012, all intelligence collection aircraft that provide data to, or receive tasking from, the joint Distributed Common Ground/Surface System (DCGS) be connected to, and able to fully operate with, the Network Centric Collaborative Targeting (NCCT) network. The provision would provide for waivers on a case-by-case basis. The committee stresses that the RIVET JOINT RC–135 signals intelligence system is considered to be connected to the DCGS system via its satellite-based reachback capability, and therefore would be subject to the requirements of this provision.

The committee believes that NCCT is an important intelligence and targeting capability that has not received adequate resources or management attention. Intelligence budget requests are generally based on inputs from the program managers of the collection platforms and few of them see that allocating scarce resources to connect to the NCCT network is a high priority because doing so benefits consumers in general. The operational utility of universal NCCT participation for commanders is not reflected in the programming process. The committee urges the Office of the Secretary of Defense to impose a joint perspective to NCCT.

Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs

Review of the ballistic missile defense policy and strategy of the United States (sec. 231)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the ballistic missile defense policy and strategy of the United States, and to report the results of the review to Congress not later than January 31, 2010. The provision specifies a number of elements to be considered in the review.

The committee believes it is essential for the next administration to conduct a full review of missile defense policy, strategy, and related matters at the outset of its tenure. The previous missile defense policy review was conducted before the United States had deployed any missile defense systems other than the Patriot system.

In order to expedite the deployment of an initial set of missile defense capabilities, the Missile Defense Agency was created and given extraordinary acquisition flexibility and authority, and high levels of concurrency were adopted.

Now that the initial missile defense capabilities have been deployed or are under production, the circumstances warrant a new overarching review to guide the next phase of U.S. missile defense programs and activities.

Limitation on availability of funds for procurement, construction, and deployment of missile defenses in Europe (sec. 232)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the availability of fiscal year 2009 funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act from being obligated or expended for procurement, site activation, construction, preparation of equipment for, or deployment of major components of a long-range missile defense system in a European country until two conditions have been met: (1) the government of the country in which such major components of such missile defense system (including interceptors and associated radars) are proposed to be deployed has given final approval (including parliamentary ratification) to any missile defense agreements negotiated between such government and the United States Government concerning the proposed deployment of such components in such country; and (2) 45 days have elapsed following the receipt by Congress of the report required by section 226(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

The provision would also limit the availability of fiscal year 2009 funds for the acquisition (other than initial long lead procurement) or deployment of operational interceptor missiles for the proposed long-range missile defense system in Europe until the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress, after receiving the views of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, that the proposed interceptor to be deployed as part of such a missile defense system has demonstrated, through successful, operationally realistic flight testing, that it has a high probability of accomplishing its mission in an operationally effective manner.

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

The committee notes that the provision would adopt the same standard that was enacted in section 226 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) with respect to the availability of funds for the proposed deployment of a long-range missile defense system in Europe. The provision would make clear that if a European host nation provides final approval of a negotiated deployment agreement with the United States, it would be able to proceed without waiting for the final approval of another European nation on any missile defense agreements negotiated with the United States.

The provision would also clarify that initial long-lead procurement of parts for the planned 2-stage interceptors could be acquired. The committee notes that the initial long lead items planned for procurement are 100 percent common with both the 2-stage and 3-stage Ground-Based Interceptors (GBIs). Therefore, they could be used for purposes other than being deployed on operational 2-stage GBIs if necessary, including for flight test and ground test interceptors for either 3-stage or 2-stage GBIs. As described elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends authorizing initial funding for these long lead parts, with the understanding that if there are problems with the 2-stage GBI development program, these long lead parts would be used for other purposes, rather than being wasted or deployed before the 2-stage GBI is certified as ready.

The United States is continuing its negotiations with Poland and the Czech Republic on agreements concerning the proposed deployment of 10 GBI missiles in Poland and a midcourse X-band radar in the Czech Republic. Although the negotiations with the Czech Republic appear to be nearly complete, the negotiations with Poland could still take months to complete, and are conditioned on whether the United States meets Poland's requests for security enhancements. If the negotiations are concluded successfully, it will take additional time for the Polish and Czech parliaments to consider ratification of the agreements. Consequently, it remains unclear whether or when any agreements would be finally approved, a necessary condition before beginning any proposed construction or deployment.

The committee notes that the proposed 2-stage interceptor intended for deployment in Poland is still being developed, and is not scheduled to have its first booster flight test until the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2009. Given that a number of Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) flight tests have been delayed substantially, it is possible that the 2-stage GBI tests will also be delayed.

In an October 2007 report, the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) noted the "significant differences" between the proposed GMD deployment with a 2-stage interceptor in Europe and the existing GMD system deployed in the United States with a 3-stage GBI. According to the report, "European defense using GMD assets is a completely new mission area for GMD." The report provided DOT&E's initial testing concept for the proposed European deployment, which would include three flight tests, two of which would be intercept tests. The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) was originally planning to conduct only two flight tests prior to deploying the system, one of which would be an intercept test. This planned flight test program would not meet the DOT&E minimum test plan concept. It is difficult to envision the certification required of the Secretary of Defense under these circumstances. However, MDA has recently agreed to conduct three flight tests, in accordance with the DOT&E test concept. The committee views this as a positive development.

The committee notes that, in their Bucharest summit declaration in April, Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) recognized the substantial contribution of the planned deployment to the protection of NATO allies against long-range mis-

siles, and said they were exploring ways to link the planned capability with NATO missile defense efforts. They also said they would develop options for a comprehensive NATO missile defense architecture to provide coverage of the portions of NATO Europe that would not be covered by the planned U.S. deployment, in order to inform any future political decision by NATO on whether and how to provide defensive coverage for the portion of its territory that would not be protected against ballistic missiles, including from the hundreds of Iranian ballistic missiles that exist today.

Airborne Laser system (sec. 233)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) to review and evaluate the testing conducted on the first Airborne Laser (ABL) aircraft and to report to the Secretary of Defense and to Congress, not later than January 15, 2010, his assessment of the operational effectiveness, suitability, and survivability of the ABL system. The provision would also limit the availability of funds for procurement of a second ABL aircraft until the Secretary of Defense, after receiving the assessment of DOT&E, certifies that the ABL system has demonstrated, through successful testing and operational and cost analysis, a high probability of being operationally effective, suitable, survivable, and affordable.

The committee observes that Missile Defense Agency officials indicated in a briefing to staff that the authority to proceed with the second ABL aircraft has been granted on the condition that the planned 2009 first shoot-down demonstration test is successful, and that the budget request included $15.8 million to begin studies and analysis on a second ABL aircraft. The committee believes that a decision on whether to proceed with a possible second ABL aircraft should only be made after much more information is available about the likelihood that the system could eventually provide an operationally effective, suitable, survivable, and affordable missile defense capability.

As the committee noted last year, the ABL program has many unanswered questions about operational effectiveness, suitability, survivability, and affordability. The committee believes these questions need to be answered before making a commitment to procure a second ABL aircraft.

Annual Director of Operational Test and Evaluation characterization of operational effectiveness, suitability, and survivability of the Ballistic Missile Defense System (sec. 234)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the annual report by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) on the testing of the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) to include a characterization of the operational effectiveness, suitability, and survivability of the BMDS and its elements that have been fielded or tested before the end of the previous fiscal year.

Section 232(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) requires DOT&E to provide an annual report to Congress assessing the adequacy and sufficiency

of the test program of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) during the previous fiscal year. Section 234(b)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) requires DOT&E to submit a report to Congress providing his characterization of the operational effectiveness, suitability, and survivability of the BMDS at the conclusion of testing of each 2-year block of the BMDS. However, MDA eliminated the previous 2-year block structure and replaced it with functional blocks that respond to specific threats. These new blocks have no timelines associated with them, thus changing the schedule assumptions of section 234(b)(2). This provision would retain the requirement for DOT&E to report to Congress on the characterization of the BMDS, consistent with the new MDA block structure.

The committee notes that the DOT&E annual missile defense testing report for 2007 included the DOT&E characterization of the operational effectiveness, suitability, and survivability of the Block 2006 BMD system and its elements, in fulfillment of the requirements of section 234(b)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. In testimony before the committee, Dr. Charles McQueary, the DOT&E, stated that he plans to include this characterization information in future annual DOT&E reports on missile defense testing.

Independent assessment of boost-phase missile defense programs (sec. 235)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct an independent assessment of the boost-phase missile defense programs of the United States to consider the extent to which boost-phase missile defense is feasible, practical, and affordable, and whether any of the existing boost-phase missile defense technology programs of the Department of Defense (particularly the Airborne Laser and the Kinetic Energy Interceptor) have a high probability of performing a boost-phase missile defense mission in an operationally effective, suitable, survivable, and affordable manner. Upon completion of its assessment, the National Academy would submit a report on the results of its assessment to the Secretary of Defense and the congressional defense committees, along with any recommendations the Academy considers appropriate.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense will have spent over $5.1 billion since 1996 on the Airborne Laser (ABL) technology demonstration program to conduct the first proof of principle missile shoot-down demonstration test in 2009, and an additional $2.8 billion in the 4-year period starting in fiscal year 2010. The Congressional Budget Office provided an initial estimate that a fleet of seven ABL aircraft could cost as much as $36.0 billion to develop, acquire, and operate. Additionally, the Department plans to spend more than $3.6 billion over the 7-year period starting in fiscal year 2007 on technology development for the Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI) as a possible boost-phase intercept system. Despite these significant past and planned expenditures, there is no assurance that either of these systems will work in an operationally effective, practical, or affordable manner.

As the committee noted last year, the ABL program has a host of significant unanswered questions related to whether it could work in an operationally effective, suitable, survivable, and affordable manner. For example, the ABL concept is to destroy a missile body—not the warhead—while it is boosting. By the time this intercept would take place, the missile could have achieved sufficient velocity to travel well outside the border of the nation that launched it. Thus, the warhead could continue to fly to an unintended location, including possibly an allied country where U.S. forces are deployed, and cause significant damage. Also, for the aircraft to have any possibility of conducting intercepts, it would have to be flying at exactly the right place and the right time, out of range of air defenses, but within range of a boosting missile. Given these constraints, there appear to be practical limits to the ability of an ABL system to operate against most nations that possess ballistic missiles.

In its March 2007 report, "Defense Acquisitions: Missile Defense Acquisition Strategy Generates Results but Delivers Less at a Higher Cost," the Government Accountability Office recommended an independent evaluation of ABL and KEI "to inform decisions on the future of the two programs." The statement of managers to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) expressed the view that an independent review should be conducted of the ABL and KEI programs.

The committee believes it would be important to have an independent, technically competent review of the feasibility, practicality, and affordability of boost-phase missile defense programs to help inform future decisions on missile defense investments.

Study on space-based interceptor element of ballistic missile defense system (sec. 236)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with one or more independent entities to conduct a review of the feasibility and advisability of developing a space-based interceptor element to the ballistic missile defense system. The provision would require that the contract be entered into after consultation with the Chairman and Ranking members of the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and no later than 75 days after the date this Act is enacted. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to undertake a thorough consultation with the Committees on Armed Services in advance of selecting the independent entity or entities to conduct the study.

The independent entities could be federally funded research and development centers, including the Department of Energy National Laboratories, recognized scientific and technical organizations such as the National Academy of Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Physical Society, or drawn from academia such as JASON.

The provision would direct the report be provided simultaneously to the Committees on Armed Services and to the Secretary of Defense and would permit the Secretary a period of 60 days to submit comments or recommendations with respect to the report to the

committees. The report and any comments would be submitted in an unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

The provision would authorize $5.0 million from funds available to the Missile Defense Agency for the study.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Modification of systems subject to survivability testing by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (sec. 251)

The committee recommends a provision that would ensure that the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) can perform adequate and necessary oversight over the live fire, survivability, and lethality testing of critical defense systems. The committee has been concerned about the oversight of testing, and the lack of standardized testing for systems fielded to personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan, including personnel protective equipment such as body armor and helmets. The committee attempted to enhance testing and DOT&E oversight authority over testing of these types of systems through statutory changes in section 231 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). Section 231 intended to authorize the DOT&E to perform necessary oversight activities over force protection and non-lethal weapon systems.

The committee feels that the ability of the DOT&E to perform his intended role to ensure that fielded systems are survivable is hindered by lack of statutory authority and limited cooperation by the military services. The committee notes that the DOT&E has worked effectively in partnership with the services in performing testing oversight duties on important rapid development and fielding initiatives like the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicle, which have contributed to improving the survivability and performance of the systems without unnecessary delay in development or fielding of vital combat systems.

The committee directs the secretaries of the military departments to ensure that programs designated for survivability oversight by the DOT&E under this authority cooperate fully with testing oversight officials such that all equipment fielded to deployed personnel is safe, survivable, and of the highest performance possible.

Biennial reports on joint and service concept development and experimentation (sec. 252)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the existing reporting requirement on joint warfighting experimentation activities. The provision would reduce the reporting requirement from annual to biennial and change the report's focus to better reflect the current state of concept development and experimentation activities in the Department of Defense, and better highlight current and future activities that will enable robust joint warfighting capabilities.

The committee commends United States Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) for its extensive efforts in concept development and experimentation. To date, JFCOM activities have explored a number

of emerging operational concepts, capabilities, and technologies, including addressing future homeland defense, interagency cooperation, urban operations, and multinational operations scenarios. However, it is not clear that JFCOM is placing a high enough priority on experimentation with future concepts and technologies that could be operationally employed in a time frame of greater than 10 years. The committee is also concerned that the efforts of JFCOM in this regard have not had sufficient and wide ranging impacts across the organizational and force structures, doctrine, and materiel development activities of the Department of Defense. The committee also notes that the services continue to pursue their own warfighting experimentation and concept development activities, though often in a manner poorly coordinated with joint efforts. Therefore, the provision's reporting requirements include focused reporting on "futures" experimentation, an assessment of the return on investments in concept development and experimentation activities in terms of specific outcomes and impacts within the Department of Defense, and descriptions of the concept development and experimentation activities of the military departments.

Further, the committee notes that the JFCOM Commander's activities in joint training, provision of joint forces, and position as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Supreme Allied Commander for Transformation may also serve to motivate recommended changes in the Department's organizational and force structure, doctrine, and materiel development efforts, which should also be incorporated into the recommendations included in the report.

Finally, the committee directs the secretaries of the military departments to support the development of this report through coordination, appropriate resources, and supplying required information in a timely manner.

Repeal of annual reporting requirement relating to the Technology Transition Initiative (sec. 253)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the recurring reporting requirement on the Technology Transition Initiative (TTI). The committee originally proposed this initiative in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) in order to accelerate the transition of technologies from science and technology programs into operational use. The initiative was codified in section 242 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314).

The committee notes that the TTI is currently successfully transitioning roughly 70 percent of its funded projects into operational use. This committee believes that this success is a result of the initiative's flexible funding, cost sharing requirements, and joint and service participation in the selection and funding of projects. The committee notes that the statute and processes of the TTI have contributed to enhancing the links between technology developers, requirements generators, and operators, and have successfully enhanced transition efficiency and speed. The committee notes that there are now a number of parallel initiatives and programs seeking to accelerate technology transition in the Depart-

ment of Defense, including, but not limited to, the Quick Reaction Fund, the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund, the work of the Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell, many Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency efforts, and the Army Agile Integration and Demonstration program.

The committee notes that some of these programs may be duplicative and others may not be adequately coordinated with partner services, agencies, and operational users, but rather are flexible funds used solely in the discretion of a single organization. The committee notes that the desire for complete flexibility in the use of appropriated funds is a necessary but insufficient condition for enhancing technology transition, and can lead to problems in ensuring adequate oversight and in coordination between elements of the Department. The committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense, working through the Technology Transition Council, continue to review these programs and their relative merits and authorities and recommend any necessary consolidation, expansion, or changes in statutory authorities, or other changes in regulations or execution that would increase their efficiency and effectiveness.

Executive agent for printed circuit board technology (sec. 254)

The committee recommends a provision that would follow the recommendations of the National Research Council and a report of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness and would require the establishment of an executive agent to oversee Department of Defense (DOD) activities related to printed circuit board technologies. The committee notes that the National Research Council's Board on Manufacturing and Engineering Design studied the issue of DOD access to legacy and future generations of printed circuit board technologies to support defense and other missions. The resulting 2005 report made a series of recommendations designed to ensure DOD access to printed circuit board technology and enable the development of new capabilities needed to support emerging requirements.

In March 2008, a Principal Response Team convened by the Navy and Defense Logistics Agency, and consisting of membership from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the National Security Agency, the military services, and the Departments of State and Energy, reported to Congress that "DOD concurs with comments on all NRC recommendations," and identified current and potential actions to address each one.

The committee notes that printed circuit board technologies are critical components of numerous defense systems, and cost the Department roughly $500.0 million annually. There are strong and growing concerns related to the development of next-generation capabilities, to preserving assured access to trusted sources of technology due to a diminishing domestic manufacturing base, and even to the trustworthiness of existing supplies of printed circuit board technology being used for military systems. The committee notes that DOD efforts to address these issues have been underfunded and disjointed in the past. The establishment of an executive agent can raise the profile of risk issues related to printed circuit board technological, as well as production and acquisition

issues, and help ensure that these concerns are better addressed in future budgets, plans, and programs. The committee further notes that the March 2008 DOD report recommended a series of possible actions for the executive agent to undertake to address a variety of issues. The committee directs the executive agent to carefully analyze and evaluate these recommendations and act on them as appropriate.

Report on Department of Defense response to findings and recommendations of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Directed Energy Weapons (sec. 255)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop specific responses to the findings and recommendations of the December 2007 Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on Directed Energy Weapons. The DSB found that directed energy offers promise as a "transformational game changer," but that "years of investment have not resulted in any current operational high-energy laser capability." The DSB made a series of recommendations broadly aimed at accelerating the operational use of directed energy weapons, including: better defining concepts of operations for directed energy weapons; better understanding the relative benefits and disadvantages of directed energy systems versus traditional, kinetic systems; and better focusing research and development and science and technology investments on high priority potential operational solutions and on resolving specific high priority technical issues.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to coordinate a formal response to the DSB findings and recommendations in concert with appropriate technology development, requirements generation, and operational communities. The committee also directs that the required analysis address the important issue of assuring that the Department of Defense has sufficient testing expertise and infrastructure to adequately perform all necessary developmental and operational tests on directed energy systems.

Assessment of standards for mission critical semiconductors procured by the Department of Defense (sec. 256)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to perform an assessment of existing and emerging technical methods for verifying the trustworthiness of semiconductors procured for use in critical defense applications.

The committee notes that the manufacture of semiconductors has continued to migrate to off-shore foundries, particularly to foundries in China. Since the defense semiconductor market comprises only 1 percent of the overall global semiconductor market, the Department of Defense's (DOD) ability to procure high end semiconductor technologies is largely dependent on commercial interests, practices, and markets.

The committee notes that the Department is currently depending primarily on a single source for high end semiconductors for defense and intelligence applications through the DOD Trusted Foundry program, which was established in 2004. The February 2005 report by the Defense Science Board Task Force on High Performance Microchip supply stated that the Trusted Foundry Pro-

gram is an interim source of high performance integrated circuits (ICs) and was appropriate for addressing the immediate needs for trusted sources of IC supply. Since that time, the trend of migration of semiconductor manufacturing overseas has continued, making it more urgent to augment the Trusted Foundry by developing a more comprehensive approach for the procurement of trusted parts.

The committee notes that one issue that needs to be addressed by the Department through the required assessment is providing defense programs assurance of dependable, continuous, long-term access to trusted, mission critical semiconductors from both foreign and domestic sources for its potentially vulnerable defense systems. DOD needs for integrated circuits include high end semiconductors, custom Application Specific Integrated Circuits (ASICs), and Field Programmable Gate Arrays (FPGAs). The committee notes that the assurance of trust includes verifying that the semiconductor has not been tampered with or modified in any way, and performs only the functions expected and required. This also requires assurance that the design process, fabrication, packaging, final assembly, and test of semiconductors are also free from tampering.

The recommended provision would require that the Department inventory and possibly implement the best methods currently available for assuring trust. The committee recommends that the Department put in place an overall policy and direction, as well as a plan for the procurement of semiconductors that assures continuous access and trust to support military requirements. The committee believes the Department also needs to monitor and implement new techniques and approaches as they become available through technological advances.

Finally, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to keep the congressional defense committees informed of the actions taken pursuant to this provision.

Budget Items

Army

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	19,832		19,832
0601102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	176,959	7,500	184,459
		Advanced energy storage research		[3,000]	
		Drug resistant infections research		[1,500]	
		Military operating environments research		[1,500]	
		Organic semiconductor modeling and simulation		[1,500]	
0601103A	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	76,980	9,200	86,180
		Low temperature vehicle performance research		[2,000]	
		Nanocomposite materials research		[2,000]	
		Nanocomposite wireless power systems research		[1,500]	
		Nanoscale biosensor research		[2,500]	
		Urban simulation and training research		[1,200]	
0601104A	4	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	105,622		105,622
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, ARMY	**379,393**	**16,700**	**396,093**

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602105A	5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	26,985	9,675	36,660
		Cold spray technology development		[2,000]	
		Composite materials applied research and technology		[2,000]	
		Improvised explosive device blast simulations		[475]	
		Magnetic nanosensor development		[2,000]	
		Nanosensor manufacturing research		[1,500]	
		Ultrasonic consolidation research		[1,700]	
0602120A	6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	46,147	2,000	48,147
		Hydrogen battery research		[2,000]	
0602122A	7	TRACTOR HIP	18,192		18,192
0602211A	8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	42,013	2,500	44,513
		Slowed-rotor technologies		[2,500]	
0602270A	9	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	16,611		16,611
0602303A	10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	48,174		48,174
0602307A	11	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	19,664		19,664
0602308A	12	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	17,048	3,000	20,048
		Photonics research for sniper detection		[3,000]	

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0602601A	13	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	55,234	18,000	73,234
		Advanced vehicle technology and fuel development		[1,500]	
		Condition based maintenance simulation tools		[4,500]	
		Fuel cell development for medium and heavy-duty vehicles		[4,000]	
		Ground vehicle reliability modeling		[2,000]	
		Hybrid electric vehicle batteries for FCS		[2,000]	
		Lightweight electric drive technologies		[2,000]	
		Military fuels research program		[2,000]	
0602618A	14	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY / ROBOTICS	71,550		71,550
0602622A	15	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	2,295		2,295
0602623A	16	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,531		7,531
0602624A	17	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	30,576	3,500	34,076
		UGV weaponization		[3,500]	
0602705A	18	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	45,278	2,000	47,278
		Soldier portable power pack technologies		[2,000]	
0602709A	19	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	25,647		25,647
0602712A	20	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	21,815	3,000	24,815
		Standoff IED detection technologies		[3,000]	
0602716A	21	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	17,348		17,348
0602720A	22	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	16,064		16,064
0602782A	23	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	24,014	2,000	26,014
		Portable compass/positioning/timing device development		[2,000]	
0602783A	24	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	5,495		5,495

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0602784A	25	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	52,066	4,000	56,066
		Geosciences and atmospheric research		[2,500]	
		Nanocomposite panels for blast and ballistic protection		[1,500]	
0602785A	26	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	16,412		16,412
0602786A	27	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	21,948	3,000	24,948
		Ballistic materials for force protection		[1,500]	
		Mobile feeding unit development		[1,500]	
0602787A	28	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	75,395	35,500	110,895
		Bioengineering research		[2,500]	
		Biomechanics research		[1,000]	
		Blast wave effect modeling		[5,000]	
		Dengue fever treatment research		[2,000]	
		Dried blood technology clinical research		[2,000]	
		Extremity war Injuries research program		[5,000]	
		Genetics research for soldier survivability		[2,000]	
		Military photomedicine program		[8,000]	
		Nanomaterials research for biological processes		[2,000]	
		PTSD research		[2,500]	
		Traumatic brain injury research		[3,500]	
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, ARMY	**723,502**	**88,175**	**811,677**

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603001A	29	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	46,793	3,500	50,293
		Biosensor controller systems development		[3,500]	
0603002A	30	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	59,043	46,000	105,043
		Advanced fibrin dressings		[5,000]	
		Battlefield tracheal intubation technologies		[2,000]	
		Bioelectrics research		[2,000]	
		Combat wound initiative		[5,500]	
		Electronic vital signs monitoring		[3,000]	
		Gulf War veterans' illnesses research		[13,000]	
		Joint medical logistics modernization program		[4,000]	
		Lower limb prosthetics research		[2,500]	
		Mild traumatic brain injury assessment sensor research		[2,000]	
		Online military medical training program		[2,000]	
		Regenerative medicine research		[5,000]	
0603003A	31	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,277	7,000	64,277
		Helicopter vulnerability reduction technologies		[1,500]	
		Tactical integration systems development		[3,500]	
		UAV payload delivery systems		[2,000]	
0603004A	32	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	73,697		73,697

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603005A	33	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	107,992	100,250	208,242
		Advanced battery development program		[10,000]	
		Advanced digital hydraulic hybrid drive systems		[3,500]	
		Advanced lithium vehicle battery systems		[3,000]	
		Advanced tactical wheeled vehicle electric drive systems		[5,000]	
		Advanced thermal and oil management controls research		[5,000]	
		Antiballistic windshield armor		[4,000]	
		Composite armor cab development		[2,000]	
		Development of logistical fuel processors		[3,500]	
		Diverse threat sensor development		[1,000]	
		Dynamometer facility upgrade		[4,250]	
		Fastening & joining research		[2,000]	
		Ground vehicle integration technologies		[4,000]	
		Hostile fire detection systems		[2,500]	
		Hybrid electric blast protected vehicle technologies		[4,000]	
		Hybrid engine development program		[6,000]	
		Hydraulic hybrid vehicle systems		[3,000]	
		Next generation non-tactical vehicle propulsion technologies		[5,000]	
		Nickel metal hydride battery development		[2,000]	
		Power and energy research equipment upgrades		[12,000]	
		Power management control and integration systems		[2,000]	
		Solid hydrogen storage systems development		[1,000]	
		Unmanned ground vehicle initiative		[12,000]	
		Vehicle prognostics technologies		[3,500]	

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603006A	34	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,183		9,183
0603007A	35	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	6,853		6,853
0603008A	36	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	50,961		50,961
0603009A	37	TRACTOR HIKE	14,562		14,562
0603015A	38	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	18,881	5,500	24,381
		Joint fires training systems		[3,500]	
		Modeling architectures for battle command experimentation		[2,000]	
0603020A	39	TRACTOR ROSE	11,575		11,575
0603100A	40	IED DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603103A	41	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	10,564	500	11,064
		Deactivation of military explosives research		[500]	
0603105A	42	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	7,116		7,116
0603125A	43	COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,064		13,064
0603238A	44	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION			
0603270A	45	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	23,996	2,000	25,996
		Laser development for light aircraft missile defense		[2,000]	
0603313A	46	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	63,998	1,000	64,998
		Hypersonic interceptor studies		[1,000]	
0603322A	47	TRACTOR CAGE	12,372		12,372
0603606A	48	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	30,797		30,797
0603607A	49	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	8,809		8,809

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603710A	50	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,916	3,500	43,416
		Short range electro-optic sensors		[3,500]	
0603728A	51	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	15,519		15,519
0603734A	52	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	7,654	3,000	10,654
		Direct methanol fuel cell development		[2,000]	
		Fuel cell technologies for continuity of operations		[1,000]	
0603772A	53	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	48,236		48,236
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, ARMY	**738,858**	**172,250**	**911,108**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
0603024A	54	UNIQUE ITEM IDENTIFICATION (UID)	649	2,000	2,649
		Unique item ID data management research		[2,000]	
0603305A	55	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION(NON SPACE)	14,005	15,500	29,505
		Advanced electronics integration		[4,000]	
		Advanced environmental control systems		[5,000]	
		Advanced fuel cell research		[3,500]	
		Radiation hardening initiative		[3,000]	
0603308A	56	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (SPACE)	19,986	3,000	22,986
		High-altitude integration testbed		[3,000]	
0603327A	57	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	116,410	5,000	121,410
		IAMD architecture analysis program		[5,000]	
0603460A	58	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)			

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603619A	59	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	29,234		29,234
0603627A	60	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	3,840		3,840
0603639A	61	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION / FCS	45,866		45,866
0603653A	62	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	108,012	4,500	112,512
		Stryker active protection system		[4,500]	
0603747A	63	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	30,716		30,716
0603766A	64	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	12,275		12,275
0603774A	65	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	2,588		2,588
0603779A	66	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	5,355		5,355
0603782A	67	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL	414,357		414,357
0603790A	68	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	5,041		5,041
0603801A	69	AVIATION - ADV DEV	7,455		7,455
0603804A	70	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	44,141		44,141
0603805A	71	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	17,788		17,788
0603807A	72	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	26,308		26,308
0603827A	73	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	36,558		36,558
0603850A	74	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	11,238		11,238
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES, ARMY	**951,822**	**30,000**	**981,822**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
0603808A	75	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM			

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604201A	76	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	71,562	3,000	74,562
		Vibration management enhancement research		[3,000]	
0604220A	77	ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELOCOPTER (ARH)	135,652		135,652
0604270A	78	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT (MIP)	32,325		32,325
0604321A	79	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	16,465		16,465
0604328A	80	TRACTOR CAGE	16,807		16,807
0604329A	81	COMMON MISSILE			
0604601A	82	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	42,414	3,000	45,414
		Next generation helmet		[3,000]	
0604604A	83	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,949		1,949
0604609A	84	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS	5,603		5,603
0604622A	85	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	2,901		2,901
0604633A	86	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	14,214		14,214
0604642A	87	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES		5,000	5,000
		HMMWV modernization research		[5,000]	
0604645A	88	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-SDD			
0604646A	89	NON-LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM	200,099	2,000	202,099
		NLOS-LS anti-tamper research		[2,000]	
0604647A	90	NON-LINE OF SIGHT CANNON	89,841		89,841
0604660A	91	FCS MANNED GRD VEHICLES & COMMON GRD VEHICLE	774,257		774,257
0604661A	92	FCS SYSTEMS OF SYSTEMS ENGR & PROGRAM MGMT	1,413,945		1,413,945
0604662A	93	FCS RECONNAISSANCE (UAV) PLATFORMS	34,379		34,379
0604663A	94	FCS UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLES	96,918		96,918
0604664A	95	FCS UNATTENDED GROUND SENSORS	12,967		12,967

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604665A	96	FCS SUSTAINMENT & TRAINING R&D	539,145		539,145
0604666A	97	MODULAR BRIGADE ENHANCEMENT	64,900		64,900
0604710A	98	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS	44,508		44,508
0604713A	99	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	2,499		2,499
0604715A	100	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - SDD	35,424	6,000	41,424
		Urban training development		[6,000]	
0604741A	101	AIR DEFENSE CZ AND INTELLIGENCE - (C-RAM)	22,415		22,415
0604742A	102	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	26,244		26,244
0604746A	103	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	23,582		23,582
0604760A	104	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)	16,095		16,095
0604780A	105	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	29,468		29,468
0604783A	106	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	676		676
0604802A	107	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - SDD	52,140	3,000	55,140
		Extended range sniper rifle research		[3,000]	
0604804A	108	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT	37,718		37,718
0604805A	109	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	9,795		9,795
0604807A	110	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - SDD	34,971		34,971
0604808A	111	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER (FCS)	126,475		126,475
0604812A	112	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0604814A	113	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS / XM 982	78,197		78,197
0604817A	114	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	10,909		10,909
0604818A	115	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	67,535		67,535
0604820A	116	RADAR DEVELOPMENT			

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604822A	117	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	60,308		60,308
0604823A	118	FIREFINDER	47,845		47,845
0604827A	119	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - WARRIOR	15,790		15,790
0604854A	120	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS	42,300		42,300
0604869A	121	PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM (CAP)	431,270		431,270
0604870A	122	NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL MONITORING SENSOR NETWORK	6,260		6,260
0605013A	123	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	73,740		73,740
0605450A	124	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	118,517		118,517
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION, ARMY	**4,981,024**	**22,000**	**5,003,024**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0603808A	125	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0604256A	126	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	21,416		21,416
0604258A	127	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,498	3,000	16,498
		Fixed-wing aerial target development		[3,000]	
0604759A	128	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	64,618		64,618
0604812A	129	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM			
0605103A	130	RAND ARROYO CENTER	16,339		16,339
0605301A	131	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	174,601		174,601
0605326A	132	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	28,271		28,271
0605502A	133	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605601A	134	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	342,079		342,079

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0605602A	135	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	74,624	3,000	77,624
		LIDAR and modeling improvements		[3,000]	
0605604A	136	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	41,066		41,066
0605605A	137	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	2,835	15,000	17,835
		HELSTF		[15,000]	
0605606A	138	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	5,054		5,054
0605702A	139	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	8,289		8,289
0605706A	140	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	17,028		17,028
0605709A	141	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	3,530		3,530
0605712A	142	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	72,942		72,942
0605716A	143	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	63,382		63,382
0605718A	144	SIMULATION & MODELING FOR ACQ, RQTS, & TNG (SMART)	5,325		5,325
0605801A	145	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	73,748		73,748
0605803A	146	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	42,905		42,905
0605805A	147	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	20,857		20,857
0605857A	148	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	5,125		5,125
0605898A	149	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	15,665		15,665
0909999A	150	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, ARMY	**1,113,197**	**21,000**	**1,134,197**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0603778A	151	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	59,749		59,749
0603820A	152	WEAPONS CAPABILITY MODIFICATIONS UAV			

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0102419A	153	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	356,434		356,434
0203726A	154	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	15,860		15,860
0203735A	155	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	141,114		141,114
0203740A	156	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	37,151		37,151
0203744A	157	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	452,787		452,787
0203752A	158	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	332		332
0203758A	159	DIGITIZATION	9,534		9,534
0203759A	160	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	38,418		38,418
0203764A	161	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
0203801A	162	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	37,871		37,871
0203802A	163	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	1,527	10,000	11,527
		Javelin modernization		[10,000]	
0203808A	164	TRACTOR CARD	19,601		19,601
0208010A	165	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	920		920
0208053A	166	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	1,957		1,957
0208058A	167	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	2,936		2,936
0301359A	168	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0303028A	169	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES			
0303140A	170	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	38,090		38,090
0303141A	171	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	104,934	-40,000	64,934
		GCSS		[-30,000]	
		PLM+		[-10,000]	
0303142A	172	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	106,327		106,327
0303150A	173	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	12,922		12,922

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0303158A	174	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	15,203		15,203
0305204A	175	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	50,976		50,976
0305206A	176	AIRBORNE RECONNAISANCE SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
0305208A	177	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	57,704		57,704
0702239A	178	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,023		1,023
0708045A	179	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	69,084	11,000	80,084
		Castings research for weapons systems		[3,500]	
		Manufacturing metrology research		[3,000]	
		Nanotechnology manufacturing research		[2,500]	
		Near-net shaped body armor plate development		[2,000]	
1001018A	180	NATO JOINT STARS			
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, ARMY	**1,632,454**	**-19,000**	**1,613,454**
	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,835		3,835
		Total, RDT&E Army	**10,524,085**	**331,125**	**10,855,210**

Army basic research programs

The budget request included $177.0 million in PE 61102A for Army defense research sciences. The committee commends the Army for increasing investments in basic research by over $75.0 million relative to the fiscal year 2008 budget request. The committee notes that the previous Director of Defense Research and Engineering has called for increases in fundamental research of $300.0 to $500.0 million per year to support focused efforts in discovery and innovation on crucial problems for national security. Consistent with that effort, the committee recommends a series of increases to support mission-informed basic research.

The committee recommends an increase in PE 61102A of: $3.0 million for research on advanced energy storage technologies; $1.5 million for research on drug resistant bacterial infections; $1.5 million for research on understanding and forecasting natural environments to support global military operations; and $1.5 million for modeling and simulation studies of organic semiconductor materials and devices.

The budget request also included $77.0 million in PE 61103A for university research initiatives. The committee recommends a number of increases in PE 61103A to support Army mission areas, including: $2.0 million for research on the low temperature performance of military vehicles; $2.0 million for research on nanomaterials for lightweight composite systems; $1.2 million for research on training and simulation to support urban terrain operating capabilities; $2.5 million for nanoscale biosensor research; and $1.5 million for development of nanocomposite technologies for wireless energy applications.

Network science and technology research center

The budget request included $10.0 million in PE 61104A for the establishment of a network science and technology research center. The committee commends the Army for its continued commitment to investments in basic research, especially in the face of severe budget constraints due to the current operations and reset of the force. The committee also commends the Army for its new investments in network science and believes that these investments can lead to significant enhancements in operational capabilities.

The committee notes with concern that the current Army plan calls for the majority of funding for this effort to go to the establishment of a single research center. The committee believes that this approach ironically fails to take advantage of many of the benefits of networked, distributed research efforts. The committee believes that these include the ability to have a multitude of geographically diverse, interdisciplinary researchers working collaboratively on military network research issues, using shared or existing resources to reduce overall cost, and exploiting advances in computing, collaboration, and other information technologies to make research and technology development efficient and seamless.

The committee is also concerned that the Army's pre-selection of a site for the center has created a situation in which very few worthy academic institutions can legitimately compete to manage the center, thereby severely limiting the Army's ability to access the highest quality network science research across the nation. The

committee also notes that the Army's management strategy for current university affiliated research centers faces some major problems. These include the fact that the centers and their relatively large basic research funding levels limit the Army's ability to reach out to a broad spectrum of universities to fund innovative research that would supplement investments in the focused centers, as well as a lack of planning for the process of terminating the centers, so that the Army's research programs can remain responsive to military needs and scientific opportunity.

Finally, the committee notes that the National Research Council's 2007 report entitled "Strategy for an Army Center for Network Science, Technology, and Experimentation" concluded that, "based on Army needs, the NSTEC [Network Science, Technology, and Experimentation Center] should be a hybrid operation consisting of two or three centralized facilities having interconnectivity to a variety of distributed supporting elements." The current Army proposed plan and budget is not consistent with this recommended hybrid approach.

Therefore, the committee directs that the network science and technology research center be established as a virtual center, with the majority of funding going to a networked group of investigators selected on the basis of technical merit of proposed research. The committee directs that only up to $2.0 million of the $10.0 million authorized in PE 61104A for the establishment of a network science and technology research center shall be available for the purpose of infrastructure and facilities development at the proposed U.S. Army Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland location. The remaining funds are to be used for other program purposes, primarily the funding of competitive projects to a diverse group of single investigators and research teams who will participate in the virtual network science center. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to report to the congressional defense committees on the status of the virtual center, the use of authorized funding, and the methods of selection of industry and academic participants in the virtual center, no later than December 31, 2008.

Army materials research

The budget request included $27.0 million in PE 62105A for applied research on materials technology. The committee notes that the Army's Vehicle Armor Technology Objective seeks to provide comprehensive solutions to threats that will be faced by the Future Combat Systems ground vehicles. In support of that objective, the committee recommends increases of: $2.0 million for research on lightweight composites for combat and tactical vehicle applications and $1.7 million for development of materials processing technologies to support production of lightweight armor systems.

To help reduce life cycle costs of Army ground and aviation assets, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62105A for development of cold spray coating technologies for repair applications.

The committee notes that one of the major threats currently facing deployed forces is improvised explosive devices (IED). To support efforts to better technically characterize these threats, the

committee recommends an additional $475,000 in PE 62105A for development of simulations of IED blast effects.

Finally, in the May 2007 report to Congress on the Defense Nanotechnology Research and Development program, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering indicated that sustained support was necessary to continue development of novel nanotechnology-based systems and devices, and that increased support was needed to further nanomanufacturing efforts. Consistent with that report, the committee recommends an additional $2.0 million for the development of advanced magnetic nanosensor technologies, and an additional $1.5 million for the development of advanced nanomanufacturing capabilities for multifunctional sensors.

Advanced Army energy and power technologies

The Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on Energy Security highlighted the critical security, cost, and performance issues that currently face and will increasingly handicap the Department of Defense (DOD) due to its overreliance on costly, sometimes unreliable sources of energy. The DSB study noted that increased investments in research on energy and power technologies were warranted in order to address this issue, stating, ". . . technologies with the potential to make incremental improvements often are not significant enough to attract much funding and are disadvantaged in their competition for deployment into programs." To support Army efforts to address emerging energy and power requirements and enable new operational capabilities, the committee makes a series of increases for energy and power research activities.

The National Research Council's 2004 report entitled "Meeting the Energy Needs of Future Warriors" noted a number of technical challenges for battery and fuel cell development and commented that "the challenge is to make them smaller, lighter, cheaper, more reliable, and more energy-dense without sacrificing safety." To support the achievement of this technological goal, the committee recommends increases of: $2.0 million in PE 62120A for development of hydrogen battery technologies; $2.0 million in PE 62705A for soldier portable fuel cell technologies; and $2.0 million in PE 63734A for direct methanol fuel cell development.

The DSB noted that there are a number of executive order and statutory mandates that are driving the Department to improve the energy efficiency of its facilities and to utilize alternative fuels in its non-tactical alternative fueled vehicles. In order to support the development of technologies that could help DOD meet those goals, the committee recommends a number of funding increases for investments in advanced energy power and technologies for vehicle applications. The committee recommends increases for advanced technology development on combat vehicles of: $6.0 million in PE 63005A for the development of military hybrid engines; $3.0 million for advanced lithium battery technologies; $5.0 million to support development of next-generation non-tactical fuel cell vehicle technologies; $2.0 million for the development of nickel metal hydride batteries for military vehicles; $10.0 million for an advanced military vehicle battery development and testing initiative; $3.0 million for the development of hydraulic hybrid vehicle systems; $4.0 million for development of hybrid blast resistant vehi-

cles; $3.5 million for the demonstration of hydraulic hybrid retrofit technologies for legacy Army vehicles; $1.0 million for the development of solid hydrogen storage technologies; $2.0 million for development of integrated power management and control technologies; $3.5 million for the development of logistics fuel processors; $5.0 million for development of electric drive technologies for tactical wheeled vehicles; and $12.0 million for Army power and energy research infrastructure and equipment.

The DSB task force also called for DOD to address critical infrastructure security issues that result from energy use. To help address these infrastructure issues, the committee recommends an additional $1.0 million in PE 63734A for the development of fuel cell systems to provide power for continuity of operations missions.

The Future Combat Systems (FCS) program has identified power and energy technologies, especially batteries, and continuing work to leverage commercial technology development, as a top science and technology priority. The committee also recognizes the value of dual-use research and technology research and development in the area of energy and power systems for vehicles. To support these efforts the committee is recommending a series of increases in applied research on dual-use energy and power vehicle systems. The committee recommends increases of: $1.5 million in PE 62601A for research on next-generation vehicle design and biofuel technologies; $2.0 million for the development of hybrid electric vehicle battery technologies for FCS; $4.0 million for development and testing of fuel cells for medium and heavy duty vehicles; and $2.0 million for advanced lightweight electric drive technologies. Additionally, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62601A for research on novel military fuels.

Army aviation technologies

The budget request included $17.0 million in PE 62211A for applied research for aviation technology. The committee notes that the United States Central Command has identified the development of standoff and persistent observation of the improvised explosive device "kill chain" by advanced sensors using unmanned air systems as a high science and technology priority. To support the development and maturation of that capability the committee recommends an increase in PE 62211A of $2.5 million for research on slowed rotor technologies for unmanned air systems.

Sniper detection systems

The budget request included $17.0 million in PE 62308A for advanced concepts and simulation. The committee notes the continued threats that snipers and mortars pose to deployed forces, especially in urban settings. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for the development of wearable sniper detection systems to aid in localizing sniper fire and mortar launches.

Army vehicle reliability technologies

The budget request included $55.2 million in PE 62601A for applied research for combat vehicle and automotive technologies. The committee notes that reducing the life cycle costs of weapon systems is an important thrust area for the Department of Defense,

especially through enhancements in system reliability in harsh operating environments and at high operating tempos. To support the development of highly reliable systems, the committee recommends increases in PE 62601A of $4.5 million for the development of computer simulation tools for vehicle design and optimization, and $2.0 million for modeling of ground vehicle reliability and condition-based maintenance.

Unmanned ground vehicle weaponization

The budget request included $30.6 million in PE 62624A for weapons and munitions technology. The committee has been supportive of the development of unmanned ground systems to reduce casualties and to enable new operational concepts and capabilities. The committee notes that the Near Autonomous Unmanned Systems Army Technology Objective is developing robotic technologies for future unmanned systems, and working to transition technologies to programs such as Future Combat Systems. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million to develop remotely controlled unmanned systems with lethal and non-lethal capabilities.

Standoff explosives detection technologies

The budget request included $21.8 million in PE 62712A for applied research on countermine systems. The committee notes that the standoff detection of explosives is a capability that is of critical concern to the Department of Defense as it seeks to combat the use of improvised explosive devices in Iraq and Afghanistan. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $3.0 million in PE 62712A for the development of standoff explosives detection technologies.

Soldier positioning technologies

The budget request included $24.0 million in PE 62782A for command, control, and communications technologies. The committee notes that the 2003 National Research Council study entitled "Science and Technology for Army Homeland Security" found that "the current system for gaining situational awareness in an urban environment is inadequate," and recommended the development of robust technologies to address this capability gap. To support this recommendation, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62782A for research on portable positioning and timing devices for use in urban terrains.

Military engineering technologies

The budget request included $52.1 million in PE 62784A for military engineering technologies. The committee notes that the Battle Space Terrain Reasoning and Awareness—Battle Command Army Technology Objective seeks to provide actionable information relating to terrain, atmospheric, and weather impacts on deployed assets. To support this objective, the committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million for geosciences and atmospheric research.

The committee notes that the Modular Protective Systems for Future Force Assets Army Technology Objective seeks to develop systems that enhance the protection and survivability of personnel

and systems from conventional and asymmetric threats. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62784A for research on low-cost, high-performance nanocomposite panels for enhanced blast and ballistic protection, and an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62786A for development of ballistic materials for force protection applications.

The committee notes that deployments in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other regions of the world are putting on forward operating bases infrastructure at unprecedented risk. Strategic, tactical, and resource constraints sometimes restrict the nature and scope of construction for these bases, yet the bases must be hardened for long-term use and asymmetric terrorist and insurgent attack.

The committee is aware of a number of efforts at service laboratories, small businesses, and universities developing new force protection technologies that can counter current and emerging threats to bases. Given the long-term need for enhanced and rapidly deployable force protection at bases in volatile operating zones, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a report outlining a plan for addressing deployable force protection infrastructure technology. The report should address current and emerging capability gaps, specific research and development goals to be accomplished to address those gaps, funding needs to address the gaps and accelerate infrastructure force protection technology deployment, and the value of creating research centers to partner with service laboratories on promising research and technology areas. The report should be delivered to the committee not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this bill.

Combat feeding technologies

The budget request included $21.9 million in PE 62786A for applied research for warfighter technologies. The committee notes that reduction in logistics costs is a goal of the Department of Defense and is being pursued through a number of efforts, including the use of alternative energy technologies. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an additional $1.5 million for the development of energy efficient, high performance mobile kitchen units.

Army medical research

The budget request included $75.4 million in PE 62787A for applied research on medical technologies. The committee notes that Army medical research and technology protects and treats personnel to sustain combat strength, reduce casualties, and save lives. The committee recommends a number of funding increases in PE 62787A to support these efforts and to help respond to a variety of medical care issues resulting from current operations or to leverage emerging research and technology.

The Army has a stated technology objective to develop fluid resuscitation to reduce injury and loss of life on the battlefield. In support of this, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to support clinical research on dried blood technologies.

To help military surgeons find new limb-sparing techniques to save injured extremities, avoid amputations, and preserve and restore the function of injured extremities, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to continue peer-reviewed re-

search efforts on extremity war injuries. To support the treatment of blast injuries, the committee recommends increases of: $3.5 million for traumatic brain injury research; $2.5 million for bio-engineering research to enhance soldier survivability; $2.5 million for post traumatic stress disorder research; $5.0 million for modeling of blast wave effects; and $1.0 million for research on injury biomechanics.

The committee notes that Army infectious disease efforts focus on medical countermeasures against naturally occurring diseases of military importance. To support those research efforts the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for research on treatments for dengue fever.

Finally, the committee notes that next-generation technologies will develop medical technologies and enable human performance improvements that could radically transform military operations. To support next-generation research efforts in military medical technologies the committee recommends increases of: $2.0 million for genetics research to enhance soldier survival in extreme environments; $2.0 million for research on nanomaterials to improve biological processes such as targeted drug delivery; and $8.0 million to initiate a military photomedicine program that would fund single investigators and research centers to develop optics and photonics based technologies to perform combat casualty care missions.

Biosensor controller systems

The budget request included $46.8 million in PE 63001A for development of advanced technologies for warfighters. The January 2008 report to Congress entitled "Efforts and Programs of the Department of Defense Relating to the Prevention, Mitigation, and Treatment of Blast Injuries" identified the development of diagnostics for traumatic brain injury as a blast injury research knowledge gap. To support addressing that gap, the committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 63001A for the development of biosensor systems to evaluate treatment response in this and other disorders, as well as to potentially serve to enhance operator-machine interface technologies.

Army medical advanced technology development

The budget request included $59.0 million in PE 63002A for medical advanced technology development. The committee continues to recognize the critical need to advance military medical technologies to address battlefield injuries. The committee has taken a number of steps to advance these efforts, including the establishment of a Department of Defense (DOD) initiative to prevent, mitigate, and treat blast injuries in section 256 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). To support these and similar efforts, as well as to support a number of Army technology objectives in medical technologies, the committee recommends a number of increases in medical research investments.

The committee notes that improvised explosive devices have created a new set of challenges for medical personnel in dealing with soft tissue and bone damage. The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million for research on the treatment of combat

wounds. To help address the treatment of blast injuries, in coordination with the Blast Mitigation Initiative, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for the development of technologies to efficiently detect and assess mild traumatic brain injuries, and an increase of $3.0 million for remote vital signs monitoring systems.

The committee recognizes the continuing need to develop advanced lower limb prostheses for battlefield amputees. The committee recommends an additional $2.5 million for the development of advanced lower limb prosthesis technologies.

The committee notes that the Battlefield Treatment of Fractures and Soft Tissue Trauma Care Defense Technology Objective includes a specific challenge to improve tissue viability technologies. In support of this goal, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for research on novel regenerative medical research to treat battlefield injuries. In addition, to support advances in military capabilities to treat combat injuries, the committee recommends increases of: $2.0 million for the development of tracheal intubation technologies for use on the battlefield; $2.0 million for research on bioelectric interactions to support wound healing capabilities; and $5.0 million to develop advanced combat wound dressings.

The committee notes that the use of information technologies can serve to make military medical operations more successful and efficient, and can potentially lead to considerable cost savings through the use of commercial technologies. To promote the use of advanced information systems and technologies in DOD medical operations, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million to support modernization of joint medical logistics efforts and an increase of $2.0 million for the development of online medical training programs for military personnel.

Finally, the committee recommends an increase of $13.0 million to support the continuing Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses Research Program. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to utilize the authorized funding for this program to undertake research on Gulf War illnesses. The committee directs that activities under the program should include studies of treatments for the complex of symptoms commonly referred to as Gulf War Illness, and identification of objective markers for Gulf War Illness. The committee recommends that no studies based on psychiatric illness and psychological stress as the central cause of Gulf War Illness be funded under the program. The committee directs that the program be conducted using competitive selection and peer review for the identification of research with the highest technical merit and military value. Further, the committee directs that this program be coordinated with similar activities in the Department of Veterans Affairs and the National Institutes of Health.

Army aviation advanced technology development

The budget request included $57.3 million in PE 63003A for advanced technology development on aviation systems. The committee continues to be supportive of efforts to use unmanned systems on the battlefield. To support the development of new capabilities for unmanned systems, the committee recommends an in-

crease of $2.0 million for the development of unmanned systems for the precision delivery of supplies to friendly forces.

The committee notes that the Army's Network-Enabled Command and Control Technology Objective seeks to develop systems that provide network-centric capabilities to the future force. In support of the objective, the committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 63003A for technologies to enable rapid tactical integration and fielding of interoperable aviation systems.

Finally, in support of the Army's Rotorcraft Survivability Technology Objective the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63003A for the development of lightweight armor systems to reduce helicopter vulnerabilities to battlefield threats, and an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63270A for development of laser systems for aircraft missile defense.

Army combat vehicle technologies

The budget request included $108.0 million in PE 63005A for advanced technology development on combat vehicles. The committee notes with concern that this is nearly 20 percent lower than the fiscal year 2008 budget request for this account, despite the fact that: current Army operations are heavily dependent on tactical vehicles; the Department of Defense is seeking to make ground vehicles more survivable against a growing number of battlefield threats, including explosively formed penetrators, rocket propelled grenades (RPGs), and improvised explosive devices (IEDs); the Army's primary transformation effort is the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program involving a large number of new vehicle technologies; and the Department is also seeking to develop and field novel energy and power vehicle technologies to reduce costs and improve performance.

The Vehicle Armor Technology Army Technology Objective seeks to provide comprehensive solutions for FCS ground vehicles to address a variety of threats, including mines, RPGs, IEDs, and other threats. Consistent with that objective, the committee recommends a number of funding increases to enhance vehicle survivability. The committee recommends increases of: $2.0 million for the development of composite armored cabs; $2.5 million for development of hostile fire detection systems; and $4.0 million for development of windshield armor systems.

The Prognostics and Diagnostics for Operational Readiness and Condition Based Maintenance Army Technology Objective has a goal to improve near-term and FCS commodity readiness and maintainability through improvements in the capability to detect and predict equipment health status and performance. In coordination with this objective and as part of efforts to improve the readiness of Army forces, the committee recommends increases of: $5.0 million to support development of advanced thermal and oil management systems to reduce vehicle life cycle costs; $4.2 million for the development of test facilities to evaluate advanced combat vehicle power train designs; $4.0 million to enhance Army capabilities for the rapid integration of new technologies onto military vehicles; $3.5 million for development of advanced vehicle prognostics systems; and $2.0 million to support ground vehicle fastening and joining research.

Finally, the committee notes that the Army's future force technology thrust in unmanned systems seeks to enhance the effectiveness of unmanned systems through improved perception, cooperative behaviors, and increased autonomy. In support of those efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million to continue the unmanned ground vehicle initiative.

Diverse threat sensor development

The budget request included $108.0 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive technology programs. The committee notes that the Army has a need to develop systems that coordinate unattended, airborne, man-portable, and vehicle-mounted sensor inputs to identify and characterize threats in complex terrain, including urban environments. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 63005A for development of systems that better combine sensor data to provide enhanced threat warning capabilities.

Army training technologies

The budget request included $18.9 million in PE 63015A for next-generation training and simulation systems. The committee notes that the Army's Institute of Creative Technologies is working on the development of a variety of simulations to support the training requirements of the Army. The Army's advanced simulation technology technology thrust area seeks to provide increasingly realistic training and mission rehearsal environments to support military missions. In order to support development of advanced combat training simulators, the committee recommends increases in PE 63015A of $3.5 million for the development of joint fires training systems, and $2.0 million for modeling architectures to support battle command simulation and training.

Deactivation of military explosives

The budget request included $10.6 million in PE 63103A for explosives demilitarization technology. To support continuing efforts to develop environmentally sound methods of disposing munitions, the committee recommends an increase of $500,000 to support research on the safe deactivation of military explosives.

Army missile and rocket technologies

The budget request included $64.0 million in PE 63313A for advanced missile and rocket technologies. The committee notes the continuing need for development of advanced high speed, precision strike weaponry. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million to support studies of long range hypersonic interceptor technology, in coordination with the efforts of the Joint Technology Office for Hypersonics, previously established by the committee.

Situational awareness technologies

The budget request included $39.9 million in PE 63710A for advanced night vision technologies. The Army's intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance future force technology thrust area seeks to develop persistent and integrated situational awareness capabilities to provide actionable intelligence to support military oper-

ations. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million for research on short range electro-optical sensor systems to support Future Combat Systems.

Unique item ID data management research

The budget request included $600,000 in PE 63024A for the ongoing development of the Army's unique item identification (UID) research. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for the continued research and development of an enterprise-wide software application to support Army programs that are required to comply with unique item mandates. UID research is permitting the Army to better manage its logistic activities, including accurate, non-intrusive item identification and data collection and enhanced unit-pack level visibility.

Advanced electronics integration

The budget request included $14.0 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense systems integration, but no funds for advanced electronics integration. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63305A for advanced electronics integration to advance state-of-the-art weapon system electronics, with the goal of reducing the size, weight, and cost of electronic components, while reducing hazardous materials used in such advanced electronics. This effort supports Army needs for research, prototyping, testing, and production technologies that have the potential to produce more efficient, higher performance, less hazardous and lower cost electronics.

Advanced environmental controls

The budget request included $14.0 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense systems integration, but no funds for advanced environmental control systems. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63305A for the development of thermal management control systems that can support sensors and electronic systems which operate in the harsh environmental conditions required by missile defense systems. The committee notes that advanced environmental controls have applicability to a variety of military systems that operate in harsh environments.

Advanced fuel cell research

The budget request included $14.0 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense systems integration, but no funds for advanced fuel cell research. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 63305A for the development of advanced fuel cell technology for applications in Army space and missile defense systems. The committee notes that lightweight, reliable, and cost-effective power sources are important components of complex weapon systems such as space and missile defense systems. Advanced fuel cells would have applicability to a wide variety of military systems.

Radiation hardening initiative

The budget request included $14.0 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense systems integration, but no funds for radi-

ation hardening integration. The subcommittee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63305A for a radiation hardening initiative to improve understanding of radiation transport and effects, modeling and simulation tools, and radiation-hardened design approaches. This activity should be coordinated with the Joint Radiation Hardened Electronics Oversight Council.

High-altitude integration testbed

The budget request included $20.0 million in PE 63308A for Army missile defense systems integration (space), but no funds for continued development of the high-altitude integration testbed. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63308A for the Army's high-altitude integration testbed to integrate and test payloads for high altitude airships and unmanned aerial vehicles for long-loiter missions. Such systems could provide enhanced information to military forces.

Air and missile defense architecture analysis

The budget request included $116.4 million in PE 63327A for air and missile defense engineering, but included no funds for development of an integrated air and missile defense (IAMD) architecture analysis program. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63327A for continued development of an IAMD architecture analysis program to improve the integration and coordination of air and missile defense capabilities into a coherent system of systems to defend against aircraft, cruise missiles, and ballistic missiles. The Army has been selected as the lead service for joint IAMD. This effort would support the Army's lead role, and its development of an IAMD Battle Command System.

Stryker active protection system

The budget request included $108.0 million in PE 63653A for Advanced Tank Armament System (ATAS), but provided no funds for development of a Stryker active protection system. The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in PE 63653A for the Stryker active protection system.

Vibration management enhancement research

The budget request included $71.6 million in PE 64201A to develop hardware and software improvements for the Army's aviation system. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million to continue research and development of advanced diagnostic tools to measure vibration in the aircraft and develop possible mitigation measures. This research utilizes an embedded condition-based maintenance system developed to detect mechanical faults in transmissions, gearboxes, main and tail rotors, and the entire power train.

Next-generation combat helmet development

The budget request included $42.4 million in PE 64601A for infantry support weapons, but no funds were provided for next-generation combat helmet development. Funds provided would support the development of a next-generation combat helmet that is safer

and significantly lighter. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 64601A for combat helmet development.

High Mobility Multi-purpose Wheeled Vehicle modernization research

The budget request included no funding in PE 64642A for advanced technology development for the Army's legacy light tactical wheeled vehicles, including technology enhancements and modernization activities for the High Mobility Multi-purpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV) in the areas of survivability, mobility, and energy and power.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64642A for the HMMWV program manager to continue efforts to develop, test, and integrate advanced technologies into the HMMWV. Previous technology integration activities have included improved cooling systems, seats and seat belt enhancements, gunner restraints, vehicle intercom systems, and fire suppression systems.

Non-Line of Sight-Launch System anti-tamper research

The budget request included $200.1 million in Research and Development, Army for the Non-Line of Sight-Launch System (NLOS–LS). The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 64646A to continue funding anti-tamper research. Anti-tamper protection of weapon systems is a growing concern in U.S. national security planning. In September 2007, the Defense Science Board issued a report entitled "Mission Impact of Foreign Influence on Department of Defense Software" that found that given the military's increasing dependence on software-based programs, "current systems designs, assurance methodologies, acquisition procedures, and knowledge of adversarial capabilities and intentions are inadequate to the magnitude of the threat." In January 2008, the Government Accountability Office reported that military program managers lack clear guidance on what information they need to protect and are challenged in selecting anti-tamper solutions because they do not have the tools needed to determine how much protection is required. This additional funding will complete ongoing NLOS–LS anti-tamper development activities, including significant test and validation by Red Teams and government agencies.

Future Combat System

The budget request included $3.6 billion for the Future Combat System (FCS) program, the Army's comprehensive force modernization program. The committee remains committed to the modernization of the Army and is hopeful that the FCS program will provide, as promised, an appropriate and affordable combination of advanced technologies to support operational concepts that will ensure future success across the spectrum of conflict. The ambitiousness, complexity, and risk associated with FCS have resulted in many challenges over the years that the Army must continue to overcome.

Therefore, the committee agrees that this program merits careful, even special oversight. Recognizing this, Congress directed in section 211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal

Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) submit an annual report on the program's progress. Moreover, in section 214 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), Congress directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct a milestone review following FCS's preliminary design review, now scheduled for April 2009. Consequently, fiscal year 2009, as the GAO notes in its March 2008 annual report, is a critical year for this program.

The GAO's March 2008 annual review of the FCS program noted that it will be difficult for the Army to demonstrate firm requirements and technical maturity in time for its preliminary design and Secretary of Defense reviews next year. Consistent with other GAO reports, the committee believes that instability in funding could make that challenge more difficult. The committee remains convinced that FCS merits support and stable funding, and therefore recommends full funding for FCS as requested by the Army.

Urban training development

The budget request included $35.4 million in PE 64715A for engineering development of non-system training devices. The committee recognizes the importance of training concepts and systems for joint military operations in urban terrain and culture to increase unit effectiveness at reduced operating costs. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 64715A for development of systems for joint military operations in urban terrain and cultural training.

Extended range sniper rifle research

The budget request included $52.1 million in PE 64802A for weapons and munitions—system demonstration and development. This program element funds multiple efforts for engineering development of weapons and munitions systems. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for extended range sniper rifle research.

Army test and target development

The budget request included $13.5 million in PE 64258A for target simulator development. The committee continues to support Department of Defense (DOD) investments in targets and test and evaluation infrastructure and capabilities, which serve to enhance force readiness, improve systems capabilities, and reduce life cycle costs. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 64258A to support development of advanced fixed-wing aerial targets to support warfighters facing current and future air defense threats.

The budget request included $74.6 million in PE 65602A for technical test instrumentation and targets. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for enhancements in laser and modeling systems to support testing of chemical and biological defense systems.

The budget request included $2.8 million in PE 65605A for the DOD High Energy Laser Test Facility (HELSTF). The committee is concerned that this level of support will not preserve all of the critical laser test functions that DOD requires, including the Mis-

sile Defense Agency. Further, the lack of funding will force a "mothballing" of test facilities and lead to a loss of technical expertise and huge startup costs when the facility is needed for potential use by the range of advanced high power laser systems under development. The committee also notes that the required analyses and reports on high energy laser testing from the fiscal year 2008 authorization reports have yet to be delivered. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $15.0 million in PE 65605A to support the operations of HELSTF.

Javelin modernization

The budget request included $1.5 million in PE 23802A for other missile product improvement programs, but provided no funds for the modernization of the Javelin anti-armor missile. Funds provided would initiate a Javelin modernization program that would increase the missile's effective range to beyond line-of-sight. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 23802A for Javelin modernization development.

Global Combat Support System, the Logistics Modernization Program and Product Lifecycle Management Plus

The budget request included $104.9 million in PE 33141A for the Global Combat Support System (GCSS), $82.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for the Logistics Modernization Program (LMP), and $42.4 million in PE 33141A for Product Lifecycle Management Plus (PLM+).

In July 2007, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that the Army would be investing approximately $5.0 billion over the next several years to develop and implement their Enterprise Resource Programs (ERP). The GAO noted that this significant investment was being made without the benefit of a comprehensive business enterprise architecture, concept of operations, and effective portfolio management. For example, the three logistics systems, GCSS, LMP, and PLM+, utilize separate financial systems and different versions of SAP software, making future consolidation extremely complex. In addition, as the Army itself reports, prior to 2006 the Army's functional approach to governance led to development of completely disparate ERPs. In a November 21, 2007 Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM) the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, John Young, seemingly validates the GAO conclusions, stating that additional work was necessary in synchronizing the separate components of the Army's enterprise resource planning strategy. While the committee expects the three logistics ERP efforts—GCSS, LMP, and PLM+—to continue development and fielding, synergies should be explored and realized. On March 14, 2008 Secretary Young signed ADMs for two Army ERPs, General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS) and GCSS, mandating one such efficiency by directing the integration on the previously separate financial subset of GCSS with GFEBS. Further efficiencies should be explored across the Army's logistics ERPs.

The committee recommends decreases of $30.0 million in PE 33141A for GCSS, $20.0 million for LMP from OMA, and $10.0 million in PE 33141A for PLM+. While the committee has historically been supportive of the Department of Defense's business systems

modernization efforts, it is concerned by the Army's functionally "stovepiped" approach to its ERP systems.

Army manufacturing technologies

The budget request included $69.1 million in PE 78045A for development of manufacturing technologies. The committee continues to support increasing funding for manufacturing research and technology to support the preservation of the defense industrial base and reduce costs of weapons systems. To enhance Army manufacturing research efforts, the committee recommends increases in PE 78045A of: $2.5 million for advanced nanotechnology manufacturing research; $3.5 million for castings research to improve performance and lower the cost of weapons systems; $3.0 million for research to improve machine tool accuracy and performance; and $2.0 million for manufacturing process improvements to reduce costs of body armor plates.

Navy

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601103N	1	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	103,707	2,500	106,207
		Automated technology for landmine detection		[1,500]	
		Radiation hardened electronic systems		[1,000]	
0601152N	2	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	17,298		17,298
0601153N	3	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	407,271	6,500	413,771
		Energetics research		[1,500]	
		Manufacturing engineering educational outreach program		[2,000]	
		Quantum studies research		[1,500]	
		S&T educational outreach programs		[1,500]	
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, NAVY	528,276	9,000	537,276
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602114N	4	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	79,913	7,500	87,413
		Free electron laser development		[3,500]	
		High brightness electron source development		[1,500]	
		UAV fuel cell technologies		[2,500]	

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0602123N	5	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	131,310	20,500	151,810
		Composite materials research for high speed craft		[3,000]	
		Energy systems integration research		[3,000]	
		Infrared materials research		[3,000]	
		Novel coating technologies for military equipment		[3,500]	
		Port security technologies		[3,500]	
		SOF combatant signature and weight performance research		[2,000]	
		Towed array systems M&S		[2,500]	
0602131M	6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	36,480	4,500	40,980
		Rapid awareness systems		[4,500]	
0602234N	7	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY			
0602235N	8	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	77,054		77,054
0602236N	9	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	93,862	1,500	95,362
		Acoustic Research Detachment test support upgrades		[1,500]	
0602271N	10	RF SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	54,830	1,500	56,330
		RF power technologies		[1,500]	
0602435N	11	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	47,278		47,278
0602651M	12	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,084		6,084
0602747N	13	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	58,658		58,658
0602782N	14	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	47,869		47,869
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, NAVY	**633,338**	**35,500**	**668,838**

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603114N	15	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	60,360	6,000	66,360
		Mobile target tracking technologies		[3,500]	
		Watercraft APS		[2,500]	
0603123N	16	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	55,099	21,500	76,599
		Combined mishap reduction system		[2,000]	
		Integrated vehicle health monitoring system		[3,500]	
		Navy / USMC fuel cell non-tactical vehicle initiative		[5,000]	
		Single generator operations lithium ion battery		[9,000]	
		Wide band gap semiconductor materials		[2,000]	
0603235N	17	COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	104,578	-61,200	43,378
		High integrity GPS		[-61,200]	
0603236N	18	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	112,520		112,520
0603271N	19	RF SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,058		37,058
0603640M	20	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	100,787	2,000	102,787
		Acoustic combat sensors		[2,000]	
0603651M	21	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,020		11,020
0603729N	22	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	12,129		12,129
0603747N	23	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	81,490		81,490
0603758N	24	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	70,216		70,216
0603782N	25	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	33,426		33,426
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, NAVY	**678,683**	**-31,700**	**646,983**

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
0603207N	26	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	66,133		66,133
0603216N	27	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	5,917		5,917
0603237N	28	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	5,905		5,905
0603254N	29	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	28,799		28,799
0603261N	30	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	4,298		4,298
0603382N	31	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	4,367		4,367
0603502N	32	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	119,164		119,164
0603506N	33	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	49,171		49,171
0603512N	34	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	120,511		120,511
0603513N	35	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	4,003	13,100	17,103
		DDG-51 permanent magnet hybrid electric propulsion		[7,600]	
		High temperature superconducting (HTS) propulsion motor		[5,500]	
0603525N	36	PILOT FISH	86,017		86,017
0603527N	37	RETRACT LARCH	93,078		93,078
0603536N	38	RETRACT JUNIPER	159,175		159,175
0603542N	39	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	1,094		1,094
0603553N	40	SURFACE ASW	29,574		29,574
0603559N	41	SSGN CONVERSION			
0603561N	42	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	141,720	15,000	156,720
		Continue SSBN(X) design & study activities		[15,000]	
0603562N	43	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	10,212		10,212
0603563N	44	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	31,111		31,111
0603564N	45	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	14,627		14,627

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603570N	46	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	158,270		158,270
0603573N	47	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS			
0603576N	48	CHALK EAGLE	352,858		352,858
0603581N	49	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	371,008		371,008
0603582N	50	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	54,401		54,401
0603609N	51	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	8,124		8,124
0603611M	52	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES / EFV	316,052		316,052
0603612M	53	USMC MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV			
0603635M	54	USMC GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM / JLTV	59,049		59,049
0603654N	55	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	115,086		115,086
0603658N	56	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	38,316		38,316
0603713N	57	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,737		7,737
0603721N	58	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	19,632		19,632
0603724N	59	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,611		5,611
0603725N	60	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	4,086	2,000	6,086
		Hydrokinetic power generator		[2,000]	
0603734N	61	CHALK CORAL	117,543		117,543
0603739N	62	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	2,846	4,000	6,846
		Highly integrated optical interconnect for military avionics		[4,000]	
0603746N	63	RETRACT MAPLE	138,091		138,091
0603748N	64	LINK PLUMERIA	60,444		60,444
0603751N	65	RETRACT ELM	139,139		139,139
0603755N	66	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	11,001		11,001
0603764N	67	LINK EVERGREEN	75,995		75,995

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603787N	68	SPECIAL PROCESSES	60,678		60,678
0603790N	69	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	10,129		10,129
0603795N	70	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	40,028	-30,000	10,028
		Reflect cancellation of ERGM development		[-30,000]	
0603851M	71	NONLETHAL WEAPONS	46,902		46,902
0603860N	72	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	99,929		99,929
0603879N	73	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) SYSTEM ENGINEER (SE)	41,807		41,807
0603889N	74	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS			
0603925N	75	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS		10,700	10,700
		Develop directed energy weapons for asymmetric threats		[10,700]	
0604272N	76	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES	63,244		63,244
0604327N	77	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM			
0604450N	78	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)			
0604707N	79	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	47,518		47,518
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES, NAVY	**3,440,400**	**14,800**	**3,455,200**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
0604212N	80	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	58,210		58,210
0604214N	81	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	29,924		29,924
0604215N	82	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	71,920		71,920

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604216N	83	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	70,329		70,329
0604218N	84	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	5,750		5,750
0604221N	85	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	3,589		3,589
0604230N	86	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	8,611		8,611
0604231N	87	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	128,742		128,742
0604234N	88	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	484,159		484,159
0604245N	89	H-1 UPGRADES	3,795		3,795
0604261N	90	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	45,790		45,790
0604262N	91	V-22A	68,763		68,763
0604264N	92	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,192		16,192
0604269N	93	EA-18	128,906		128,906
0604270N	94	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	106,932		106,932
0604273N	95	VH-71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	1,047,835		1,047,835
0604280N	96	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	834,650		834,650
0604300N	97	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	678,936	-87,200	591,736
		Reduce CG(X) R&D to reflect delay in program decisions		[-87,200]	
0604307N	98	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	188,500		188,500
0604311N	99	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	985		985
0604329N	100	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	19,574		19,574
0604366N	101	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	234,653		234,653
0604373N	102	AIRBORNE MCM	39,882		39,882
0604378N	103	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL - COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	10,533		10,533

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604501N	104	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	153,558	-33,600	119,958
		Reduce CG(X) R&D to reflect delay in program decisions		[-33,600]	
0604503N	105	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	143,453	4,100	147,553
		Improved towed array handler		[4,100]	
0604504N	106	AIR CONTROL	8,191		8,191
0604512N	107	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	42,843		42,843
0604518N	108	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	14,792		14,792
0604558N	109	NEW DESIGN SSN	167,357	5,300	172,657
		Submarine electronic chart updates		[5,300]	
0604561N	110	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS			
0604562N	111	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	58,592		58,592
0604567N	112	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	72,932	5,400	78,332
		Transfer LHA (R) contract design from NDSF		[5,400]	
0604601N	113	MINE DEVELOPMENT	2,008		2,008
0604603N	114	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS			
0604610N	115	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	50,732		50,732
0604654N	116	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	10,858		10,858
0604703N	117	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	5,263		5,263
0604727N	118	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	22,510		22,510
0604755N	119	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	35,999		35,999
0604756N	120	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	36,238	10,700	46,938
		Next generation Phalanx		[10,700]	
0604757N	121	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	57,574	9,000	66,574
		NULKA improvements		[9,000]	

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604761N	122	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	13,750		13,750
0604771N	123	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	7,833	2,500	10,333
		Composite tissue transplantation research		[2,500]	
0604777N	124	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	49,007		49,007
0604784N	125	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM			
0604800N	126	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	1,532,748	215,000	1,747,748
		Fund competitive propulsion system		[215,000]	
0605013M	127	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	30,238		30,238
0605013N	128	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	72,497		72,497
0605172N	129	MULTINATIONAL INFORMATION SHARING (MNIS)			
0605212N	130	CH-53K RDTE	570,484		570,484
0605430N	131	C/KC-130 AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM (AMP)	24,407		24,407
0605450N	132	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	62,324		62,324
0605500N	133	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	1,132,026		1,132,026
0304785N	134	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	16,678		16,678
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION, NAVY	**8,682,052**	**131,200**	**8,813,252**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0604256N	135	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	24,959		24,959
0604258N	136	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	80,337		80,337
0604759N	137	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	42,391		42,391
0605152N	138	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	8,084		8,084
0605154N	139	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	49,745		49,745

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0605155N	140	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT			
0605502N	141	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605804N	142	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	713		713
0605853N	143	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	51,568		51,568
0605856N	144	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,597		3,597
0605861N	145	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	69,913		69,913
0605862N	146	RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION			
0605863N	147	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	195,017		195,017
0605864N	148	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	356,254	-10,000	346,254
		Unjustified request		[-10,000]	
0605865N	149	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	12,195		12,195
0605866N	150	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	2,708		2,708
0605867N	151	LINK CRIMSON	25,358		25,358
0605873M	152	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	24,687		24,687
0305885N	153	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	1,998		1,998
0804758N	154	SERVICE SUPPORT TO JFCOM, JNTC	5,148		5,148
0909999N	155	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, NAVY	**954,672**	**-10,000**	**944,672**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0603660N	156	ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	[ ]		[ ]
0604227N	157	HARPOON MODIFICATIONS	68,214		68,214

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604402N	158	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT	275,823		275,823
0101221N	159	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	80,120	-19,346	60,774
		LINAC		[4,000]	
		Navy RRW		[-23,346]	
0101224N	160	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	34,131		34,131
0101226N	161	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	7,384		7,384
0101402N	162	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	47,495		47,495
0203761N	163	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	34,469		34,469
0204136N	164	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	71,232		71,232
0204152N	165	E-2 SQUADRONS	54,096		54,096
0204163N	166	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	26,696	3,000	29,696
		Warfighter enhanced decision making		[3,000]	
0204229N	167	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	14,212		14,212
0204311N	168	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	20,565		20,565
0204413N	169	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	2,325		2,325
0204571N	170	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	28,017		28,017
0204574N	171	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,441		1,441
0204575N	172	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	24,276		24,276
0205601N	173	HARM IMPROVEMENT	31,427		31,427
0205604N	174	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	4,247		4,247
0205620N	175	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	21,720		21,720
0205632N	176	MK-48 ADCAP	15,879		15,879

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0205633N	177	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	122,906	4,000	126,906
		Radio frequency synthetic subsystems for military automated test systems		[3,000]	
		Rapid repair structural adhesives		[1,000]	
0205658N	178	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	3,625		3,625
0205675N	179	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	71,576		71,576
0206313M	180	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	273,696		273,696
0206623M	181	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	136,080		136,080
0206624M	182	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	9,646		9,646
0207161N	183	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	6,679		6,679
0207163N	184	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	8,556		8,556
0208058N	185	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	11,960		11,960
0301303N	186	MARITIME INTELLIGENCE	[ ]		[ ]
0301323N	187	COLLECTION MANAGEMENT	[ ]		[ ]
0301327N	188	TECHNICAL RECONNAISANCE AND SURVEILLANCE	[ ]		[ ]
0301372N	189	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE - GDIP	[ ]		[ ]
0303109N	190	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	652,463		652,463
0303140N	191	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	27,037		27,037
0303158M	192	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	2,000		2,000
0303158N	193	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	4,148		4,148
0305149N	194	COBRA JUDY	101,114		101,114
0305160N	195	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	8,208		8,208
0305192N	196	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	4,614		4,614
0305204N	197	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	45,717		45,717

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0305205N	198	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	480,098	-48,200	431,898
		Reflect delay in BAMS program		[-48,200]	
0305206N	199	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	55,719		55,719
0305207N	200	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,982		13,982
0305208N	201	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	44,540		44,540
0307207N	202	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS)	74,604		74,604
0308601N	203	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	8,007		8,007
0702207N	204	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	21,130		21,130
0702239N	205	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,877		1,877
0708011N	206	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	56,681	1,700	58,381
		Digital direct manufacturing technologies		[1,700]	
0708730N	207	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)		15,000	15,000
		National Shipbuilding Research Program		[15,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, RDT&E	**3,110,432**	**-43,846**	**3,066,586**
	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,309,385		1,309,385
		Total, RDT&E Navy	**19,337,238**	**104,954**	**19,442,192**

Navy basic research

The budget request included $103.7 million in PE 61103N for university research initiatives. The committee notes that the 2007 Marine Corps Science and Technology (S&T) Strategic Plan lists the development of advanced robotic systems for ground combat in order to "take humans out of direct involvement in hazardous and exceptionally arduous missions" as a technology objective. In support of achieving that objective, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million for research on automated robotic technologies for landmine detection.

The 2007 Naval S&T Strategic Plan identifies a specific technology objective of adapting defense systems to the environment, especially with respect to space environmental effects. To help address this concern, the committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 61103N for research on novel radiation hardened microelectronics.

The budget request included $407.3 million in PE 61153N for defense research sciences programs. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 61153N for research on quantum computing and quantum mechanics that can support efforts to enhance Navy sensor and communications systems. The 2004 National Research Council study entitled "Advanced Energetic Materials" characterized the U.S. effort on research and development of energetic materials as "suboptimal," but stated that the materials are "a key component of the nation's defense strategies." To help address this identified gap, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 61153N for basic research on energetic materials.

To support efforts to enhance math and science education nationally and develop the next generation of clearable scientists and engineers to work on national security issues, the committee recommends an additional $1.5 million in PE 61153N for science and technology educational outreach efforts.

Manufacturing engineering training

The budget request included $407.3 million in PE 61153N for defense research sciences. The committee notes that National Science and Technology Council's March 2008 report entitled "Manufacturing the Future: Federal Priorities for Manufacturing R&D" highlighted the role that federal investments could play in enhancing the domestic manufacturing base through improvements in workforce training and education. The report cited a 2005 National Association of Manufacturers skills gap survey of more than 800 manufacturing businesses, which found that 81 percent were experiencing "severe" (13 percent) or "moderate" (68 percent) shortages of skilled workers overall, and 90 percent reported shortages of skilled production employees. These shortages lead to deficiencies in the defense industrial base and therefore weaken the Department of Defense production and supply chain. To help address this issue, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 61153N for manufacturing engineering educational outreach programs.

Navy power projection research

The budget request included $79.9 million in PE 62114N for applied research on power projection technologies. The committee notes that the 2007 Defense Science Board Task Force on Directed Energy Weapons noted that science and technology (S&T) funding for laser weapons should be focused on concentrated development of free electron lasers for ship defense. In support of that recommendation, the committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million for high power free electron laser development. To support the Naval S&T Strategic Plan objective of developing energy storage technologies, the committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62114N for the development of fuel cells for unmanned aerial vehicle applications. Finally, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million for research on advanced electron sources for use in next-generation radar systems.

Navy force protection research

The budget request included $131.3 million in PE 62123N for applied research on force protection technologies. The 2007 Naval S&T [science and technology] Strategic Plan identifies the development of advanced materials in platform construction to support the production of more survivable platforms as a key technology objective. In support of that objective, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for composite materials research for high speed craft, and an increase of $2.0 million for research to reduce the structural weight and improve signature characteristics of special operations combatant craft through the use of lightweight composite materials.

The Naval S&T Strategic Plan also has a technology objective of enhancing homeland and port defense monitoring. In support of this effort, the committee recommends an additional $3.5 million in PE 62123N for development of deployable, under hull inspection technologies. Consistent with the Navy's High Energy and Pulse Power Technology Objective, which seeks to develop energy storage power system architectures and pulsed power control systems, the committee recommends an additional $3.0 million to develop energy delivery technologies for advanced naval weapons systems.

In support of Office of Naval Research efforts to improve towed sonar array reliability and enhance situational awareness, the committee recommends an additional $2.5 million for modeling and simulation efforts on towed sonar array system reliability. In support of Navy objectives to reduce the cost of high-resolution infrared focal plane arrays for missile seekers and other applications, and in conjunction with ongoing related Army and Missile Defense Agency efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for infrared materials research.

Finally, consistent with Navy efforts to identify new coating technologies for military equipment, the committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 62123N for development of novel surface coatings to improve performance and reliability of defense systems.

Situational awareness processing technologies

The budget request included $36.5 million in PE 62131M for applied research on Marine Corps landing force technologies. The committee notes that one of the Marine Corps' science and technology objectives is the development of "improved situational awareness for warfighters at all echelons." Consistent with that objective, the committee recommends an additional $4.5 million for applied research on the distribution of tactical information to individual warfighters.

Acoustic research and test capabilities

The budget request included $93.9 million in PE 62236N for applied research on warfighter sustainment technologies. The committee notes that the 2007 Strategic Plan for DOD (Department of Defense) T&E (Test and Evaluation) Resources stated that "improved acoustic and radio frequency (RF) signature measurement capability is necessary to adequately conduct T&E on new hull forms." In support of the development of that capability, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62236N for upgrades to Navy acoustic research and test equipment.

Navy electronics research

The budget request included $54.8 million in PE 62271N for radio frequency systems applied research. The committee notes that next-generation Navy radars, communications, and electronic warfare systems will all depend on advanced high power microelectronics. The Navy's Power and Energy Science and Technology Focus Area includes the specific objective of developing new materials to increase the efficiency and power density of Navy systems. To complement these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million for research on advanced semiconductor radio frequency power technologies.

Advanced technologies for power projection

The budget request included $60.4 million in PE 63114N for advanced technologies for power projection. The committee notes that the capability to support detection, tracking, and identification of mobile targets, including to support maritime interdiction and land attack of high value targets, is a high priority based on several fleet and combatant commands assessments of current operational capability gaps. The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and Office of Naval Research science and technology programs are currently supporting these science and technology development efforts with planned transitions in fiscal year 2012. To accelerate the development and reduce the risk of these efforts, the committee recommends an additional $3.5 million in PE 63114N for development of mobile target tracking and identification technologies.

The committee notes that the Naval Expeditionary Command recommendations to the Office of Naval Research for high priority capability gaps to be addressed with science and technology investments included "fires detections and engagement systems for incoming direct and indirect fires." To support efforts to address that gap, the committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE

63114N for the development of watercraft active protection systems.

Force protection advanced technology

The budget request included $55.1 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology. This program addresses applied research associated with providing force protection capability for all naval platforms.

The budget request included no funding for continuing the development of wide band gap semiconductor substrate materials. These materials offer capability for higher power and higher frequency operation in high temperature environments across a broad spectrum of applications. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for the continued development of wide band gap semiconductor substrate material.

The budget request included no funding for any initiative to leverage rapidly developing ongoing advances in hydrogen-powered fuel cell vehicle technology to enable revolutionary changes in the Department of the Navy non-tactical vehicle fleet. Fuel cells powered by hydrogen could totally change the present dependence on petroleum as the logistics fuel and could offer the ability to run systems silently and with significantly reduced thermal signatures for missions requiring low probability of detection. In previous years, the Department of the Navy conducted several short-term demonstrations of hydrogen fuel cell powered vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for an expanded demonstration of fuel cell vehicles, to include an extended vehicle range refueling capability enhancement to include testing that could establish the basis for a potential full qualification of a hydrogen-powered fuel cell vehicle for fleet operations.

The budget request included no funding for development of a lithium battery technology that could replace one of the three generators normally in operation or reserve aboard all large Navy ships. If lithium battery technology could be scaled up to a capacity of roughly 2.5 megawatts, such a battery would replace one of the three ship service generators normally in operation or in reserve aboard all surface combatants. Such a battery system could provide a lower cost, higher quality source of electrical power that would replace redundant back-up power sources dedicated to subsystems throughout the ship. The battery would also eliminate the possibility of a ship experiencing a catastrophic loss of power ("going dark") due to a cascading failure of generators and an inability to restart the main engines following a loss of main power. The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million to enable the development of such lithium battery technology.

The budget request included no funding for development of a combined mishap reduction system. The committee is aware that the private sector has developed web-based information management systems that enable managers at all levels in an organization to prevent avoidable accidents among their personnel. These systems identify high-risk practices, procedures, conditions, and attitudes before accidents occur and provide paths to mitigate them. The Department of Defense has long collected data about the causes of accidents after they occur. Using this information alone,

however, has proven insufficient for reducing accident rates below recent historical levels. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to enable the development of a combined mishap reduction system.

The budget request included no funding for an integrated vehicle health monitoring program. Such a program could determine the value of adopting commercial automotive standards as a baseline for a set of open standards as part of an open system vehicle electronics architecture. This program could also achieve reductions in the demand for space, weight, power, and cooling, as well as reduce the time and cost needed to develop new vehicle applications. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million to enable the development of a prototype of an integrated health monitoring system for proof-of-concept evaluation and demonstration.

The committee recommends a total authorization of $76.6 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology.

High-integrity Global Positioning System

The budget request included $104.6 million for common picture advanced technology in PE 63235N, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy, including $61.2 million for high-integrity Global Positioning System (GPS). The committee recommends no funds for high-integrity GPS.

Ground sensor networks

The budget request included $100.8 million in PE 63640M for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations. The committee notes that small arms fire accounts for a large number of coalition casualties in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that a number of services and defense agencies are pursuing technological solutions to meet urgent needs of deployed forces. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for the development of ground sensor networks that can detect and locate hostile fire.

Shipboard system component development

The budget request included $4.0 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development, but included no funding for high temperature superconductor alternating current (HTS–AC) synchronous marine propulsion motor development or for developing a permanent magnet hybrid propulsion system for the DDG–51 Aegis destroyer.

The Navy has been developing and testing a 36.5 megawatt prototype HTS–AC synchronous propulsion motor. Funds are required to complete preliminary design and risk reduction of the tactical motor in order to initiate detailed design and fabrication of the motor in 2010. HTS propulsion motors could support current and future Navy needs, either as an upgrade to the DDG–1000, or for the CG(X) next-generation cruiser. Successful development of the HTS motor will allow much greater flexibility in regards to space and weight considerations on Navy warships. The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million to continue development and testing of the HTS–AC synchronous marine propulsion motor.

The budget request included no funding for continued development and testing of the permanent magnet motor (PMM). Congress

has provided funding for several fiscal years to mature the PMM technology for main propulsion motor applications. The team developing this system has developed a plan to design and build a smaller PMM that would support a hybrid electric drive system for DDG–51 Aegis destroyers. The contractor claims that such a system installed on a DDG–51 would pay back the investment in approximately 3 years, based only on fuel savings of approximately 13,000 barrels of fuel per ship per year. The committee recommends an increase of $7.6 million to design and build a hybrid electric drive system based on PMM technology.

The committee recommends a total authorization of $17.1 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development.

Advanced submarine system development

The budget request included $141.7 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine systems development. The design and development efforts in these programs are to evaluate a broad range of system and technology alternatives to directly support and enhance the mission capability of current submarines and future submarine concepts.

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

However, there appears to be insufficient work to maintain the skill set among submarine designers until the Navy would otherwise start designing a replacement for the *Ohio* class. A previous report by the RAND Corporation evaluating the submarine design industrial base concluded that it would be less expensive to sustain some number of workers in excess of those needed to meet the residual design demands during such a gap. One means of achieving this goal would be to begin the more extensive design activities earlier than the Navy would otherwise start them to support a specific date to start building the next class. The committee believes that the Navy should continue that effort in fiscal year 2009 and recommends an increase of $15.0 million for that purpose.

Facilities improvements

The budget request included $4.1 million in PE 63725N, but included no funding for a program to develop a hydrokinetic power generator. This technology uses the phenomenon of vortex-induced vibrations to extract useful kinetic energy from ocean and other water currents. Researchers claim that it is highly scalable and could produce energy over a wide range of current speeds, starting as low as 1 knot. This energy extraction technology is non-obtrusive, environmentally compatible, and modular. Such generating systems could be very useful for supporting various Navy power needs, including coastal naval bases, instrumentation stations, battery recharging, off-shore stations, and ships not under way.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to support development and testing of this power generation approach.

Optical interconnect

The budget request included $2.8 million in PE 63739N for Navy logistics productivity initiatives, but included no funding to develop low cost, high quality fiber optic interconnect technology for military aerospace application. The Department of Defense continues to demand increasing data processing, communication, and system control capabilities. The next-generation data and communication management systems needed for weapons systems will depend upon tightly integrated optical fiber solutions, also known as optical interconnect. This solution optimizes space utilization while achieving high bandwidth, decreased weight, immunity to electromagnetic interference, resistance to corrosion, and improved safety and security. The Navy has requirements for next-generation optical interconnect technology for several aircraft platform systems, and anticipates that this technology could be applied to Navy vessels as well. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million to develop this important technology.

Land attack technology

The budget request included $40.0 million in PE 63795N for land attack technology, including $38.8 million for the naval surface fire support development activity. Most of the funding within this activity would have been applied to development of the extended range guided munition (ERGM).

Based on continuing development problems, and capped by recent test failures, the Navy decided to terminate the ERGM program after submitting the fiscal year 2009 budget request.

The committee strongly supports making improvements in naval surface fire support capability. However, the Navy cannot usefully spend all of the funds requested in this program until it decides on a path forward.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $30.0 million in land attack technology. The remaining funds should be sufficient to support Navy efforts to mature other technologies and develop a new plan for meeting surface fire support requirements.

Directed energy

The budget request included $108.6 million PE 62114N and PE 63114N for directed energy and continued development of an electromagnetic rail gun. No funding was requested in PE 63925N, directed energy and electric weapons systems. Neither was there any funding included for a laser weapons system (LAWS), which is a top research and development priority on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list, or for the Guillotine program. LAWS is under development as a rapid prototype to serve as an adjunct laser weapon for the Navy's Close-In Weapon System (CIWS) to counter rockets, artillery, mortar, and unmanned aerial vehicles for ship and expeditionary base defense. Additional funding would accelerate development by 2 years. Guillotine would provide commanders with a non-lethal capability to disrupt threats and terrorist operations.

The committee agrees with the Navy's objectives, outlined in Joint Vision 2020, to develop directed energy weapons that provide unique capability against emerging asymmetric threats. The committee recommends an increase of $10.7 million in PE 63925N in support of LAWS and Guillotine development and related directed energy and laser weapon systems research and development, including high power free electron and high brightness electron laser technology.

Next-generation cruiser

The budget request included $172.1 million in PE 64300N and $140.4 million in PE 64501N for development efforts in support of a next-generation cruiser, CG(X). CG(X) is planned to be the replacement for the CG–47 class cruiser, with primary missions including air and missile defense. The Navy's long-range shipbuilding plan proposes to procure the first ship of the CG(X) program in 2011.

The John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required that the Navy include nuclear power in its Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) for the CG(X) propulsion system.

Section 1012 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) further requires that CG(X) be nuclear powered, unless the Secretary of Defense submits a notification that inclusion of an integrated nuclear power system is not in the national interest. The statement of managers accompanying that act directed the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report with the budget request for fiscal year 2009 providing information regarding CG(X) design, cost, schedule, industrial base considerations, and risk assessment; that would reflect the results of the CG(X) AoA and provide evidence that the Navy is on schedule for procuring the first ship of the class in 2011.

The Secretary of the Navy has delayed submission of the CG(X) report because the CG(X) AoA, which was scheduled to be complete by third quarter fiscal year 2007, remains under review by the Navy. Fundamental considerations regarding the cruiser's requirements, characteristics, technology readiness levels, and affordability continue to be studied, making it likely that milestone A, which was targeted for September 2007, will slip into 2009. By all measures, there is no reasonable path for the next-generation cruiser to meet the current schedule for milestone B and award of a ship construction contract in 2011.

Pending completion of the AoA, determination of radar requirements, ship characteristics, propulsion system, and an executable program schedule, and in view of the delay to program major milestones, the activities planned for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 cannot be executed per the schedule reflected in the fiscal year 2009 budget request. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $87.2 million in PE 64300N and a decrease of $33.6 million in PE 64501N. These recommended decreases would maintain the cruiser development activities at the same level as was funded in fiscal year 2008.

Improved towed array handler

The budget request included $143.5 million in PE 64503N for SSN–688 and Trident submarine modernization, but included no funding for developing or testing improved handling gear for submarine towed arrays. One continuing problem area involves the mechanisms for deployment of the towed array from the submarine's hull. The current system attempts to "push" the flexible array out of the submarine using multiple rollers which often results in damage to array elements and deployment failure. A new system that "pulls" the array out could reduce the number of rollers which are the source of array damage and allow for other improvements and increased reliability.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.1 million to complete further development of the new handling system and testing of a prototype to demonstrate improved thin-line towed array system reliability from better array handlers.

Submarine electronic chart updates

The budget request included $143.5 million in PE 64558N, but included no funding for a program to update electronic charts for submarines.

Navy instructions mandate the use of electronic chart display products across the Navy. This requirement was conceived in stand-alone, display workstation applications, which no longer represent the state-of-the-practice of net-ready, web-service environments. The committee is aware that the Navy conducted a Small Business Innovative Research effort that focused on the demonstration of net-ready, web-service updates of electronic charts for submarines. Funding is needed to:

(1) enhance the current voyage management system/enhanced control display unit capabilities on the attack submarines;

(2) establish an interim chart update repository ashore to support the Navy until formal transition to National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency production;

(3) develop and evaluate potential bandwidth reduction options for vector data products, and establish related certification requirements and procedures;

(4) demonstrate navigation task reduction through automated chart updates by data consumers; and

(5) complete operational testing of developed services and web clients for release to the fleet.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.3 million to support these activities.

Next-generation Phalanx

The budget request included $36.2 million in PE 64756N for ship self-defense (hard kill), but included no funding for next-generation Phalanx. The Phalanx weapon system is the Navy's principal close-in weapon system for ship self-defense, and has proven to be extremely adaptive for performance against emerging air and surface target sets. The continually evolving nature of the threat, unique challenges posed by operations in the littorals, increased emphasis on single ship probability of raid annihilation, and fact of life tech-

nology obsolescence require continued development effort to sustain the superior performance of this critical ship self-defense system. The committee recommends an increase of $10.7 million in PE 64756N for the continued development of the next-generation Phalanx.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system

The budget request included $57.6 million for ship self-defense soft-kill systems development in PE 64757N, including $3.0 million for various development activities related to the NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system.

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

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

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

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

(4) increased duty cycle; and

(5) additional systems engineering and software support.

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

Combat wound tissue transplantation technologies

The budget request included $7.8 million in PE 64771N for medical development. The committee notes the continuing and growing need for combat casualty care technologies including tissue and organ replacement and transplantation. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 64771N for composite tissue transplantation research.

F–35 Joint Strike Fighter competitive propulsion system

The budget request included $1,532.7 million in PE 64800N and $1,524.0 million in PE 64800F for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program. In section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), Congress explicitly directed the Department of Defense to (1) develop a competitive propulsion system for the JSF aircraft; and (2) continue competition for the propulsion system throughout the production phase of the JSF program.

The committee is disappointed that the administration chose to ignore the law by failing to fund the competitive propulsion system. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $215.0 million in PE 64800N and $215.0 million in PE 64800F for development of the F–35 JSF competitive propulsion system.

Navy test and evaluation support

The budget request included $356.3 million in PE 65864N for test and evaluation support. The committee commends the Navy for the growth in this line, and urges the Navy to continue to sustain and modernize test capabilities to support current and emerg-

ing service and joint requirements. However, the committee is concerned that test and evaluation accounts are often used to deposit discretionary funds that are then transferred for use for other purposes.

The committee recommends a reduction of $10.0 million in PE 65864N for the activities described in budget presentations as "PBD P19—COTF Balancing." The committee was later informed that the Office of the Secretary of Defense transferred the funds to the Navy without sufficient explanation, so the amount was placed into a test and evaluation account for the purposes of the budget request until clarification was received. The committee has not received any clarification for the purpose of the funds and feels that this is insufficient justification for the request.

Advanced LINAC facility

The budget request included $80.1 million in PE 11221N, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy (RDTEN), but included no funding for the Crane linear accelerator facility (LINAC). The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for the LINAC to simulate the high radiation environment in space. The committee directs the Navy to develop and use these additional funds in conjunction with the Joint Radiation Hardened Electronics Oversight Council.

Navy support of the reliable replacement warhead

The budget request included $23.3 million in PE 11221N Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy (RDTEN) for support to the reliable replacement warhead (RRW). The committee recommends no funds for Navy support to phase 3 RRW activities and a reduction of $23.3 million. This effort anticipated that the National Nuclear Security Administration would be moving to the phase 3 of the RRW study process in 2009. No funds were provided for RRW phase 2A in fiscal year 2008, as a result funding for phase 3 is premature.

Warfighter enhanced decision making

The budget request included $26.7 million in PE 24163N for fleet communications, but included no funding for a warfighter enhanced decision making and mobile networking applications initiative (WEDM).

Two years ago, Congress directed the Navy to establish a laboratory to address information technology (IT) challenges facing local and regional commands. The laboratory's focus on emerging technologies offers a unique opportunity to develop and test a joint operational proof-of-concept WEDM. This initiative would be aimed at fielding leading edge applications that could shorten the operational "kill chain" and enhance information flow to the warfighter. WEDM would also provide an opportunity for the academic community to work with the Department of Defense to develop and rapidly deploy training curricula for emerging technologies.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million to establish the WEDM pilot program to provide modeling and simulation, lab testing, live testing, and training on equipment prior to shore site acquisition to ensure that the C4I systems programmed for in-

stallation on Navy ships are compatible with shore facilities and are of appropriate capacity to support fleet deployments worldwide.

Aviation improvements

The budget request included $122.9 million in PE 25633N for aviation improvements, but no funds to develop next-generation automated test systems (ATS) instrumentation for aircraft avionics or to develop rapid repair structural adhesives for aircraft applications.

Current ATS are large and numerous. The Navy finds it difficult to keep the commercial hardware used in test equipment modernized on a schedule similar to advanced and evolving aircraft avionics. The Navy specifically, and the Department of Defense broadly, require technology that is easily upgradeable and flexible to conduct complex tests on a variety of fielded systems. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million to develop new technology for ATS to reduce the size and increase the versatility of test equipment through software upgrades.

The Navy has been pursuing efforts to develop structural adhesives that cure in the presence of ultraviolet light, reducing required maintenance equipment while retaining required strength. This would permit rapid repair of structures, such as damaged military aircraft and radomes. Present technology only supports either room temperature curing for several days or high pressure and temperature cycles in autoclaves. Developing adhesives that cure rapidly, store at room temperature, last on the shelf for a year, and are environmentally safe would have great benefits to Navy logistics. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million to develop structural adhesives that exhibit these properties.

The committee recommends a total authorization of $126.9 million in PE 25633N for aviation improvements.

Broad Area Maritime Surveillance Unmanned Aircraft System

The budget request included $480.1 million in PE 35205N for the Broad Area Maritime Surveillance Unmanned Aircraft System (BAMS UAS). The BAMS UAS program development contract, which the Navy had expected to award in October 2007, was delayed until late April 2008. As a result, development activities originally planned for fiscal year 2008 will inevitably move to fiscal year 2009. For example, an updated BAMS UAS program schedule indicates that system engineering activities such as the system functional review have slipped to fiscal year 2009.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $48.2 million in PE 35205N for BAMS UAS to reflect this delay.

Digital manufacturing technologies

The budget request included $56.7 million in PE 78011N for Navy manufacturing technology programs. The committee notes that the Director of Defense Research and Engineering and the Defense Science Board have both identified significant shortfalls in manufacturing research and development funding in the Department of Defense. To help address these shortfalls and strengthen

the defense industrial base, the committee recommends an increase of $1.7 million in PE 78011N for the development of advanced direct digital manufacturing technologies to support the rapid prototyping of defense materiel.

National Shipbuilding Research Program—Advanced Shipbuilding Enterprise

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

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

Air Force

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	309,926		309,926
0601103F	2	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	125,949	8,100	134,049
		Advanced design technologies for hypersonics research		[2,000]	
		Diamond substrates for microelectronics research		[2,500]	
		Information security research		[2,000]	
		Military decision cycle time research		[1,600]	
0601108F	3	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,425		13,425
0301555F	4	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0301556F	5	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0305172F	6	COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS	[ ]		[ ]
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, AIR FORCE	**449,300**	**8,100**	**457,400**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602015F	7	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT			
0602102F	8	MATERIALS	117,143	8,500	125,643
		Advanced carbon fiber research and testing		[2,500]	
		Fire and blast resistant materials research		[2,000]	
		Health monitoring sensors for aerospace components		[1,500]	
		Thermal protection systems for hypersonics		[2,500]	

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0602201F	9	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	122,870	1,500	124,370
		Optical connector research		[1,500]	
0602202F	10	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	82,091	4,500	86,591
		Joint theater air-ground simulation system		[2,500]	
		Satellite control system training technology		[2,000]	
0602203F	11	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	218,049	7,000	225,049
		Hybrid bearing development		[2,000]	
		X-51B scramjet research		[5,000]	
0602204F	12	AEROSPACE SENSORS	109,048	4,500	113,548
		Information quality research		[1,500]	
		Wideband electronic sensing technologies		[3,000]	
0602601F	13	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	117,519	13,000	130,519
		Seismic research program		[13,000]	
0602602F	14	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	55,963		55,963
0602605F	15	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	62,871		62,871
0602702F	16	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	109,492	2,500	111,992
		Cyber attack mitigation technologies		[2,500]	
0602890F	17	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	49,449		49,449
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, AIR FORCE	**1,044,495**	**41,500**	**1,085,995**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603112F	18	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	41,926	5,000	46,926
		Metals affordability initiative		[5,000]	

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603203F	19	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	56,916	2,000	58,916
		Reconfigurable secure computing technologies		[2,000]	
0603211F	20	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	44,918		44,918
0603216F	21	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	170,856	9,000	179,856
		Assured aerospace fuels research		[3,000]	
		HiSTED supersonic/hypersonic cruise missile engine		[6,000]	
0603231F	22	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	26,630		26,630
0603270F	23	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	21,056		21,056
0603311F	24	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY			
0603401F	25	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	80,958	2,000	82,958
		Thin film amorphous solar arrays		[2,000]	
0603444F	26	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	4,838		4,838
0603601F	27	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	11,813	3,000	14,813
		Integrated targeting devices		[3,000]	
0603605F	28	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	44,507		44,507
0603680F	29	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	39,729		39,729
0603789F	30	C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	30,103	2,000	32,103
		Optical interconnects research		[2,000]	
0603801F	31	SPECIAL PROGRAMS			
0603924F	32	HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	4,013	5,000	9,013
		HEL directed energy weapons		[5,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, AIR FORCE	**578,263**	**28,000**	**606,263**

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
0603260F	33	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,988		4,988
0603287F	34	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	477		477
0603421F	35	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III			
0603423F	36	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III - OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	2,975	304,360	307,335
		GPS III-OCX		[304,360]	
0603427F	37	GPS OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT - BACKWARDS COMPATIBILITY	304,360	-304,360	0
		GPS III-OCX backwards compatibility		[-304,360]	
0603430F	38	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	388,041		388,041
0603432F	39	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	237,749		237,749
0603438F	40	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	76,845	5,000	81,845
		Space situational awareness		[5,000]	
0603742F	41	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	29,400		29,400
0603790F	42	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,334		4,334
0603791F	43	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	627		627
0603845F	44	TRANSFORMATIONAL SATCOM (TSAT)	842,974	350,000	1,192,974
		TSAT		[350,000]	
0603850F	45	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	21,105		21,105
0603851F	46	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	65,629		65,629
0603854F	47	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM RDT&E (SPACE)	12,422		12,422
0603858F	48	SPACE RADAR			
0603859F	49	POLLUTION PREVENTION	2,877		2,877
0603860F	50	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	7,479		7,479
0604015F	51	NEXT GENERATION BOMBER			

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604796F	52	ALTERNATIVE FUELS	28,464		28,464
0604830F	53	AUTOMATED AIR-TO-AIR REFUELING	9,889		9,889
0604856F	54	COMMON AERO VEHICLE (CAV)			
0604857F	55	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	110,032	10,000	120,032
		ORS		[10,000]	
0305178F	56	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYSTEM (NPOESS)	289,469		289,469
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES, AIR FORCE	**2,440,136**	**365,000**	**2,805,136**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
0603840F	57	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	18,790		18,790
0604222F	58	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	20,166		20,166
0604226F	59	B-1B	128,871		128,871
0604233F	60	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	7,462		7,462
0604240F	61	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	351,417	-18,500	332,917
		B-2 Radar (Transfer to APAF 24)		[-18,500]	
0604261F	62	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SYSTEMS			
0604270F	63	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	54,995		54,995
0604287F	64	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	52		52
0604329F	65	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	125,067		125,067
0604421F	66	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	74,918		74,918

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604425F	67	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	210,501	10,000	220,501
		SBSS 10		[10,000]	
0604429F	68	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	34,279		34,279
0604441F	69	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	529,771	30,000	559,771
		SBIRS operations and training		[30,000]	
0604443F	70	THIRD GENERATION INFRARED SURVEILLANCE (3GIRS)	149,064	-30,000	119,064
		Third generation infrared surveillance		[-30,000]	
0604602F	71	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	2,095		2,095
0604604F	72	SUBMUNITIONS	1,730		1,730
0604617F	73	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	5,790		5,790
0604618F	74	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION			
0604706F	75	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	10,998		10,998
0604735F	76	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	28,047		28,047
0604740F	77	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	177		177
0604750F	78	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,488		1,488
0604762F	79	COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CLOVERS)			
0604800F	80	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	1,524,016	250,000	1,774,016
		Fund competitive propulsion system		[215,000]	
		Technology development for F135 engine		[35,000]	
0604853F	81	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)	33,719		33,719
0605011F	82	RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	13,828		13,828
0605221F	83	NEXT GENERATION AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT	831,759	61,660	893,419
		USAF-requested transfer from APAF 10		[61,660]	

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0605277F	84	CSAR-X RDT&E	305,062	-40,000	265,062
		Reflect delays in acquisition program		[-40,000]	
0605278F	85	HC/MC-130 RECAP	11,692		11,692
0207434F	86	LINK-16 SUPPORT AND SUSTAINMENT	186,213		186,213
0207450F	87	E-10 SQUADRONS	42,215		42,215
0207451F	88	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP)	66,909		66,909
0207701F	89	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	135,152		135,152
0401138F	90	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA)	26,777		26,777
0401318F	91	CV-22	18,562		18,562
0401845F	92	AIRBORNE SENIOR LEADER C3 (SLC3S)	1,992		1,992
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION, AIR FORCE	**4,953,574**	**263,160**	**5,216,734**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0604256F	93	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	34,568		34,568
0604759F	94	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	61,818	4,000	65,818
		High speed test track		[4,000]	
0605101F	95	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	28,676		28,676
0605502F	96	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH			
0605712F	97	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	29,537		29,537
0605807F	98	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	787,737		787,737
0605860F	99	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	14,895		14,895
0605864F	100	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	48,072		48,072

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0605976F	101	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION - TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	46,234		46,234
0605978F	102	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT - TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	28,898		28,898
0804731F	103	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING			
1001004F	104	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,910		3,910
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, AIR FORCE	**1,084,345**	**4,000**	**1,088,345**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0604263F	105	COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT PLATFORM	3,868		3,868
0605024F	106	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	20,987		20,987
0605798F	107	ANALYSIS SUPPORT GROUP	[ ]		[ ]
0101113F	108	B-52 SQUADRONS	38,651	9,500	48,151
		B-52 CONECT		[9,500]	
0101120F	109	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE			
0101122F	110	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	396		396
0101313F	111	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM - USSTRATCOM	17,553		17,553
0101314F	112	NIGHT FIST - USSTRATCOM	5,299		5,299
0101815F	113	ADVANCED STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	[ ]	[-10,000]	[ ]
		ISSO		[-10,000]	
0102326F	114	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	23,858		23,858
0102823F	115	STRATEGIC AEROSPACE INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	15		15

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0203761F	116	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRANSITION FUND	20,807		20,807
0205219F	117	MQ-9 UAV	43,557		43,557
0207131F	118	A-10 SQUADRONS			
0207133F	119	F-16 SQUADRONS	123,979		123,979
0207134F	120	F-15E SQUADRONS	184,213		184,213
0207136F	121	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	5,585		5,585
0207138F	122	F-22A SQUADRONS	700,305		700,305
0207141F	123	F-117A SQUADRONS			
0207161F	124	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	5,748		5,748
0207163F	125	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	54,239		54,239
0207170F	126	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	3,192		3,192
0207247F	127	AF TENCAP	11,578		11,578
0207248F	128	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM			
0207253F	129	COMPASS CALL	4,670		4,670
0207268F	130	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	150,956		150,956
0207277F	131	CSAF INNOVATION PROGRAM			
0207325F	132	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	13,035		13,035
0207410F	133	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	118,834	-40,400	78,434
		Delay AOC, increment 10.2		[-40,400]	
0207412F	134	MODULAR CONTROL SYSTEM	60,590		60,590
0207417F	135	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	126,300		126,300
0207418F	136	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	1,530		1,530
0207423F	137	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	29,782		29,782

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0207424F	138	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	794,036		794,036
0207433F	139	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY			
0207438F	140	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	19,437		19,437
0207445F	141	FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK	62,788		62,788
0207446F	142	BOMBER TACTICAL DATA LINK	11,702		11,702
0207448F	143	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,727		1,727
0207449F	144	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	32,151		32,151
0207581F	145	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)	97,641	98,000	195,641
		Improve maturity of MP-RTIP sensor suite for larger aircraft		[98,000]	
0207590F	146	SEEK EAGLE	21,645		21,645
0207591F	147	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION			
0207601F	148	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	28,981		28,981
0207605F	149	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	3,870		3,870
0207697F	150	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	7,137		7,137
0208006F	151	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	97,560		97,560
0208021F	152	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	12,220		12,220
0208161F	153	SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	1,077,970		1,077,970
0301310F	154	NATIONAL AIR INTELLIGENCE CENTER	[ ]		[ ]
0301314F	155	COBRA BALL	[ ]		[ ]
0301315F	156	MISSILE AND SPACE TECHNICAL COLLECTION	[ ]		[ ]
0301324F	157	FOREST GREEN	[ ]		[ ]
0301386F	158	GDIP COLLECTION MANAGEMENT	[ ]		[ ]
0302015F	159	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	4,069		4,069
0303112F	160	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS (AIRCOM)			

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0303131F	161	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	70,995		70,995
0303140F	162	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	187,933		187,933
0303141F	163	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	4,320		4,320
0303150F	164	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,218		3,218
0303158F	165	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	3,234		3,234
0303601F	166	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	337,098		337,098
0304111F	167	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0304260F	168	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	173,631		173,631
0304311F	169	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0304348F	170	ADVANCED GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE (AGI)	[ ]		[ ]
0305099F	171	COMMUNICATION, NAVIGATION, SURVEILLANCE	6,275		6,275
0305103F	172	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,083		2,083
0305110F	173	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	16,758		16,758
0305111F	174	WEATHER SERVICE	47,347	6,000	53,347
		Integrate all terrain, weather & risk assessment information into one display		[6,000]	
0305114F	175	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	6,867		6,867
0305116F	176	AERIAL TARGETS	34,777		34,777
0305124F	177	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0305127F	178	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0305128F	179	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	786		786
0305142F	180	APPLIED TECHNOLOGY AND INTEGRATION			
0305146F	181	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	39		39

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0305159F	182	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	[ ]	[-404,000]	[ ]
		FINDER		[25,000]	
		Phased Array		[27,000]	
		Program reduction		[-50,000]	
		Program reduction		[-406,000]	
0305160F	183	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)			
0305164F	184	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	127,513		127,513
0305165F	185	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS)	91,277		91,277
0305172F	186	COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS	[ ]		[ ]
0305173F	187	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	1,985		1,985
0305174F	188	SPACE WARFARE CENTER	3,003		3,003
0305182F	189	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	12,376		12,376
0305193F	190	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	1,237		1,237
0305206F	191	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	149,752	-10,000	139,752
		Blackswift testbed		[-10,000]	
0305207F	192	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	12,819		12,819
0305208F	193	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	107,834		107,834
0305219F	194	MQ-1 PREDATOR UAV	24,773	10,000	34,773
		UAV sense and avoid		[10,000]	
0305220F	195	GLOBAL HAWK UAV	284,292		284,292
0305221F	196	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	8,807		8,807
0305265F	197	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	420,342		420,342
0305887F	198	ELECTRONIC COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	5,438		5,438

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0305906F	199	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM			
0305913F	200	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	41,292		41,292
0305924F	201	NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE OFFICE	10,797		10,797
0305940F	202	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	16,166		16,166
0307141F	203	INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEVELOPMENT	15,726		15,726
0308699F	204	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	3,152		3,152
0401115F	205	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	172,560		172,560
0401119F	206	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	125,063		125,063
0401130F	207	C-17 AIRCRAFT	236,047	-48,000	188,047
		Reduce growth in performance improvement program		[-48,000]	
0401132F	208	C-130J PROGRAM	52,354		52,354
0401134F	209	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	32,100		32,100
0401218F	210	KC-135 AIRCRAFT	7,133		7,133
0401219F	211	KC-10 AIRCRAFT			
0401221F	212	KC-135 TANKER REPLACEMENT			
0401314F	213	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT			
0401839F	214	AIR MOBILITY TACTICAL DATA LINK			
0408011F	215	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	5,728		5,728
0702207F	216	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,531		1,531
0702806F	217	ACQUISITION AND COMMAND SUPPORT	34,428		34,428
0708011F	218	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS			
0708012F	219	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0708610F	220	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	189,679	-50,000	139,679
		Expeditionary combat support system (ECSS)		[-50,000]	
0708611F	221	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,145		8,145
0804757F	222	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER	3,214		3,214
0808716F	223	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	116		116
0901202F	224	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	5,768		5,768
0901212F	225	SERVICE-WIDE SUPPORT	3,016		3,016
0901218F	226	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	8,123		8,123
0901220F	227	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	18,625		18,625
0901538F	228	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	31,782	-15,000	16,782
		DEAMS		[-15,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, AIR FORCE	**7,211,815**	**-39,900**	**7,171,915**
	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	10,304,689	-414,000	9,890,689
		Total, RDT&E Air Force	**28,066,617**	**255,860**	**28,322,477**

Air Force basic research programs

The budget request included $125.9 million in PE 61103F for university research initiatives. The committee commends the Air Force for increasing its investments in basic research in the fiscal year 2009 budget request. This is consistent with the National Research Council's 2005 report entitled "Assessment of Department of Defense Basic Research," which recommended that "the Department of Defense should redress the imbalance between its current basic research allocation, which has declined critically over the past decade, and its need to better support the expanded areas of technology, the need for increased unfettered basic research, and the support of new researchers."

Consistent with the need to fund more basic research efforts in areas of technological interest to the Air Force, the committee recommends increases in PE 61103F of: $2.0 million for research on advanced hypersonic technology designs; $2.0 million for information security research; $1.6 million for research on reducing military decision making cycle times; and $2.5 million for research on diamond substrates for microelectronics.

Air Force materials research

The budget request included $117.1 million in PE 62102F for applied research on materials. The committee notes that the National Research Council's 2005 report on "High Performance Structural Fibers for Advanced Polymer Matrix Composites" highlighted the need for the Department of Defense to reduce costs and improve its understanding of the manufacture and properties of advanced carbon fibers. Consistent with those recommendations, the committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62102F for research on advanced carbon fiber materials for Air Force applications. The committee notes that the Naval Studies Board's 2007 report on "Conventional Prompt Global Strike (CPGS) Capability" noted that "the boost glide and high-speed cruise missile concepts as CPGS options require advanced technologies, especially in the areas of thermal protection and management . . ." The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million for the development of thermal protection systems for global strike hypersonic vehicles.

The Director of Defense Research and Engineering's 2007 Strategic Plan identified advanced materials as an enabling technology for a number of desired military capabilities, including protection against improvised explosive devices and air dominance. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62102F for development of fire and blast resistant materials for force protection missions.

Finally, the committee notes that the Air Force Research Laboratory strategy has a strategic goal to "accurately diagnose the current state and predict the future state of aerospace systems" by 2015. To support that effort, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million for development of health monitoring sensors of aerospace components.

The budget request included $41.9 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials technology development for weapons systems. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to develop

and transition metals and process technologies for fielded and future Air Force systems.

Optical components for air vehicles

The budget request included $122.9 million in PE 62201F for applied research on aerospace vehicle technologies. The committee notes that the National Research Council's 2006 study on "Future Air Force Needs for Survivability" noted the need to reduce electronic emission signatures on aircraft. The committee recommends an additional $1.5 million in PE 62201F for research on optical components to replace electrical components for use in onboard aircraft communications systems.

Air Force training technology

The budget request included $82.1 million in PE 62202F for applied research on human effectiveness. The committee notes that in a 2007 memorandum to the Secretary of Defense, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering highlighted the need to significantly increase investments in research on adaptive, interactive full immersion training. To enhance Air Force and joint training capabilities, the committee recommends increases in PE 62202F of $2.0 million for advanced satellite operator training systems development and $2.5 million for development of immersive tools for enhancing theater air-to-ground command and control coordination modeling and simulation.

Air Force aerospace propulsion technology

The budget request included $218.0 million in PE 62203F for applied research on aerospace propulsion. The 2006 National Research Council report entitled "A Review of United States Air Force and Department of Defense Aerospace Propulsion Needs" concluded that Air Force investments in propulsion science and technology need ". . . to be increased if technical gaps are to be filled." The report focused on a variety of space, tactical air, and engine technology gaps that need to be addressed.

To enhance Air Force propulsion technology efforts, the committee recommends an increase in 62203F of $2.0 million for development of high temperature, corrosion resistant bearings for advanced propulsion systems.

The committee continues to support Department of Defense efforts to develop technologies to support time-critical strike missions. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62203F for robust scramjet research activities leading to flight tests and demonstration of an alternate engine to support the Air Force X–51 testbed program.

Aerospace sensor technologies

The budget request included $109.0 million in PE 62204F for applied research on aerospace sensors. The committee notes that the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) science and technology (S&T) strategy highlights the need for development of "novel data mining and advanced relevance assessment technologies" to support establishment of "universal situational awareness." To help address this need, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5

million for research on enhancing information quality to support persistent surveillance missions.

The AFRL S&T strategy has set a strategic goal of demonstrating "layered and flexible sensing architecture that respond to the Commander's intent" by identifying and precisely locating high value difficult targets by 2015. To support the development of this architecture, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62204F for development of wideband system components to support electronic intelligence systems.

Air Force seismic research

The budget request included $117.5 million in PE 62601F Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force for space technologies including $6.8 for seismic technologies to support national requirements for monitoring nuclear explosions. The committee recommends an increase of $13.0 million to improve operational seismic capability.

Cyber attack mitigation technologies

The budget request included $109.5 million in PE 62702F for applied research on command, control, and communications technologies. The September 2007 Defense Science Board study entitled "Mission Impact of Foreign Influence on DOD Software" highlighted the need for "programs to advance the state-of-the-art in vulnerability detection and mitigation in software and hardware." In support of this finding, the committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million for the development of systems to detect and defeat malicious software on military networks and information systems.

Reconfigurable securing computing

The budget request included $56.9 million in PE 63203F for development of advanced aerospace sensors. The Air Force and Department of Defense have set cybersecurity as a high technology priority. To support these efforts at the tactical level and reduce the costs for the development of security systems, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to develop reconfigurable secure computing technologies for advanced sensor systems.

Propulsion technologies

The budget request included $170.9 million in PE 63216F for aerospace and propulsion and power technology development. The Defense Science Board Task Force on DOD Energy Strategy recommended investing "in energy efficient and alternative energy technologies to a level commensurate with their operational and financial value." The committee believes that the development of alternative sources of fuel for Air Force missions could result in huge cost savings for the Department of Defense, and therefore recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63216F for research on assured aerospace fuels to assess alternative fuels from sources such as coal, biomass, and shale, while minimizing environmental impact.

The committee continues to support development of hypersonic technologies to enable high speed, precision strike capabilities. The committee recommends an additional $6.0 million in PE 63216F for

development of supersonic and hypersonic cruise missile engine technologies, as part of the Versatile Affordable Advanced Turbine Engine (VAATE) High Speed Turbine Engine Demonstrator (HiSTED) program.

Thin film amorphous solar arrays

The budget request included $81.0 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for thin film amorphous solar arrays for space systems. Fiscal year 2009 will be the last year of this successful research and development program of advanced solar arrays for space systems using thin film amorphous substrate. These solar arrays are 10 times cheaper, three to five times lighter, and significantly more efficient than current solar arrays. After the successful demonstration flight on the Tac-Sat2 satellite, the committee believes that the Air Force should work with industry to explore future opportunities to transition these solar arrays to future Tac-Sat satellites or other satellite programs of record. Fiscal year 2009 funds would be used to finish the analysis of the experimental and demonstration data and complete the project.

Integrated targeting devices

The budget request included $11.8 million in PE 63601F for development of conventional weapons technology. The Air Force Research Laboratory science and technology strategy states that "an important aspect of universal situational awareness is the advancement of sensor technologies." In order to support the development of enhanced sensor technologies to support improving precision strike capabilities, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for lightweight, targeting device development to integrate multiple sensor types.

Optical interconnect for battlefield communications

The budget request included $30.1 million in PE 63789F for advanced development of command, control, communications, and intelligence technologies. The Director of Defense Research and Engineering's 2007 strategic plan highlights networks and communications, including technologies to address airborne networks, as an enabling technology that should receive the highest level of corporate attention and coordination. To support these efforts the committee recommends an additional $2.0 million for development of optical interconnects to support data communications onboard unmanned aircraft systems and satellites.

High energy laser weapon systems

The budget request included $4.0 million in PE 63924F for the high energy laser advanced technology program managed by the high energy laser joint technology office. The committee notes that the Defense Science Board Task Force on Directed Energy Weapons recommended that "the Director of Defense Research and Engineering should give high priority to science and technology activities addressing high power solid state laser development and accompanying beam quality and beam control development." To support this effort, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 mil-

lion in PE 63924F for optimization of solid state laser technologies and acceleration of the transition of operational systems to warfighters.

Global Positioning System III operational control segment

The budget request included $734.7 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF) for the Global Positioning System III (GPS III) in three separate budget lines: $420.3 million for the GPS III space segment; $3.0 million for the GPS III operational control segment; and $304.4 million for the backwards compatibility for the operational control segment. Previously all three GPS activities were in a single GPS III program element. While the committee recognizes some value in separating the ground and space segments, the committee believes that separating the ground segment into two different budget lines needlessly removes program management flexibility.

The committee recommends combining RDTEAF line 37 with line 36 into a single budget line and program element, PE 63423F, for the GPS III operational control segment.

If the continued separation of the space and operational control segments introduces additional cost or management difficulty into the GPS III program, the committee would support recombining both segments into a single program element.

Space situational awareness

The budget request included $76.8 million in PE 63438F for space control technology. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to utilize Missile Defense Agency X-band and UHF-band sensors for additional space object tracking to improve space situational awareness.

Transformational Communications satellite

The budget request included $843.0 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF) for the Transformational Communications satellite (TSAT). This amount is $384.8 million less than was projected for TSAT just last year. The committee recommends an increase of $350.0 million for TSAT.

The Air Force and the Department of Defense (DOD) reduced the TSAT program by $3.6 billion over the future-years defense program (FYDP), delaying the first launch of TSAT until fiscal year 2018 or beyond, a delay of 4 years. The committee is very disappointed in the decision to delay TSAT. For the last several years the Air Force and the DOD executive agent for space have asserted that TSAT is one of its highest priorities for the Department and the core of the protected satellite communications architecture.

TSAT would provide protected, high data rate, wideband communications with many times the capability of the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) and the Wideband Global System (WGS) that it will replace. The significantly enhanced capabilities provided by TSAT are required to support a broad range of modernization programs, including the Army Future Combat System and the many existing and future unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) programs. In addition, TSAT will provide a networking capability

based on Internet protocols that will substantially increase the number of users and the way information is shared.

The TSAT program started with an overly aggressive schedule, significant technical risks, and significant cost uncertainty, but with substantial management attention the technical and other risks are being addressed. The key technologies for TSAT are all at a technical readiness level 6 and the independent program assessment found that TSAT is ready to move to the preliminary design phase.

Nevertheless, the Department has initiated a review to revalidate the TSAT program requirements as part of a military satellite communications investment strategy study. The committee is concerned that some of the options being discussed as part of the study will, if adopted, further delay delivery of the TSAT capabilities to the broad user community, waste money in the long run, and generate a significant communications gap in the future. Many of the options under consideration will so reduce the capability of TSAT that the committee questions why such a substantially downgraded TSAT is worth the effort, time, and expense. TSAT as originally envisioned would dramatically increase data throughput and, through the introduction of an Internet protocol approach, fundamentally change the way in which satellite communications are utilized.

The committee recognizes the critical need for the full scope TSAT, but will not support TSAT under the circumstances as currently presented to the committee by the Air Force and DOD. At this juncture the committee would support funding for TSAT only if the Air Force and DOD return TSAT to a meaningful technology and schedule path. This is a difficult decision given the superb management of the program by the TSAT program office.

Once again the committee questions the senior level Air Force commitment to being a space force.

Operationally Responsive Space

The budget request included $110.0 million in PE 64857F for Operationally Responsive Space (ORS). The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for increased work on approaches to standardized bus designs with common interfaces, additional satellite launches to support both technology demonstrations and operational concepts, and additional launch capabilities including a resource study to look at block buys for launch vehicles.

The committee commends the work of the ORS office since it was formally established last year, and appreciates the effort required to establish a multi-service, multi-agency, functioning program office. To support the multi-service, multi-agency nature of the office the committee supports the concept of rotational directors and deputy directors.

The committee urges the ORS office to continue to maintain a balanced program including launch, bus development, sensor development, and developing fully integrated satellites. In addition, the launch of the Tac-Sat2 satellite demonstrated that many issues remain to be resolved in the development of operational concepts for the Transformational Communications Satellite (TSAT).

B–2 radar modernization program

The budget request included $351.4 million in PE64240F for the B–2 bomber, including $83.1 million for radar modernization. The committee recommends a transfer of $18.5 million from PE6420F to Aircraft Procurement, Air Force line 24 to facilitate the management of the radar modernization program.

Space-based space surveillance block 10

The budget request included $210.5 million for space situational awareness systems in PE 64425F including $210.5 million for space-based space surveillance block 10 (SBSS 10). SBSS 10 is a spacecraft to improve deep space situational awareness by finding, fixing, and tracking space objects that is scheduled to launch in early 2009. The committee recommends an additional $10.0 million for SBSS 10 to allow for timely development of training materials, technical orders, and a simulation environment to train Air Force SBSS 10 operators, thereby reducing the time between launch and transition to Air Force operations.

Space-based Infrared Satellite system

The budget request included $529.8 million in PE 64441F for the Space-based Infrared Satellite system (SBIRS). The committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million for SBIRS operations and training.

The SBIRS program is suffering from the same problem that is becoming increasingly apparent in several space systems—a disconnect between the ground and space segments. Because of the technical, cost, and schedule issues that have surrounded the SBIRS space segment, the Air Force has had to divert funds slated for ground related activities to the space segment for at least the last 3 years. As a result, the ground activities associated with SBIRS have been underfunded. The committee notes that for both fiscal years 2008 and 2009 funding for the ground segment has appeared on the Chief of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list.

Now that the first HEO sensor is on orbit, with excellent initial performance, and the second HEO sensor is close behind, the lack of ground funding is a growing problem. The unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2009 is $71.2 million and includes funding for such basic items as the wideband data transmission requirements needed for the payload on-orbit test station to exploit and utilize the capabilities of the new HEO sensors, and crew training. Also included on the unfunded list is completing the hardware and software to allow the mission control station and the backup station to control, track, task, and process the data from both the legacy and the SBIRS systems. Moreover, on the current schedule the backup station will be certified for full operations before the main mission station.

The committee also notes that the Air Force has now decided not to include the Space and Atmospheric Burst Reporting System (SABRS), part of the U.S. nuclear detonation system, as part of the payload on the SBIRS–GEO 3 satellite. The committee directs the Air Force to either reinstate the SABRS on the SBIRS–GEO 3 satellite or find an equally capable alternative host and report its deci-

sion to the congressional defense committee no later than August 30, 2008.

Third Generation Infrared Surveillance satellite system

The budget request included $149.1 million in PE 64443F for the Third Generation Infrared Surveillance (3GIRS) satellite system. The committee recommends a reduction of $30.0 million.

3GIRS is a technology development program to develop the next generation of infrared early warning satellite. The committee supports further development and on orbit testing of new technologies to support the follow-on to the Space Based Infrared Satellite system (SBIRS). The last SBIRS GEO satellite will probably launch in fiscal year 2016 depending on the final decision as to the full size of the SBIRS GEO constellation. In its budget justification material for 3GIRS, the Air Force plans to freeze the technology for the follow-on to SBIRS and make a decision to proceed to build an operational satellite at the end of fiscal 2010 even though the first launch of the follow-on would not be until 2019. The committee is concerned that the Air Force plan would prematurely lock in a technology without completing needed sensor development and without fully understanding the performance of the two approaches currently funded. The committee notes that there is a third unfunded option as well. As a result, the committee urges the Air Force to complete development of the focal plane arrays and to consider short-term on orbit demonstrations of both approaches. The committee encourages utilizing the Operationally Response Space Office to explore opportunities to conduct on orbit experiments.

F135 engine

The budget request included $1,524.0 million in PE 64800F for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program. Over the past 2 years, Congress has added $820.0 million to continue funding of the F136 engine, a competitive propulsion source, to ensure there is fair and full competition for the propulsion system of the JSF.

The Department of Defense froze the technology baseline of the F135 engine several years ago when the JSF and the engine began system development and demonstration (SDD). To ensure that both engines incorporate the best configuration and most recent technology available, the Department should invest in and direct a program for the F135 and F136 engine programs that would drive technology insertion and provide potential customers with the best performing, most efficient engines possible. For example, the committee believes that the potential application of new composite materials in the F135 engine program could result in life cycle cost savings. Because no funds were set aside for the F136 engine in the administration's budget request, elsewhere in this report the committee has recommended an increase of $430.0 million for the development of the F–136 engine.

In order to maintain a level playing field, the committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million in PE 64800F for F135 engine technology development.

Combat Search and Rescue Replacement Aircraft

The budget request included $305.1 million in PE 65277F for development of the Combat Search and Rescue Replacement Aircraft (CSAR–X) and $15.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) for advanced procurement for CSAR–X. The Air Force anticipated awarding the development contract for the CSAR–X in the spring of 2008, but the award has been delayed until the first quarter of fiscal year 2009 due to successful protests by losing offerors, development of additional data about the program, as well as the offerors' schedules.

On April 11, 2008, the Air Force released Amendment 6 to the Request for Proposal for the CSAR–X. Amendment 6 modifies the development funding required in fiscal year 2009, lowering the amount, according to the Air Force, to $265.1 million. These delays and the new program profile associated with Amendment 6 also remove the need for programming any advance procurement funds in fiscal year 2009.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $40.0 million in PE 65277F for CSAR–X and a reduction of $15.0 million in APAF for CSAR–X advance procurement.

High speed test track

The budget request included $61.8 million in PE 64759F for major test and evaluation investments. The committee continues to be concerned about the Air Force's downsizing of its test and evaluation infrastructure and workforce. The committee believes that a shortsighted reduction in Air Force testing capabilities will inevitably increase technical risk, life cycle costs, and potentially reduce operational performance of future Air Force acquisition programs. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million to support development of high speed test track technology for use on testing of critical missile, propulsion, and sensor subsystems.

B–52 bomber

The budget request included $38.7 million in PE 11113F for B–52 squadrons, including $35.2 million for combat network communications technology (CONECT). The committee recommends an additional $9.5 million for CONECT. The Air Force failed to include adequate funding in the budget request to meet the requirements of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to maintain 76 B–52 bombers in a common configuration and included this funding on the Air Force unfunded priorities list.

Air Operations Centers

The budget request included $118.8 million in PE 27410F for Air Operations Centers, including $40.4 million for integration and development of Air Operation Centers (AOCs), increment 10.2. The Air Force has not finished fielding increment 10.1 of the AOCs, yet has launched into development of increment 10.2. Increment 10.2 will rely, in part, on the Defense Information Systems Agency's Net-enabled Command and Control (NECC). However, both the Director of Defense Research and Engineering's technology readiness assessment and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation's

ongoing oversight of the NECC program have raised concerns regarding technical risk, aggressive and optimistic scheduling, and unclear testing and deployment strategies.

Until technical risk, testing, and program schedule issues are addressed in a coordinated and joint fashion for both NECC and AOCs, the committee believes that continuing development of AOCs, increment 10.2 would be premature. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $40.4 million in PE 27410F for the development of AOCs, increment 10.2.

Joint surveillance target attack radar system research and development

The budget request included $97.6 million in PE 27581F for research and development projects for the E–8 joint surveillance target attack radar system (JSTARS).

The E–10 aircraft was supposed to be a test bed for the multiplatform radar technology insertion program (MP–RTIP). The Air Force intends to field this MP–RTIP sensor suite on a number of air vehicles, including the Global Hawk unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV).

Last year, the Air Force decided to cancel the E–10 program. However, the Air Force realized that canceling testing and development of the large MP–RTIP would leave a void in its capability to defend the U.S. homeland as well as U.S. and coalition forces against cruise missile attacks. The JSTARS (E–8) was the original platform designated for MP–RTIP. That makes the current JSTAR aircraft a prime candidate as the Air Force investigates a path forward. The Air Force could transfer the radar back to JSTARS with minimal risk. Installation of MP–RTIP could provide nearly the same capability as the E–10 while saving scarce defense dollars.

The committee believes that the Air Force should pursue another path, whether that would be the E–8 JSTARS or some other platform, and field the better capability than can be achieved with the Global Hawk. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $98.0 million in PE 27581F for maturing the MP–RTIP sensor suite.

Weather service research and development

The budget request included $47.3 million in PE 35111F for research and development projects for the Air Force weather weapon system (AFWWS), but included no funding to develop software toolkits for operations risk management (STORM) upgrades for the system.

AFWWS and its warfighter application are charged with providing regional and tactical weather observations and forecasts to Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems used by commanders, planners, and operators throughout the world. The Air Force needs to upgrade AFWWS to provide commanders and mission planners with a better appreciation of the uncertainty of weather forecasts and observations. Such an upgrade should enable them to better determine the risk of ongoing and planned operations. The AFWWS is currently capable of calculating the needed

uncertainty but is unable to provide computer-to-computer transfer of such information.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million to upgrade the AFWWS and integrate all vital information (terrain, weather, risk assessment) into one visual display.

C–17 research, development, test, and evaluation

The budget request included $236.0 million in PE 41130F for C–17 research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E), including $150.8 million for performance improvement development and testing. The funding for performance improvement development and testing represents a 50 percent increase over the fiscal year 2008 amount.

The committee believes that the Air Force should continue to seek improvements in existing weapons systems, and therefore is not recommending elimination of all funding. However, given the superb performance and operation of the C–17 fleet over the past several years, the committee sees no justification for increased RDT&E funding for C–17s at this time.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $48.0 million in PE 41130F for C–17 performance improvement development and testing.

Expeditionary Combat Support System

The budget request included $189.7 million in PE 78610F for the Expeditionary Combat Support System (ECSS). The committee is encouraged by the recent progress ECSS has made towards achieving Milestone B certification in the fall of this year. Also encouraging is the Air Force strategy briefed to the committee for better coordination and integration of ECSS with another information technology initiative, the Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System (DEAMS). However, significant concerns remain. Current plans show that over the next 3 years the Air Force has underfunded the ECSS by over $500.0 million. Additionally, the committee has learned that the program office is significantly understaffed. While the committee has been given assurances that the funding concerns will be reconciled in future years, the current schedule of concurrently developing and fielding Release 1 and Release 2 appears high risk. Until the Air Force fully funds the ECCS and provides sufficient manning, the current schedule appears overly optimistic. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $50.0 million in PE 78610F for ECSS, Release 2.

Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System

The budget request included $27.3 million in PE 91538F for the research, development, test, and evaluation activities related to the Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System (DEAMS). The committee has historically been supportive of the Department of Defense's business systems modernization efforts, but is concerned by the Air Force's functionally "stovepiped" approach to its Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) financial systems. Current Air Force strategy designates DEAMS as the Air Force financial system of record for working capital fund accounting, requiring the Expeditionary Combat Support System (ECSS) financial trans-

action to be provided to DEAMS. Current strategy increases the number of interfaces between DEAMS and ECSS, increases long-term costs, and greatly complicates the Air Force movement to a fully integrated information technology environment.

The committee notes that the Air Force has recognized the weaknesses of the current "stovepiped" strategy and, under a proposed new strategy, plans to migrate working capital fund financials to ECSS. Supported by the Office of the Secretary of Defense's Business Transformation Agency, this proposal will provide the foundation for the Air Force's evolution to a single enterprise resource program. Under the new strategy, the committee believes that the development funding requested for DEAMS is excess to need.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $15.0 million for DEAMS. The committee directs that the Air Force preserve funding for testing activities related to DEAMS when allocating the reduction.

Defense-wide

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601000BR	1	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	18,000		18,000
0601101E	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	195,657		195,657
0601111D8Z	3	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY			
0601114D8Z	4	DEFENSE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH	2,833	8,000	10,833
		Program increase		[8,000]	
0601120D8Z	5	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	68,972		68,972
0601384BP	6	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	53,191	4,000	57,191
		In-vitro models for biodefense vaccines		[1,000]	
		Superstructural particle evaluation		[3,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, DEFENSE-WIDE	**338,653**	**12,000**	**350,653**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602000D8Z	7	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	15,254		15,254
0602227D8Z	8	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER			
0602228D8Z	9	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE	15,156		15,156
0602234D8Z	10	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	31,340	2,800	34,140
		Next generation OTHR risk reduction		[2,800]	
0602303E	11	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	254,009		254,009

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0602304E	12	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	145,262		145,262
0602383E	13	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	66,291		66,291
0602384BP	14	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	203,731	18,500	222,231
		Agent fate response tool		[2,000]	
		Chem-Bio IR detector		[3,000]	
		Multivalent Marburg/Ebola vaccine		[4,500]	
		Rapid response chem-bio countermeasures		[4,000]	
		Therapeutics against botulism		[5,000]	
0602670D8Z	15	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) APPLIED RESEARCH	7,685		7,685
0602702E	16	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	371,481	-4,500	366,981
		Laser guided bullet		[-4,500]	
0602715E	17	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	285,264		285,264
0602716BR	18	WMD DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY			
0602716E	19	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	211,457	2,500	213,957
		Three dimensional integrated circuit research		[2,500]	
0602717BR	20	WMD DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES			
0602718BR	21	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	211,078	6,000	217,078
		Blast mitigation and protection		[2,000]	
		National incident management system		[4,000]	
0303153K	22	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER			
1160401BB	23	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	23,104	2,000	25,104
		FOPEN radar technologies		[2,000]	

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1160407BB	24	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,459	1,500	3,959
		Portable TBI diagnosis systems		[1,500]	
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, DEFENSE-WIDE	**1,843,571**	**28,800**	**1,872,371**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603000D8Z	25	INSENSITIVE MUNITIONS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	15,970		15,970
0603121D8Z	26	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	32,832		32,832
0603122D8Z	27	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	79,970	2,000	81,970
		TBI threshold research		[2,000]	
0603160BR	28	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES - PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	211,325		211,325
0603175C	29	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	118,718		118,718
0603225D8Z	30	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	23,727		23,727
0603286E	31	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	107,857	-3,000	104,857
		A160		[-3,000]	
0603287E	32	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	287,009	-50,000	237,009
		Blackswift testbed		[-40,000]	
		ISIS		[-10,000]	
0603384BP	33	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	337,927	7,200	345,127
		Engineered biological detectors		[2,700]	
		Improved CBR filters		[2,000]	
		Raman chemical ID system		[2,500]	

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603618D8Z	34	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,320		9,320
0603648D8Z	35	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	206,337	22,800	229,137
		C2 Gap Filler JCTD		[22,800]	
0603662D8Z	36	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	39,923		39,923
0603665D8Z	37	BIOMETRICS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	10,579		10,579
0603670D8Z	38	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	9,381		9,381
0603680D8Z	39	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	11,981	10,000	21,981
		High performance defense manufacturing technology program		[10,000]	
0603711D8Z	40	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM/AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS	8,449		8,449
0603712S	41	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	19,375	19,000	38,375
		Biofuels research program		[4,000]	
		Emerging critical interconnection technology program		[2,000]	
		Mobile microgrid research		[3,000]	
		Vehicle fuel cell & hydrogen logistics program		[10,000]	
0603713S	42	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	30,000		30,000
0603716D8Z	43	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	69,038		69,038
0603720S	44	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT		3,000	3,000
		Superlattice nanotechnology research		[3,000]	
0603727D8Z	45	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	11,098		11,098
0603739E	46	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	201,146		201,146
0603745D8Z	47	SYNTHETIC APERTURE RADAR (SAR) COHERENT CHANGE DETECTION (CDD)	7,984		7,984

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603750D8Z	48	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS			
0603755D8Z	49	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	208,079		208,079
0603760E	50	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	338,964		338,964
0603764E	51	LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY			
0603765E	52	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	196,697		196,697
0603766E	53	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	156,733		156,733
0603767E	54	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	226,470		226,470
0603768E	55	GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	110,572		110,572
0603769SE	56	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,538		13,538
0603781D8Z	57	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	31,244		31,244
0603805S	58	DUAL USE TECHNOLOGY			
0603826D8Z	59	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	113,924	2,000	115,924
		Special warfare domain awareness		[2,000]	
0603828D8Z	60	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	114,947	1,500	116,447
		WMD exercises		[1,500]	
0603832D8Z	61	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	38,147		38,147
0603941D8Z	62	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	94,672		94,672
0603942D8Z	63	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,170		2,170
1160402BB	64	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	28,930		28,930
1160472BB	65	SOF INFORMATION AND BROADCAST SYSTEMS ADVANCED	10,990		10,990
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**3,536,023**	**14,500**	**3,550,523**

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
0603161D8Z	66	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	38,758		38,758
0603228D8Z	67	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT			
0603527D8Z	68	RETRACT LARCH	22,945		22,945
0603709D8Z	69	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	11,847		11,847
0603714D8Z	70	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM		20,000	20,000
		ASAP		[20,000]	
0603851D8Z	71	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	31,600		31,600
0603881C	72	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,019,073	-7,000	1,012,073
		Short-range ballistic missile defense		[28,000]	
		THAAD long lead (Transfer to new MDA procurement line)		[-65,000]	
		Upper-tier follow-on to Arrow		[30,000]	
0603882C	73	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	2,076,662		2,076,662
0603883C	74	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT	421,229	-45,800	375,429
		Program reduction		[-45,800]	
0603884BP	75	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	51,291	4,000	55,291
		Real-time viral agent detectors		[4,000]	
0603884C	76	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	1,076,983	-59,800	1,017,183
		Mobile sensor network concept		[5,000]	
		Premature funds		[-64,800]	
0603886C	77	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM INTERCEPTOR	386,817	-45,000	341,817
		Premature funds		[-45,000]	
0603888C	78	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS	665,445		665,445

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603890C	79	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS CORE	432,262	-30,000	402,262
		BMD systems core		[-30,000]	
0603891C	80	SPECIAL PROGRAMS - MDA	288,315	-100,000	188,315
		MDA special programs		[-100,000]	
0603892C	81	AEGIS BMD	1,157,783	23,000	1,180,783
		Aegis BMD/SM-3 enhancements		[80,000]	
		SM-3 long lead (Transfer to MDA procurement line 1A)		[-57,000]	
0603893C	82	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	242,441	-50,000	192,441
		Premature funds		[-50,000]	
0603894C	83	MULTIPLE KILL VEHICLE	354,455	-50,000	304,455
		Excess funds		[-50,000]	
0603895C	84	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	29,771	-10,000	19,771
		Space test bed		[-10,000]	
0603896C	85	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS	289,277		289,277
0603897C	86	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE HERCULES	55,955		55,955
0603898C	87	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	69,982		69,982
0603904C	88	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	96,404		96,404
0603905C	89	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED MULTI ECHELON TRAINING SYSTEM (DMETS)			
0603906C	90	REGARDING TRENCH	2,978		2,978
0603907C	91	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)			
	91X	Missile Defense Agency undistributed reduction		-268,700	-268,700
0603920D8Z	92	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	14,373		14,373

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603923D8Z	93	COALITION WARFARE	14,030		14,030
0604016D8Z	94	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	5,102	6,500	11,602
		Asset lifecycle program		[3,500]	
		Corrosion control, prevention and prediction research		[3,000]	
0604648D8Z	95	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	14,962		14,962
0604670D8Z	96	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING	5,991	2,500	8,491
		COMPOEX		[2,500]	
0604787D8Z	97	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION COMMAND (JSIC)	19,643		19,643
0604828D8Z	98	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	16,906		16,906
0605017D8Z	99	REDUCTION OF TOTAL OWNERSHIP COST	24,765		24,765
0303191D8Z	100	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	3,524		3,524
0604400D8Z	100X	UAS AIRSPACE INTEGRATION		15,000	15,000
		UAV modeling and simulation		[15,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES, DEFENSE-WIDE	**8,941,569**	**-595,300**	**8,346,269**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
0604051D8Z	101	DEFENSE ACQUISITION CHALLENGE PROGRAM (DACP)	30,363		30,363
0604161D8Z	102	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	4,355		4,355

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604165D8Z	103	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	117,572	30,000	147,572
		Biconic vehicle manufacture		[-15,000]	
		Hypersonic boost glide vehicle		[45,000]	
0604384BP	104	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	299,373		299,373
0604709D8Z	105	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	5,725		5,725
0604764K	106	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	13,770		13,770
0604771D8Z	107	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	20,600		20,600
0605000BR	108	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	15,946		15,946
0605013BL	109	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,611		11,611
0605018BTA	110	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM	37,400		37,400
0605020BTA	111	BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY R&D ACTIVITIES	148,958		148,958
0605021SE	112	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	400		400
0605140D8Z	113	TRUSTED FOUNDRY	42,360		42,360
0605648D8Z	114	DEFENSE ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE (DAE) PILOT PROGRAM	5,883		5,883
0303129K	115	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM			
0303141K	116	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	18,604		18,604
0303158K	117	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	147,339	-90,000	57,339
		NECC		[-90,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	**920,259**	**-60,000**	**860,259**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0603757D8Z	118	TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (T2)	38,729		38,729

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604774D8Z	119	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	11,385		11,385
0604875D8Z	120	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	14,310		14,310
0604940D8Z	121	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	133,852	8,500	142,352
		SAM hardware simulators		[5,000]	
		Range network enterprise technologies		[3,500]	
0604943D8Z	122	THERMAL VICAR	9,658		9,658
0605100D8Z	123	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	8,834		8,834
0605104D8Z	124	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	34,520		34,520
0605110D8Z	125	USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	4,007		4,007
0605117D8Z	126	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	62,816		62,816
0605126J	127	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	55,282		55,282
0605128D8Z	128	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)			
0605130D8Z	129	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	34,910		34,910
0605161D8Z	130	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,475		4,475
0605170D8Z	131	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	14,723		14,723
0605200D8Z	132	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	4,379		4,379
0605384BP	133	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	100,082		100,082
0605502BR	134	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH			
0605502C	135	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - MDA			
0605502D8Z	136	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605502E	137	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605502S	138	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0605790D8Z	139	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH/CHALLENGE	2,165	3,000	5,165
		Anti-tamper software systems		[3,000]	
0605798D8Z	140	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	11,040		11,040
0605798S	141	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS			
0605799D8Z	142	FORCE TRANSFORMATION DIRECTORATE	20,701	-15,000	5,701
		Program reduction		[-15,000]	
0605801KA	143	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	52,696		52,696
0605803SE	144	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	25,435		25,435
0605804D8Z	145	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	20,396		20,396
0605897E	146	DARPA AGENCY RELOCATION	28,000		28,000
0605898E	147	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	52,700		52,700
0606100D8Z	148	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	5,878		5,878
0301555G	149	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0301556G	150	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0303166D8Z	151	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	30,039		30,039
0303169D8Z	152	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RAPID ACQUISITION	5,254		5,254
0305103E	153	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	50,000	-25,000	25,000
		Program reduction		[-25,000]	
0305193D8Z	154	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	17,625		17,625
0305193G	155	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	[ ]		[ ]
0305400D8Z	156	WARFIGHTING AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUPPORT	831		831
0901585C	157	PENTAGON RESERVATION	19,734		19,734
0901598C	158	MANAGEMENT HQ - MDA	86,453		86,453

Title II - RDT&E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0901598D8W	159	IT SOFTWARE DEV INITIATIVES	599		599
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**961,508**	**-28,500**	**933,008**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0604130V	160	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR SECURITY (DISS)	11,533		11,533
0605127T	161	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP) INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	2,496		2,496
0607384BP	162	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	10,274		10,274
0607828D8Z	163	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	49,371		49,371
0204571J	164	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	8,030		8,030
0208043J	165	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,728		1,728
0208045K	166	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	76,226		76,226
0301011G	167	CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0301144K	168	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	19,073		19,073
0301301L	169	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
03011318BB	170	HUMINT (CONTROLLED)	[ ]		[ ]
0301371G	171	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE - CCP	[ ]		[ ]
0301372L	172	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE - GDIP	[ ]		[ ]
0301555BB	173	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]		[ ]
0301555BZ	174	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]		[ ]
0301556BB	175	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0301556BZ	176	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0302016K	177	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	615		615

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0302019K	178	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	16,054		16,054
0303126K	179	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS - DCS	8,508		8,508
0303131K	180	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	9,685		9,685
0303135G	181	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	15,577		15,577
0303136G	182	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	49,578		49,578
0303140D8Z	183	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	13,459		13,459
0303140G	184	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	394,074	1,000	395,074
		Software assurance education		[1,000]	
0303140K	185	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM			
0303148K	186	DISA MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	2,181		2,181
0303149J	187	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	3,662		3,662
0303149K	188	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR			
0303150K	189	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	36,374	-2,000	34,374
		SORTS		[-2,000]	
0303153K	190	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	19,319		19,319
0303170K	191	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	429		429
0303610K	192	TELEPORT PROGRAM	2,060		2,060
0304210BB	193	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	16,225		16,225
0304345BQ	194	NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (NGP)	[ ]		[ ]
0305102BQ	195	DEFENSE GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0305103D8Z	196	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	1,000		1,000
0305103G	197	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	[ ]		[ ]
0305103K	198	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	12,800		12,800

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0305125D8Z	199	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	12,700		12,700
0305127BZ	200	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0305146BZ	201	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	2,947		2,947
0305183L	202	DEFENSE HUMAN INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0305186D8Z	203	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	8,237		8,237
0305193G	204	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	[ ]		[ ]
0305193L	205	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	[ ]		[ ]
0305199D8Z	206	NET CENTRICITY	12,716		12,716
0305202G	207	DRAGON U-2	[ ]		[ ]
0305206G	208	AIRBORNE RECONNAISANCE SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
0305207G	209	MANNED RECONNAISANCE SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
0305208BB	210	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,165		3,165
0305208BQ	211	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
0305208G	212	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
0305208K	213	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,227		3,227
0305208L	214	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
0305219BB	215	MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV	13,679		13,679
0305229G	216	REAL-TIME ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT (RT10)	[ ]		[ ]
0305866L	217	DIA SUPPORT TO SOUTHCOM INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0305880L	218	COMBATANT COMMAND INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS	[ ]		[ ]
0305883L	219	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET (HDBT) INTEL SUPPORT	[ ]		[ ]
0305884L	220	INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0305885G	221	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[25,000]	[ ]
		Final e-Curfew		[25,000]	
0305889G	222	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	[ ]		[ ]
0307141G	223	INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEV	[ ]		[ ]
0307207G	224	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	[ ]		[ ]
0708011S	225	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	20,480	30,000	50,480
		Industrial base innovation fund		[30,000]	
0708012S	226	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	2,846		2,846
0902298J	227	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS)	3,401		3,401
1001018D8Z	228	NATO JOINT STARS	27,756		27,756
1130435BB	229	STORM			
1160279BB	230	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PROG			
1160403BB	231	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	43,977		43,977
1160404BB	232	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,263		13,263
1160405BB	233	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	39,125		39,125
1160408BB	234	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	48,137		48,137
1160421BB	235	SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV-22 DEVELOPMENT	38,229		38,229
1160425BB	236	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AIRCRAFT DEFENSIVE SYSTEMS			
1160426BB	237	OPERATIONS ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS) DEVELOPMENT	7,090		7,090
1160427BB	238	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS)	4,052		4,052
1160428BB	239	UNMANNED VEHICLES (UV)	1,527		1,527
1160429BB	240	MC130J SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION	4,659		4,659

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1160477BB	241	SOF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	2,759		2,759
1160478BB	242	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	3,190		3,190
1160479BB	243	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS	3,495		3,495
1160482BB	244	SOF ROTARY WING AVIATION	3,822		3,822
1160483BB	245	SOF UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	3,142		3,142
1160484BB	246	SOF SURFACE CRAFT	5,206		5,206
1160488BB	247	SOF PSYOP	15,554		15,554
1160489BB	248	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	14,686		14,686
1160490BB	249	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	8,729		8,729
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**1,152,127**	**29,000**	**1,181,127**
	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,805,519	25,000	3,830,519
		Total, RDT&E Defense-Wide	**21,499,229**	**-574,500**	**20,924,729**

Title II - RDT&E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE			
0605118OTE	1	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	53,196		53,196
0605131OTE	2	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	11,572		11,572
0605814OTE	3	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	124,004		124,004
		Total, Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	**188,772**	**0**	**188,772**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**79,615,941**	**117,439**	**79,733,380**

Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research

The budget request included $2.8 million in PE 61114D8Z for the Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (DEPSCoR). The committee notes that this program was funded at $16.9 million in fiscal year 2008 and, according to military service program managers, has funded meritorious basic research programs that have contributed to defense capabilities. The program is currently undergoing a congressionally directed independent assessment that will serve to improve the management and execution of the program. The committee recommends an additional $8.0 million for the DEPSCoR program.

In-vitro models for biodefense vaccines

The budget request included $53.2 million in PE 61384BP for chemical and biological defense basic research, but no funds for development of lung models to improve vaccines. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 61384BP for development of an in-vitro lung model to support biodefense vaccines against aerosolized pathogens. The committee notes that there is insufficient understanding of the interaction between human lung immune cells and aerosolized biological agents. In order to design effective vaccines against such threats, it would be important to improve this understanding.

Superstructural particle evaluation

The budget request included $53.2 million in PE 61384BP for chemical and biological defense basic research. This basic research improves the understanding of the scientific processes for protection against chemical and biological agents. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 61384BP to continue efforts in superstructural particle evaluation and characterization with targeted reaction analysis. This program shows potential as an enabling technology for other efforts in the chemical and biological defense area.

Next-generation over-the-horizon radar

The budget request included $31.3 million for the Lincoln Laboratory Research Program in PE 62234D8Z, but no funds for next-generation over-the-horizon radar development (OTHR). The budget request did include $1.0 million in PE 63648D8Z to begin a Joint Capability Technology Demonstration (JCTD) of a next-generation OTHR. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is expected to contribute funds to this JCTD in fiscal year 2009 as well.

The Joint Requirements Oversight Council has validated a Joint Capabilities Document for homeland air and cruise missile defense of North America, which documents significant surveillance gaps in the approaches to the United States. The OTHR JCTD is intended to address these vulnerabilities. U.S. Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORTHCOM/NORAD), the sponsors of the JCTD, submitted a high-priority requirement to augment funding for the OTHR JCTD to conduct technology risk reduction activities.

This JCTD will capitalize on the large investment of the Australian Ministry of Defense in OTHR technology. The risk-reduction initiative would procure a copy of a brass board next-generation radar design developed by Australia. This brass board would be used to develop and test technology to enhance performance.

The committee believes that this project merits support and applauds the joint efforts of the Department of Defense and DHS to find innovative solutions for securing U.S. airspace. The committee recommends an increase of $2.8 million in PE 62234D8Z, and $1.9 million in Other Procurement, Air Force, line 24, General Information Technology, for OTHR JCTD risk reduction.

Chemical agent fate response planning tool

The budget request included $203.7 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funds to develop analytic tools to plan appropriate responses to chemical exposures. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62384BP to develop an appropriate response planning tool that uses the chemical agent fate database and supports consequence management and operations effects assessments. Such a response planning tool would fulfill a requirement of the Joint Operational Effects Federation.

The committee notes that the chemical agent fate program is a joint service program that focuses on the acquisition and use of chemical warfare agent persistence data to improve the ability of U.S. forces to protect themselves and their equipment while operating in a chemically contaminated environment. It also has applications to domestic consequence management planning and response.

Chemical and biological applied research

The budget request included $203.7 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense applied research. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62384BP to develop advanced processes for the production of molecular therapeutics against botulism, with the goal of advancing to Phase I clinical studies. The committee notes that there is no vaccine approved and licensed by the Food and Drug Administration against the botulism toxin, and therapeutic approaches may hold significant potential.

The committee also recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62384BP for rapid response countermeasures for chemical and biological threats. This effort is intended to provide a low-cost sensor that can be widely distributed and networked to provide early warning capabilities. This effort would address issues related to sensitivity, selectivity, miniaturization, manufacturability, and low-cost production. The committee notes that progress in these areas would permit a significant improvement in chemical and biological sensors.

Chemical and biological infrared detector

The budget request included $203.7 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funds to develop miniaturized infrared detection technology. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62384BP

to continue development and miniaturization of an advanced infrared detection system for chemical and biological agents. The objective is to demonstrate a functional prototype that operates at high speed and sensitivity with minimal false alarm rates. This technology may provide an end product with significantly lower logistical burden than other technologies.

Multivalent Marburg and Ebola vaccine

The budget request included $203.7 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funds to advance Marburg/Ebola vaccine candidates into clinical trials. The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in PE 62384BP to help move candidate vaccines against Marburg and Ebola viruses into Phase I clinical trials, including clinical lot production for human injection, human safety trials, and human dose escalation studies. The Department of Defense is currently evaluating five different vaccine technologies for Marburg and Ebola, and this additional funding would permit progress toward selecting the most promising candidate for advanced development.

DARPA technology transition

The budget request included $371.5 million in PE 62702E, $107.9 million in PE 63286E, and $287.0 million in PE 63287E for Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) science and technology projects. The committee recommends reductions of $4.5 million in PE 62702E for laser guided bullet research; $3.0 million in PE 63286E for the A160 program; and $10.0 million in PE 63287E for the Integrated Sensor is Structure program. The committee is concerned that these programs do not have clearly delineated transition paths in place, or programmed funding in place, so that they will be adopted by any service program of record or science and technology activity.

The committee commends DARPA's efforts to invest in high risk, high payoff technologies, but believes that scarce science and technology resources should be used in a manner well coordinated between the science and technology executives of the military services and DARPA.

Three-dimensional integrated circuit technologies

The budget request included $211.5 million in PE 62716E for applied research in electronics technology. To support efforts to miniaturize defense technologies, the committee recommends an additional $2.5 million for research on three-dimensional integrated circuits for use in sensors and other defense applications.

Blast mitigation and protection

The budget request included $211.1 million in PE 62718BR for technologies to defeat weapons of mass destruction. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62718BR for blast mitigation and protection analysis and software development to improve the Vulnerability Assessment and Protection Option analytic tool used by the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to predict the effects of explosive blasts on buildings, and to design protection and mitigation options for military facilities. Given the threat of terror-

ists using high explosives, this analytic capability is an important component of force protection assessment and planning.

Comprehensive National Incident Management System

The budget request included $211.1 million in PE 62718BR for technologies to defeat weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62718BR for the Comprehensive National Incident Management System being developed by the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to improve national capabilities to analyze potential catastrophic events such as pandemic influenza and terrorist attacks using WMD. This technology has the potential to significantly improve the ability of the Department of Defense and U.S. Northern Command to analyze, model, and plan for such catastrophic events, including the ability to provide support to civil authorities for consequence management of such events.

Special operations technologies

The budget request included $23.1 million in PE 116401BB for special operations technology development. The committee notes that the United States Special Operations Command (SOCOM) has highlighted "tagging, tracking, and locating" as a key technology challenge. To support development of tracking technologies, the committee recommends an additional $2.0 million in PE 1160401BB for the development of multi-sensor data fusion systems to enhance detection and discrimination of targets hidden in foliage.

The budget request included $2.5 million in PE 1160407BB for special operations forces medical technology development. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million for the development of portable devices to diagnose traumatic brain injuries.

Blast trauma research

The budget request included $80.0 million in PE 63122D8Z for technology support for combating terrorism. To help address issues of traumatic brain injuries suffered by military personnel, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for development of threshold blast-induced traumatic brain injury data that will provide safe weapons operations guidelines, safe standoff distances for the use of explosions in combat training and operations, and inform engineering design considerations of force protection equipment. The committee directs that this work be performed in coordination with the activities of the Department of Defense Blast Injury Research Program Coordinating Office.

Blackswift

The budget request included $70.0 million in PE 63287E and $50.0 million in PE 35206F for the Blackswift Test Bed. The Blackswift program seeks to develop "an extended duration hypersonic test bed which will allow for the study of tactics for a hypersonic airplane." The committee recommends a reduction of $40.0 million from PE 63287E for the Blackswift program. The committee directs the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDRE),

the Air Force, the Prompt Global Strike Office, and the newly established Joint Technology Office for Hypersonics to review the program to ensure that it is focused on addressing the highest priority hypersonics technological gaps in order to operationally field hypersonic capabilities in the future. The committee recommends that the remaining $30.0 million requested for Blackswift in PE 63287E be used to continue the program.

The committee notes that the 2006 National Research Council report, "Future Air Force Needs for Survivability", states:

> Hypersonic missiles with ranges comparable to those of current missiles could increase targeting timeliness and flexibility and thus increase operational utility in the 2018 time frame. It is not clear, however, whether a hypersonic cruise aircraft (other than a missile) designed for long-range flight and recovery offers unique capability and operational utility. Furthermore, it is unlikely that such an air-breathing hypersonic platform, other than a missile, will be available in the near term.

The committee notes that although it is widely agreed that the best opportunity for near-term transition of hypersonics technology will be in cruise missile or conventional strike systems, especially to support time critical and prompt global strike missions, sufficient resources for research, development, or testing of the systems has never been focused, coordinated, or sustained within the Department of Defense. Examples of these programs include the DARPA Falcon Hypersonic Technology Vehicle (HTV–2), the Air Force's X–51 program and the now terminated HyFly and Revolutionary Approach to Time Critical Long-Range Strike Project (RATTLRS) programs. The committee feels that these programs have all suffered from a lack of investment in addressing fundamental technical issues and insufficient resources for required flight test and demonstration activities.

The committee further notes that many fundamental research and technology challenges related to hypersonics flight were identified by both the DDRE National Aerospace Initiative and the 2004 National Research Council's "Evaluation of the National Aerospace Initiative," including air-breathing propulsion and flight test, materials, thermal protection systems, structures, integrated vehicle design and multidisciplinary optimization, and integrated ground testing and numerical simulation/analysis remain insufficiently funded. In addition, there is still no set of approved requirements for any hypersonic missile or aircraft.

Finally, the committee notes that the Blackswift program has been projected to cost at least $800.0 million, with DARPA and the Air Force sharing the cost according to a recent memorandum of understanding. Given the severe constraints on the Air Force budget, especially in science and technology and test and evaluation, the committee is not convinced that the Air Force will be able to provide the resources necessary to keep this ambitious program on schedule or on budget, especially since it is not tied to any specific requirement. The committee notes that one of the drivers of the technical program is the need to have the aircraft perform typical aircraft maneuvers, such as an aileron roll, although it is not clear

why that will necessarily enhance the program's probability of transition into formal acquisition. The committee also directs that the Air Force and DARPA work to ensure that the flight test program is consistent with the projected goals of the program.

Further, the Air Force (AF) budget request included $50.0 million in PE 35206F to "provide a temporary repository for AF funds supporting DARPA Blackswift unmanned, hypersonic ISR [intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance] and strike vehicle." The committee recommends a reduction of $10.0 million for this effort. The committee directs that the remaining funding be invested in addressing the highest priority technological challenges to meet Air Force needs in hypersonics technology.

Engineered biological detectors

The budget request included $337.9 million in PE 63384BP for chemical and biological defense advanced technology development, but included no funds to develop engineered biological warfare agent detectors. The committee recommends an increase of $2.7 million in PE 63384BP for development of a prototype biological sensor for assessment and testing as a spiral upgrade of current generation systems. Effective detection of biological warfare agents is the key to contamination avoidance and force protection in a biologically contaminated area.

Improved chemical, biological, and radiological filters

The budget request included $337.9 million in PE 63384BP for chemical and biological defense advanced technology development, but included no funds for developing improved chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) filtration capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63384BP for design, engineering, and prototyping of CBR filters. Improved filters would fill a requirement for enhanced collective protection capability against a wide spectrum of threat agents. Such filters would be multi-use and multi-platform configurable, for use in buildings, ships, and shelters.

Raman chemical identification system

The budget request included $337.9 million in PE 63384BP for chemical and biological defense advanced technology development, but included no funds to develop a miniaturized Raman chemical agent identification system. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63384BP for development of a handheld chemical agent identification system that is smaller and more reliable than existing systems, in order to improve the ability of U.S. forces to rapidly identify unknown chemical agents and substances for force protection purposes.

Command and control gap filler joint capabilities technology demonstration

The budget request included $206.3 million in PE 63648D8Z, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for Joint Capability Technology Demonstrations (JCTD). While $4.0 million of these funds will be allocated for the command and control for North American surveillance gap filler JCTD, U.S. Northern Com-

mand (NORTHCOM) testified that the JCTD is underfunded by $22.8 million. This JCTD is the number one unfunded priority for NORTHCOM.

As identified in the National Strategy for Aviation Security, the National Strategy for Maritime Security, and the Joint Requirements Oversight Council-validated Homeland Air and Cruise Missile Defense of North America Joint Capabilities Document, there are significant airspace surveillance deficiencies and gaps—7 years after September 11, 2001.

The gap filler JCTD will remedy many of these deficiencies by integrating feeds from all the disparate surveillance systems operated by government departments and agencies, including classified systems, and sustain development of new technology for extending air surveillance based on the utilization of ambient radio waves from such sources as television and radio station broadcasts.

The committee recommends an authorization of $26.8 million for this gap filler JCTD, $22.8 million above the requested amount.

High performance manufacturing technologies

The budget request included $12.0 million in PE 63680D8Z for the manufacturing science and technology program. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for efforts on the development of high performance manufacturing technologies as authorized by title II, subtitle D of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). The committee directs that the funding be used for development of test beds and prototypes of advanced manufacturing technologies, diffusion of advanced manufacturing processes throughout the industrial base, and the development of technology roadmaps to ensure that the Department of Defense can access required manufacturing and technology capabilities in critical defense technologies.

Defense Logistics Agency technology programs

The budget request included $19.4 million in PE 63712S for generic logistics research and development and technology demonstrations. Following the recommendation of the Defense Science Board Task Force on DOD Energy Strategy, the committee recommends a series of investments designed to address defense energy requirements using lower cost, reliable, alternative fuel sources. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for research on advanced biofuels to support military operations, $10.0 million to continue efforts to develop advanced vehicle fuel cell technologies and demonstrate the use of hydrogen technologies for defense operations, and $3.0 million for the development of deployable microgrid systems that can utilize a variety of energy sources to produce installation and vehicle power.

The committee notes that the National Research Council Committee on Manufacturing Trends in Printed Circuit Technology recommended that the Department of Defense "should ensure access to new printed circuit board (PrCB) technology by expanding its role in fostering new PrCB design and manufacturing technology." DOD recently concurred with the recommendations of that report, but has yet to make any significant changes in investment level in this area. In support of that recommendation, the committee rec-

ommends an increase of $2.0 million for the development of emerging critical interconnect and printed circuit board technology.

Superlattice nanotechnology

The budget request included no funding in PE 63720S for microelectronics technology development and support. The committee notes that the 2007 report on the Defense Nanotechnology Research and Development Program states a goal "to utilize breakthroughs in nanotechnology to provide revolutionary devices and systems to advance warfighter capabilities and battle systems capabilities." Consistent with that goal, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63720S for research on superlattice nanotechnology to develop high power, high temperature devices for defense applications.

Special warfare domain awareness technologies

The budget request included $113.9 million in PE 63826D8Z for quick reaction special projects. The committee notes that the 2007 Naval Science and Technology (S&T) Strategic Plan's asymmetric and irregular warfare focus area has a specific objective of enhancing riverine surveillance capabilities through development of "common and persistent" maritime pictures. To support this objective, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63826D8Z for development of augmented reality systems to support special warfare situational awareness needs.

Weapon of mass destruction exercises

The budget request included $114.9 million in PE 63828D8Z for joint experimentation programs. The committee notes that the United States Joint Forces Command's joint experimentation program funds concept development and experimentation efforts and leads the development, exploration, and assessment of new joint concepts, organizational structures, and emerging technologies. A focus of committee attention this year has been the threat of domestic use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) by terrorist groups, and the capabilities of the Department of Defense to participate in actions to detect and defeat or mitigate the effects of such an event. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63828D8Z to support experimentation activities related to the potential use of WMD against critical domestic infrastructure, and directs that such activities involve the participation of other appropriate Federal, local and State entities so as to better inform planning and coordination efforts.

Arrow missile defense program

The budget request included approximately $1.0 billion for terminal defense programs in PE 63881C, of which $74.3 million is for the U.S.-Israeli cooperative program of development and procurement for the Israeli Arrow missile defense system. The Arrow Weapon System provides Israel defense against regional ballistic missiles, including against Iran's Shahab–3 missile. Israel is interested in an upper-tier follow-on to its Arrow system in order to provide more capable protection against missiles with possible weapons of mass destruction warheads.

There are several options under consideration for an upper-tier follow-on to the Arrow system. One would be to develop a new Israeli Arrow–3 interceptor, which would also require the development of a new long-range radar for the system to be effective. Other options include the possibility of using existing U.S. missile defense technologies, such as the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system or a land-based version of the Standard Missile–3 interceptor, which is used by the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system, to provide highly effective upper-tier defense for Israel. The committee believes that developing a new Israeli interceptor missile and long-range radar would be very expensive and would duplicate existing U.S. capabilities. Therefore, the committee encourages the full consideration of U.S. systems as potentially the most effective and cost-effective approach to providing an upper-tier missile defense capability for Israel.

The committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in PE 63881C for the Missile Defense Agency to fully evaluate the potential of existing U.S. missile defense systems and technologies—particularly a land-based version of the Standard Missile–3 interceptor used in conjunction with a THAAD radar—to provide an operationally effective, timely, and cost-effective upper-tier missile defense capability for Israel. Such an option would be fully interoperable with deployed U.S. missile defense systems, which could reinforce and support the Israeli upper-tier system.

Short-range ballistic missile defense

The budget request included approximately $1.0 billion for terminal defense programs in PE 63881C, of which $44.9 million is for cooperative U.S.-Israeli development of a short-range ballistic missile defense system called the David's Sling Weapon System. This system is being developed in response to short-range missile and rocket attacks against Israel from Lebanon. The United States is sharing the development of the system in order to ensure that it is compatible with U.S. missile defense systems, and to provide an option for the U.S. military to procure the system in the future if needed. The committee recommends an increase of $28.0 million in PE 63881C to accelerate the development of the David's Sling Weapon System in order to permit timely fielding of the system.

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense

The budget request included approximately $1.0 billion for terminal defense programs in PE 63881C, of which $864.9 million is for the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) program. The committee recommends a transfer of $65.0 million from the budget request, and an increase of $75.0 million, to a new defense-wide procurement line for long lead procurement of interceptors and ground equipment for THAAD Fire Units 3 and 4. This would permit awarding the long lead contract for both Fire Units 3 and 4 together, and would lead to a more efficient and economical production plan. It would also permit a production rate of three interceptors per month, which would reduce the cost of each interceptor while delivering the capability sooner than the current plan.

The committee is deeply disappointed that the budget request for the THAAD system would delay the delivery of interceptors for

Fire Units 3 and 4 by a year and cause a production gap of 18 months. This delay would be wholly inconsistent with the need to provide our regional combatant commanders with the near-term effective defenses they need to defend our forward-deployed military forces, allies, and friends against the many hundreds of short- and medium-range ballistic missiles that exist today. As specified in section 223 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the THAAD system is a high priority near-term system, and the committee believes that delaying its production for budget reasons is unacceptable.

The committee notes that after the budget was submitted and congressional objections were raised to the planned delay, the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) acknowledged that the delay would be unacceptable and indicated that it plans to change the allocation of fiscal year 2009 funding within the funds requested for THAAD, and to use an inflation adjustment, to provide $65.0 million for long lead procurement of interceptors for Fire Unit 3, to avoid the delay and the production gap. The committee believes MDA should not have planned for the delay and the production gap in the first place.

A number of new requirements were placed on the THAAD program by the Army, including requirements to meet new insensitive munitions standards, and to use a 5-ton truck instead of a High-Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV) for the fire control vehicle. Given the extraordinary acquisition authority and flexibility granted to the MDA, the committee is disappointed that MDA did not budget the funds from lower priority programs outside of THAAD to meet these new requirements while keeping the THAAD production schedule on track.

Furthermore, the committee is disappointed that MDA is only planning and budgeting to procure four THAAD Fire Units and 96 THAAD interceptors. As the Commander of the Joint Force Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense told the committee in April 2007, the Joint Capabilities Mix study, conducted by the Joint Staff in association with the combatant commands and the military departments, concluded that the United States needs about twice as many THAAD and Standard Missile–3 interceptors as the number currently planned, just to meet the minimum inventory needs of the combatant commanders to provide protection against existing short- and medium-range missile threats. That minimum number does not include the normally required spare, reserve, and reload missiles.

The committee observes that the United Arab Emirates has expressed an interest in purchasing three THAAD fire units and 144 THAAD interceptors for defense of its territory, which is about the size of Maine. Their purchase would be 50 percent larger than the number of interceptors currently planned by MDA for all U.S. forces, and would include twice as many interceptors per fire unit as MDA is currently planning for U.S. forces.

The committee believes that MDA's current plan for THAAD acquisition is wholly inadequate and needs to be changed to meet the current needs of our combatant commanders. The committee believes that MDA should focus on meeting at least these minimum inventory upper-tier requirements as its highest acquisition pri-

ority, and directs MDA to report to the congressional defense committees by no later than December 1, 2008 on its plans to meet the inventory requirements identified in the Joint Capabilities Mix study.

Additionally, the committee notes that section 223(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required the Department of Defense to request any long lead procurement for THAAD Fire Units 3 and 4 in the fiscal year 2009 budget request using procurement funds, rather than research and development (R&D) funds. In addition, section 223(c) of that act prohibits the use of fiscal year 2009 R&D funds for procurement of long lead items for Fire Units 3 and 4. Therefore, the committee recommends that all $140.0 million in long lead procurement funds for THAAD Fire Units 3 and 4 be provided in a new defense-wide procurement line, as described elsewhere in this report and displayed in the funding tables in this report.

Finally, the committee is concerned that MDA has not planned or budgeted any funds in fiscal year 2009 for procuring a THAAD radar. This would create a gap in THAAD radar production and cause a schedule disconnect between fire unit delivery and radar delivery. Therefore, the committee also recommends an increase of $40.0 million in the new missile defense procurement funding line for long lead procurement of the THAAD radar for Fire Unit 3, to avoid a production gap and a schedule disconnect. The committee urges MDA to synchronize the THAAD fire unit and radar production and delivery schedules.

Ground-based Midcourse Defense

The budget request included $2.1 billion in PE 63882C for the ballistic missile defense midcourse element, which is the source of funds for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system deployed in Alaska and California, and for the proposed deployment of the GMD system in Europe.

The budget request included $19.2 million for long lead procurement of operational 2-stage Ground-Based Interceptors (GBIs) intended for European deployment, "pending successfully meeting the criteria described in Section 226 of the FY08 National Defense Authorization Report [sic]." Section 226 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) prohibits the use of fiscal year 2008 funds to acquire or deploy the planned operational European 2-stage GBIs until the Secretary of Defense, after receiving the views of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E), certifies that the system has a high probability of working in an operationally effective manner. The committee recommends a similar provision for fiscal year 2009, as described elsewhere in this report.

The committee notes that the proposed 2-stage interceptor intended for deployment in Poland is still being designed and developed, and is not scheduled to have its first booster flight test until the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2009, and the first planned intercept test in the second quarter of fiscal year 2010. Given that a number of GMD flight tests have been delayed substantially, it is possible that these 2-stage GBI tests will also be delayed.

In an October 2007 report, DOT&E noted the "significant differences" between the proposed GMD deployment with a 2-stage interceptor in Europe and the existing GMD system deployed in the United States with a 3-stage GBI. According to the report, "European defense using GMD assets is a completely new mission area for GMD." The report provided DOT&E's initial testing concept for the proposed European deployment, which would include three flight tests, two of which would be intercept tests. The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) originally planned to conduct only two flight tests prior to deploying the system, one of which would be an intercept test. This planned flight test program would not meet the DOT&E minimum test plan concept. It is difficult to envision the certification required of the Secretary of Defense under these circumstances. However, MDA has recently agreed to conduct three flight tests, in accordance with the DOT&E test concept. The committee views this as a positive development.

The committee notes that the long lead items planned for procurement with the $19.2 million are 100 percent common with both the 2-stage and 3-stage GBIs. Therefore, they could be used for purposes other than being deployed on operational 2-stage GBIs if necessary, including for flight test and ground test interceptors for either 3-stage or 2-stage GBIs. Consequently, the committee recommends authorizing the requested $19.2 million, with the understanding that if there are problems with the 2-stage GBI development program, these long lead assets would be used for other purposes, rather than being wasted or deployed before the 2-stage GBI is certified as ready.

The committee notes that MDA has changed its GMD test plans to accelerate the testing of the 2-stage GBI intended for European deployment. As part of this change, MDA merged the objectives of two previously planned tests (FTG–06 and FTG–07) into one test (FTG–06), so that the next test could be the first Booster Verification Test (BVT–01) of the 2-stage GBI. Consequently, the target originally planned and budgeted for FTG–07 is no longer needed for that test, since that test's objectives are being merged into FTG–06. The committee directs MDA to inform Congress of any significant changes in its test and target plans on a timely basis.

The committee notes that the political process toward negotiation and ratification of agreements with Poland and the Czech Republic on the proposed deployment of a missile defense system on their territory will take additional time to resolve itself, possibly through fiscal year 2008. This additional time may delay the ability of MDA to obligate or expend fiscal year 2008 funds into fiscal year 2009, which would presumably delay its ability to obligate and expend fiscal year 2009 funds. The committee is concerned that MDA will have difficulty executing funds requested for fiscal year 2009 for the proposed European deployment.

For example, Congress appropriated $28.0 million in fiscal year 2008 for site activation activities, but those funds cannot be obligated or expended until the governments of Poland and the Czech Republic give final approval to the proposed deployments on their respective territories. This raises concerns that the funds requested in fiscal year 2009 for site activation will be premature or

unexecutable. The committee directs MDA to keep the congressional defense committees informed regularly of the plans and schedule for executing funds for the proposed European deployment, and of any delays in the planned execution of funds.

Airborne Laser

The budget request included $421.2 million in PE 63883C for the Airborne Laser (ABL) technology demonstration program. The committee notes that the budget request for ABL included $15.8 million for planning and analysis related to a possible second ABL aircraft. Since the first planned proof of principle shoot-down demonstration test is not scheduled until the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2009, and since even a successful test will not provide answers to the many questions about whether the ABL technology could be made into an effective, suitable, survivable, and affordable weapon system, the committee believes it is inappropriate to provide any funds in fiscal year 2009 related to a potential second ABL aircraft.

Any decision on whether to proceed with a possible second ABL aircraft should only be made after much more information is available about the likelihood that the system could eventually provide a militarily useful, operationally effective, and affordable missile defense capability, when balanced against other missile defense programs, capabilities, and needs, and also balanced against other Department of Defense priorities and needs. As described elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a provision that would limit the availability of funds for procurement of a second ABL aircraft until the Secretary of Defense certifies that it has a high probability of accomplishing its mission in an operationally effective, suitable, survivable, and affordable manner.

The Government Accountability Office has noted that the ABL program has a history of significant cost increases and schedule delays. When the program was originally proposed in 1996 it was estimated that the technology demonstration program would cost $1.0 billion and be completed in 2001. However, after numerous cost and schedule delays, it is now estimated that the technology demonstration program will cost more than $5.1 billion and be completed in 2010, a 500 percent cost growth and 9–year delay. In 2007, because of integration issues and technical challenges, the program increased its costs by $253.0 million and added a year to the program schedule.

As the committee noted last year, the ABL program remains a far-term, high risk technology development and demonstration program. If the technology could be made to work in a militarily useful and operationally effective manner, it would not produce an operational capability before 2018. The committee believes there are higher priorities for missile defense funds, particularly the near-term capabilities currently needed by our combatant commanders to defend our forward-deployed forces, allies, and other friendly nations against many existing short- and medium-range ballistic missiles.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction in PE 63883C of $15.8 million, the funds requested for work related to a second ABL aircraft, and a reduction of $30.0 million for work not related

to maintaining the schedule for the planned proof of principle shoot-down demonstration test in 2009.

Real-time non-specific viral agent detector

The budget request included $51.3 million in PE 63884BP for chemical and biological defense advanced component development and prototypes, but included no funds for development of a mobile non-specific viral agent detector. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63884BP for development of a mobile real-time non-specific viral agent detector that would improve current detection capabilities. The committee notes that this effort could provide a significant upgrade to the Joint Biological Agent Identification and Diagnostic System (JBAIDS). This technology, which would add the capability to detect infectious diseases, would be useful both for forward-deployed forces and for potential domestic consequence management missions.

Ballistic missile defense sensors

The budget request included $1.1 billion in PE 63884C for radars and other sensors for the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS), including sensors for different missile defense elements.

The committee notes that there is no funding requested in fiscal year 2009 to begin production of the THAAD radar for Fire Unit 3, designated AN/TPY #8, and is concerned that this would result in a production gap and a schedule disconnect with Fire Unit 3. The committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million in a new defense-wide missile defense procurement funding line for long lead procurement of AN/TPY #8 for THAAD Fire Unit 3, as described elsewhere in this report.

The committee is concerned that the consolidation of all sensor work in one program element may have the unintended consequence of reducing focus on and responsiveness to the needs of the individual elements for the timely production of sensors for the element weapon systems, such as THAAD radars to accompany THAAD fire units. The committee expects the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to ensure that funding and production of radars for THAAD will be synchronized with the production schedules for their associated fire units.

The committee notes that the budget request included $26.5 million for the site activation and deployment of a forward-based X-band radar, designated AN/TPY–2 #3, to an undecided location, and $18.0 million for overseas site security for this radar. Since the MDA has not decided where to deploy such a radar, has not begun negotiations with any foreign nation for such a deployment, and there is no agreement with any foreign nation to deploy such a radar on its soil, the committee believes this funding is premature. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $26.5 million in PE 63884C for costs related to site activation and deployment of AN/TPY–2 #3 radar to an undecided foreign location, and a reduction of $18.0 million for overseas site security of AN/TPY–2 #3.

The budget request included $20.3 million to operationalize the External Sensors Lab boost-phase capabilities. Since there are no boost-phase missile defense systems within a decade of deployment,

the committee believes this funding is premature. The committee recommends a reduction of $20.3 million in PE 63884C.

The committee is aware of a proposal to enhance the BMDS sensor system by deploying additional shipboard radars to increase the coverage and availability of mobile radar networks, while potentially producing significant cost savings. This mobile sensor enhancement concept is worth evaluating to determine if it would provide a significant improvement to the capability of an integrated BMDS. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63884C for the MDA and the Navy to evaluate this concept and determine whether it merits further development.

Kinetic Energy Interceptor

The budget request included $386.8 million in PE 63886C for the Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI) program. This is $172.8 million more than requested in the fiscal year 2008 budget request for KEI, $46.7 million more than appropriated, and a very large sum of funds for a program at such an early stage of development. The committee notes that the KEI program was originally conceived as a boost-phase risk reduction alternative to the Airborne Laser (ABL) program because of the high risks associated with the ABL technology development effort.

However, the KEI program is no longer considered primarily a boost-phase program; it is being managed as a technology development program for a mid-course follow-on to the Ground-based Interceptors (GBIs) being deployed as part of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) program. The GBIs are scheduled to be deployed through 2013, and will have many years of useful operational life following deployment, so there is no urgent need to develop a follow-on now to a system that will not complete its deployment for another 5 years.

The fiscal year 2008 budget request for KEI focused on developing the technology for a high-performance silo-based interceptor, rather than as a mobile system, with a flight test in 2008. That flight test has now been delayed until 2009 because of technology problems with the development program.

The budget request for KEI represents another significant change in direction and a significant increase in program funding at a time when the program has lost focus and direction, and when the long-range midcourse defense capability is being addressed by the GMD system with its GBI interceptors. The committee is concerned that this level of funding is more than can be effectively executed during fiscal year 2009. The committee believes there are higher priority needs in the missile defense program, such as near-term defenses against existing short- and medium-range missiles, and that the KEI program can and should take more time to develop technologies that may be useful in the decades to come when the GBIs reach the end of their useful operational life, if there is not another capability that is more suitable. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $45.0 million to PE 63886C for the Kinetic Energy Interceptor development program.

Ballistic missile defense reductions

The budget request included $432.3 million in PE 63890C for the Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) Systems Core program; and $288.3 million in PE 63891C for Missile Defense Agency (MDA) Special Programs. The committee recommends a decrease of $30.0 million in PE 63890C for BMD Systems Core; and a decrease of $100.0 million in PE 63891C for MDA Special Programs to partially offset the additional funding needed for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) program and its Standard Missile–3 (SM–3) interceptor, the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) program, and other high priority near-term missile defense programs described elsewhere in this report. The committee notes that the proposed funding reductions are for projects that are of lower priority than the near-term capabilities provided by the Aegis BMD, SM–3, and THAAD programs, which meet the needs of combatant commanders to defend our forward-deployed forces, allies, and other friendly nations against the existing threat of many hundreds of short- and medium-range ballistic missiles. The Joint Capabilities Mix study concluded that we need about twice as many THAAD and SM–3 interceptors as currently planned just to meet the minimum operational requirements of our regional combatant commanders.

Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD)

The budget request included $1.2 billion in PE 63892C for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) program, including $57.0 million for long lead procurement of Standard Missile–3 (SM–3) Block IA interceptor missiles. The committee notes that the Aegis BMD system with its SM–3 interceptor is the only midcourse defense system currently being deployed to provide defense against short- and medium-range ballistic missile threats to our forward-deployed forces, allies, and other friendly nations. The Aegis BMD system has had an impressive record of successful tests against short- and medium-range targets, including a multi-mission test against a ballistic missile and an air-breathing threat, and a multiple target intercept against two ballistic missile targets.

The SM–3 missile is being developed to have increasing capability with each successive version, from Block IA, to Block IB, to the Block IIA version being developed jointly with Japan. The Aegis BMD system and its SM–3 interceptor have the potential to provide a significant measure of defensive capability in various regions of the world, and to increase its capability to conduct intercepts based on radar tracks from offboard sensors, known as "engage on remote," and to engage missiles early in their midcourse flight, including in the ascent phase.

The committee notes that the Joint Capabilities Mix (JCM) study, conducted by the Joint Staff, concluded that U.S. combatant commanders need about twice as many SM–3 and THAAD interceptors as currently planned to meet just their minimum operational requirements for defending against the many hundreds of existing short- and medium-range ballistic missiles. The committee is deeply disappointed that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has not planned or budgeted to acquire more than a fraction of the SM–3 interceptors needed to meet the warfighters' minimum oper-

ational needs. The committee believes that achieving at least the JCM levels of upper tier interceptors in a timely manner should be the highest priority for MDA, and expects the Agency to modify its plans and budgets to meet our combatant commanders' current operational needs. In section 223 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), Congress specified the Aegis BMD system and its SM–3 interceptor as a high priority near-term program for the Department of Defense to focus on. As the JCM study makes clear, the Department has failed to do so.

Section 223(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requires that any long lead or advance procurement for SM–3 Block IA missiles in the fiscal year 2009 budget be requested in procurement funds, rather than in research and development (R&D) funds. Section 223(c) of that act prohibits the use of fiscal year 2009 R&D funds for procurement of long lead items for SM–3 Block IA missiles. The Department chose not to comply with the law, and requested R&D funds for procuring long lead items for the SM–3 missiles. This is not acceptable. The committee notes that the Department is obliged to comply with the law, and expects the Department to do so.

To be consistent with the law, and to correct the Department's failure to comply with the law, the committee recommends that all long lead funds for SM–3 missiles be authorized and appropriated in a new defense-wide procurement line described elsewhere in this report. Accordingly, the committee recommends a transfer of $57.0 million from PE 63892C to the new procurement line for long lead procurement of SM–3 Block IA missiles. The committee also recommends an increase of $20.0 million in that new procurement line for the procurement of long lead items for an additional 15 SM–3 interceptors, to begin the process of increasing the inventory of SM–3 missiles toward the JCM levels. The committee notes that MDA does not plan any procurement of SM–3 Block IB missiles after fiscal year 2010, which is inconsistent with the JCM study conclusions concerning the need for about twice as many SM–3 and THAAD missiles as are currently planned. The committee expects MDA to modify its plans and budgets for the fiscal year 2010 budget submission to address the inventory levels indicated by the JCM study.

To address these numerous concerns, the committee recommends an increase of $80.0 million in PE 63892C for the following projects: $20.0 million for facilitizing an increase in SM–3 production capacity to four missiles per month; $20.0 million to reduce schedule risk for the Block IB missile; and $40.0 million for accelerated development of enhanced Aegis BMD capability for "engage on remote" and ascent-phase engagement.

Space Tracking and Surveillance System

The budget request included $242.4 million in PE 63893C for the Space Tracking and Surveillance System (STSS). The committee notes that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has again changed the approach to the STSS program for fiscal year 2009, but the program is out of phase with the schedule of related events.

The committee notes that the launch of the two STSS demonstration prototype satellites has been delayed until November 2008. MDA plans to gather on-orbit data from these demonstration satellites through 2010. These data will be necessary to determine further changes in design of the objective follow-on STSS satellites. The committee is concerned that MDA plans to issue a Request for Proposals for the objective follow-on satellites in August of 2008, several months before the demonstration satellites are launched, and well before actual orbital data are available to help determine the final design parameters of the follow-on satellites.

Furthermore, the committee notes that MDA and the Air Force are just beginning to obtain actual on-orbit data from the initial Space-based Infrared System (SBIRS) satellites, and the results appear both promising and important for understanding what our current capabilities are and what our future requirements will be for the STSS system. Before MDA finalizes its design for the follow-on STSS satellites, the committee believes it should work closely with the Air Force to fully evaluate the data available from the SBIRS system, and evaluate the data provided by the two STSS demonstration satellites. Only then will MDA be in a position to determine the final design for the STSS system. The STSS program schedule is ahead of need, and ahead of the data it will need to determine the final requirements and design for the objective STSS satellites.

Consequently, the committee recommends a decrease of $50.0 million in PE 63893C, to allow more time to evaluate on-orbit data from SBIRS and from the two STSS demonstration satellites before proceeding with the final design of the objective STSS satellites.

The committee also urges MDA to coordinate with the Air Force to use the SBIRS ground stations for STSS residual operational capability and for the STSS objective system.

Multiple Kill Vehicles

The budget request included $354.5 million in PE 63894C for the Multiple Kill Vehicle (MKV) program. This is nearly a three-fold increase from the fiscal year 2007 funding level, and an increase of nearly $125.0 million from the fiscal year 2008 funding level, which represents large budget growth in the MKV program.

The committee notes that the MKV program is at an early development stage, with the preliminary design review not expected until the third quarter of fiscal year 2010 and the first substantive knowledge point not expected until mid–2011. The committee is concerned that the program cannot effectively execute the large amount of funding requested for a program at such an early stage of development. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $50.0 million in PE 63894C.

The committee believes that, although the MKV program is pursuing a laudable technical goal, there are higher priorities for current missile defense funds, including providing our regional combatant commanders with near-term capabilities to defend our forward-deployed forces, allies, and other friendly nations against the many hundreds of short- and medium-range ballistic missiles that exist today.

The committee also notes that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) plans to fund two contractor teams with competing technology approaches, but does not plan to have a competitive selection of the best technology in the future. Although MDA is pursuing development of MKV technologies for long-range midcourse defense interceptors and for the Standard Missile–3 Block II interceptor, keeping two contractor teams for the indefinite future is both expensive and possibly unnecessary. The committee urges MDA to consider a competitive selection process to determine which of the two contractor teams has the best technology, and to select that team as the only team to fund in the future.

The committee is also concerned that the consolidation of all kinetic kill vehicle technology development in one office may have the unintended effect of removing continued focus on developing or improving existing and planned unitary kinetic kill vehicles, such as the unitary kill vehicle planned for the Standard Missile–3 Block IIA missile being developed jointly by the United States and Japan.

As the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation has reported, there are still no validated or accredited models and simulations available to provide confidence in the performance of the Exoatmospheric Kill Vehicle deployed on the Ground-Based Interceptors of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system. It is essential to fully demonstrate and improve the capability of this system, which will likely be deployed for at least 20 years.

The committee urges MDA to consider whether it needs to take mitigating actions to ensure that the unitary kill vehicle programs have sufficient focus and resources, particularly in the event that the MKV efforts do not yield effective or affordable results.

Space test-bed

The budget request included $29.7 million in PE 63895C for Ballistic Missile Defense System space programs, of which $10.0 million is for a "space test-bed." The committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million in PE 63895C, the entire amount requested for the space test-bed.

As the committee noted last year, the proposed space test-bed is intended to be the initial step toward deploying space-based interceptors. There is no need or justification to deploy space-based interceptors, and therefore no justification to create the proposed space test-bed. The committee notes that Congress denied all funding requested for the proposed space test-bed in fiscal year 2008.

There are, however, numerous real missile threats in existence today for which near-term missile defense capabilities are needed. The Joint Capabilities Mix study has concluded that there is a need for about twice as many Standard Missile–3 and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense interceptors just to meet the minimum operational requirements of the regional combatant commanders against the hundreds and hundreds of short- and medium-range ballistic missiles that currently can target our forward-deployed forces, allies, and other friendly nations. As Congress made clear in section 223 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the committee believes it is a high priority to fund these near-term effective systems

that meet current combatant commander needs against existing threats.

Missile Defense Agency funding reduction

The budget request included $9.3 billion for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) in research, development, test, and evaluation funds. The committee recommends an undistributed reduction of $268.7 million in MDA funding.

Corrosion control technologies

The budget request included $5.1 million in PE 64016D8Z for the Department of Defense Corrosion Program. The committee notes that corrosion damage to Department of Defense (DOD) assets has been estimated to lead to a $20.0 billion annual cost to the Department. The committee supports the research efforts of the DOD Corrosion Program, which seeks to develop and demonstrate new technologies to mitigate the effects of corrosion. To support these efforts the committee recommends an additional $3.0 million for research on the use of polymer materials and coatings to enhance corrosion prevention and mitigation. The committee also recommends an increase of $3.5 million to develop comprehensive technical, maintenance, and training systems to reduce asset life cycle costs related to corrosion damage.

Conflict modeling technologies

The budget request included $6.0 million in PE 64670D8Z for human, social, and cultural behavioral research and engineering. The committee supports enhancing Department of Defense capabilities to model and anticipate future conflicts and better understand political-social systems and their interactions. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 64670D8Z to continue conflict modeling, planning, and outcomes experimentation activities.

Prompt global strike

The budget request included $117.6 million in PE 64165D8Z for prompt global strike. The committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in PE 64165D8Z and $45.0 million for the advanced hypersonic boost glide vehicle.

The budget request for prompt global strike included $40.0 million for the alternative re-entry system/warhead engineering and delivery vehicle options/development, which would support work on various aspects of a biconic re-entry vehicle for use as a possible prompt global strike option. The committee believes that work on the biconic vehicle is premature and therefore recommends that no funds be made available for the manufacture of the biconic vehicle. Work on technologies to support prompt global strike systems generally, such as command destruct, fuze development, and similar generally applicable technologies, however, should continue. The committee notes that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) hypersonic glide vehicle HTV–2 is scheduled for testing in fiscal year 2009, and that if these tests are successful, there would be no need for the biconic vehicle.

The committee recommends that of the funds that were included in the budget request for the biconic vehicle, approximately $15.0 million shall be available for the advanced hypersonic boost glide vehicle in addition to the $30.0 million for a total of $45.0 million. The committee notes that funding for the advanced hypersonic boost glide vehicle was previously included in PE63305A. The committee believes that all prompt global strike activities, with the exception of the DARPA funded work on HTV–2, which will terminate at the end of fiscal year 2009, should be consolidated in one budget account.

Net-enabled command and control

The budget request included $147.3 million in PE 33158K for the Joint Command and Control Program for Net-enabled command and control, as well as $8.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW) Line 21 and $35.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) Line 120 for the same program. This is out of a total investment of $227.4 million for the program and nearly $675.0 million between fiscal years 2007 and 2010 to develop and begin to field the program. The committee recommends decreases of $90.0 million in PE 33158K, $25.0 million from OMDW, and $7.9 million from PDW.

The committee notes that both the Director of Defense Research and Engineering's (DDRE) technology readiness assessment and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation's ongoing oversight of the Network enabled command and control (NECC) program have raised issues regarding technical risk, aggressive and overly optimistic scheduling, and unclear testing and deployment strategies. The DDRE assessment noted a lack of definition of the program as to requirements or agreement on program definition with stakeholders. The committee understands that these and other NECC program issues could lead to a delay in the Milestone B decision approval for the program.

In addition, the committee notes that the services are currently developing information systems under the Global Command and Control System Family of Systems (GCCS–FOS), which are planned for eventual integration into a single NECC architecture. The committee is not aware of any service that has a well articulated and coordinated transition strategy and deployment and integration schedule for this complex system of systems. Finally, the committee notes that GCCS–FOS technologies have not yet been fully fielded, nor will users and testers have significant operational experience with the newest versions of the GCCS–FOS for a number of years. Since NECC is designed to be the follow-on program for the GCCS–FOS, the committee recommends a reduction in its funding growth until technical risk, testing, and program schedule issues are addressed in a coordinated and joint fashion amongst all stakeholders, and a set of operational lessons learned and capability gaps from GCCS–FOS deployments is developed and analyzed.

Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program

The budget request included $133.9 million in PE 64940D8Z for the Central Test and Evaluation (T&E) Investment Program man-

aged by the Test Resource Management Center, originally established by the committee in section 231 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314). The 2007 Strategic Plan for DOD T&E Resources noted that "outdated threat missile fly-out models reduced the effectiveness of both active and passive countermeasures testing." To help address this shortfall, the committee recommends an additional $5.0 million for development of surface-to-air missile hardware simulators. The strategic plan also commented that "the expanded computing capability being deployed in the upcoming C4ISR [command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance] systems will need to be replicated at the (test) ranges by upgrading existing or acquisition of new hardware and software systems." Consistent with addressing that need, the committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million for development of range network enterprise systems to support distributed testing.

Anti-tamper technologies

The budget request included $2.2 million in PE 65790D8Z for Small Business Innovation Research program activities. The committee notes that the 2007 Defense Science Board study, "Mission Impact of Foreign Influence on DOD [Department of Defense] Software," found that "software deployed across the DOD continues to contain numerous vulnerabilities and weak information security design characteristics." To address these weaknesses the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for the development of anti-tamper software systems.

Force transformation directorate

The budget request included $20.7 million in PE 65799D8Z for the force transformation directorate. The committee recommends a reduction of $15.0 million from this account, and directs that the remaining requested funds be used to transition programs to other activities within the Department of Defense. The committee notes that the disestablishment of the Office of Force Transformation (OFT) has diminished the role that this program plays in driving transformative defense technologies and operational concepts. The committee acknowledges that OFT has made significant contributions to the development of active protection systems and operationally responsive space capabilities, but feels that the Department of Defense needs to reconsider the totality of programs that all seemed to be aimed at a common, laudable purpose of driving force transformation.

The committee believes that the efforts of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, United States Joint Forces Command, and the Joint Capability Technology Demonstration program, among others, can be coordinated to serve the role that was intended for the research and development programs of OFT at its inception. The committee notes that all these efforts are under the oversight or direct control of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDRE), and so directs the DDRE to strongly consider merging force transformation program activities with these other efforts.

Software assurance education and research

The budget request included $394.1 million in PE 33140G for the Information Systems Security Program, but no funds for the development and integration of secure software design practices in curricula of higher education institutions that teach computer science and software engineering.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million for this purpose at one of the institutions designated as a National Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education by the National Security Agency.

Status of Operational Readiness and Training Systems

The budget request included $36.4 million in PE 33150K for the Global Command and Control System (GCCS). The committee notes that this program includes funding to continue the development, testing, and fielding of the legacy Status of Operational Readiness and Training Systems (SORTS) that is currently being replaced by the Department of Defense's objective system, the Defense Readiness Reporting System. The committee recommends a decrease of $2.0 million in PE 33150K for SORTS.

Industrial Base Innovation Fund

The budget request included $20.5 million in PE 78011S for industrial preparedness programs. The committee notes that the 2006 Defense Science Board Task Force on the Manufacturing Technology Program called for increased investment in manufacturing research and technology over a 5-year period to a level of "one percent of the RDT&E budget," to align the Department of Defense with the level of manufacturing technology investments in the early 1980s. The committee notes that for the fiscal year 2009 budget request this would be $796.0 million. The actual Manufacturing Technology (Mantech) budget request is only $198.0 million.

The committee further notes that the Director of Defense Research and Engineering called for an increase in funding for "manufacturing science technology" in the range of $50.0 to $70.0 million per year. The committee notes that the fiscal year 2009 Mantech budget request is only an increase of $4.6 million over the fiscal year 2008 budget request and a decrease of $80.4 million relative to fiscal year 2008 appropriated levels.

The committee notes that investing in innovation in the defense industrial base can only serve to help address many of the issues facing the Department of Defense. For example, the committee believes that the development of innovative manufacturing capabilities can lead to lower cost, more efficient production of defense systems, potentially lead to spin-off commercial technologies that can support national manufacturing and industrial base needs, and address critical manufacturing assured supply chain issues that limit the Department's capability to acquire critical defense equipment and technologies, such as body armor, production of advanced aerospace materials, and electronic components.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in PE 78011S to continue the Industrial Base Innovation Fund. The committee directs that the funds be executed jointly with the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Industrial Policy,

to ensure that critical shortfalls in the defense industrial base are addressed. The committee directs that the highest priority on investments be made in areas that support accelerating the surge production of items likely to be required in near-term military operations and in areas to preserve or expand diminishing critical defense industrial base.

Items of Special Interest

Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense funding

The committee notes that the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system was used in February for a one-time mission to intercept and destroy a decaying U.S. satellite before it re-entered the earth's atmosphere. This mission, which cost more than $90.0 million, used considerable Aegis BMD assets and funding. The committee is concerned that the Aegis BMD program will not be fully reimbursed for its expenses in preparing for, testing for, and conducting the mission, as well as for restoring the system's components to their normal missile defense configuration, and replacing the Standard Missile–3 interceptor used for the mission. If the Aegis BMD program is not reimbursed for these expenses, it would not be able to perform some $90.0 million worth of planned and budgeted activities that have been approved by Congress. This would not be acceptable.

The committee directs the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and the Department of Defense to ensure that the Aegis BMD program is fully reimbursed for all expenses related to the one-time satellite intercept mission, so that all previously planned, funded, and approved Aegis BMD work will proceed without delay. The committee directs MDA to report to the congressional defense committees by no later than October 1, 2008 on the status of the full reimbursement of the Aegis BMD program.

Agency relocation

The budget request included $28.0 million in PE 65897E for Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) relocation costs, and another $45.0 million is programmed for this purpose in fiscal year 2010. The committee believes that the request and budget plan have not yet been adequately justified and directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a report on the plan for DARPA's relocation, as described below. The committee notes that current plans for the relocation call for the Department of Defense (DOD) to lease a new facility for DARPA and to provide funding for the building's outfitting to meet mandated force protection requirements.

The plans also call for the Department to provide funding for other DARPA requirements, including facilities to handle classified information, specialized heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, and specialized information technology requirements. The committee is unclear as to whether the Department will be responsible for restoring the building's specialized modifications at the end of DARPA's new lease to the satisfaction of the building owner and what that cost will be to the government.

The committee is unclear as to the rationale and cost implications for selecting a commercial lease requiring extensive upgrades

over government facilities, which government facilities were evaluated as alternatives to leasing, what cost-benefit analyses were performed, and what criteria were used to finally select an option. The committee understands that the DARPA leasing plan has been approved through the General Services Administration and by the relevant congressional committees of jurisdiction. Nonetheless, the committee notes that upon expiration of its current lease in 2010, DARPA could potentially be relocated onto other existing government property, which may more cost-effectively meet force protection, classified facility, and information technology requirements and therefore save valuable resources.

The committee notes that research agencies like DARPA need to be able to attract the finest technical talent to perform their critical mission for DOD. The committee notes that DARPA has had some difficulty attracting appropriate talent, despite special personnel flexibilities available to the organization, and has plans to use commercial executive search firms to enhance recruiting efforts. The committee understands that an agency's location plays a role in its ability to attract talent, and further notes that some organizations with similar hiring challenges, like the Office of Naval Research and Air Force Office of Scientific Research are located in commercially developed areas, while others, such as the Naval Research Laboratory, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, the National Security Agency, and the Army's Night Vision Laboratory are not.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees detailing the justification for the agency relocation plans and requested funding, no later than September 1, 2008. The report shall include a cost-benefit analysis comparing the leasing of commercial property and upgrading those facilities to meet DARPA requirements to alternative options; describe which government properties, buildings, and facilities were evaluated as alternatives to commercial leasing; detail the costs that will be incurred to the government to restore the building to the lessor's requirements at the end of the lease; describe the criteria that were finally used to select an option; and include certifications that to perform its mission efficiently, DARPA must maintain a headquarters in the Washington, DC region, that no commercial or government facilities currently exist within that region to meet DARPA's unique requirements, and that the selected plan for relocation represents the best value for the Department.

Executive helicopter program (VH–71A)

The budget request included $1,047.8 million in PE 64273N for continued development of the executive helicopter, VH–71A. The VH–71A program is intended to provide the replacement helicopter for transportation of the President and Vice President of the United States, heads of state, and other dignitaries. The administration established challenging performance requirements and an aggressive fielding schedule for the program, reflecting an elevated level of urgency to field this new capability for post–9/11 operations. In an effort to manage programmatic risk and meet the stressing demands for this new capability, the program adopted an incremental fielding strategy for the 23 aircraft to be placed in

service. The first portion of the program, called Increment One, would deliver five aircraft, with four of these aircraft used to provide an initial limited capability to fulfill immediate presidential transport requirements. The second portion of the program, called Increment Two, would deliver 19 aircraft to complete all of the presidential support requirements.

The committee is aware that the VH–71A program has encountered significant challenges associated with modifying the selected commercial aircraft to meet the cost and schedule requirements for Increment One. As a result, the Navy plans for only limited employment for Increment One aircraft due to expectations that service life of these helicopters will be limited.

The Navy has found that Increment Two, which was originally planned for concurrent development with Increment One, is beyond the reach of the cost, technical, and schedule baseline established for the program. Faced with this realization, the Department of Defense has restructured the program with a focus on validating requirements, establishing realistic cost and schedule estimates, eliminating concurrency, and developing a new baseline for future budget requirements.

Recognizing that the fiscal year 2008 budget would have been inadequate to support concurrent efforts on both Increment One and Increment Two, the Department issued a "stop work" order on Increment Two. Although the program continues to refine an independent cost assessment in support of future budget decisions, initial estimates point toward a cost overrun of at least 70 percent. This level is well in excess of the percentages that would trigger a breach of the Nunn-McCurdy limits for major acquisition programs.

While it is evident that the VH–71A program will require a Nunn-McCurdy certification in order to proceed with Increment Two, the Department has apparently chosen to wait until submission of the annual Selected Acquisition Report to initiate the certification process. This delay appears to be based on a technical interpretation that, since the government has stopped all work on Increment Two and has neither finalized cost assessments nor revised the program's baseline to reflect the cost growth, it is premature to declare that thresholds have been breached. Under this scenario, the Navy would potentially receive fiscal year 2009 funding and be in a position to sign a contract modification for Increment Two prior to declaring a Nunn-McCurdy breach. Subsequent to signing such a contract, they would then declare a Nunn-McCurdy breach and, thereby, trigger the certification process that this provision of law requires.

The committee realizes that the administration has spent significant time conducting senior level analysis and review of this critical program's requirements, cost, and schedule, in conjunction with the ongoing restructure and deliberations on the fiscal year 2010 budget. However, the committee is concerned that program cost and schedule may be further impacted by potential delays associated with meeting the requirements for Nunn-McCurdy certification, and encourages the Department to initiate proceedings in accordance with section 2433 of title 10, United States Code. The committee notes that the Secretary of the Air Force did not wait

until either the Air Force had signed a contract or had received additional funds before declaring a Nunn-McCurdy breach on the C–5 reliability enhancement and re-engining program.

Because of all these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a VH–71A report to the congressional defense committees outlining VH–71A program:

(1) performance requirements;

(2) revised cost estimates;

(3) causes for cost growth;

(4) detailed breakout of cost growth related to under-estimated requirements; and

(5) actions being implemented to reduce and control development and production costs.

Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary to identify alternatives for extending the service life of Increment One aircraft and increasing their utility in the effort to provide greater return on this investment.

The committee directs that, of the amounts authorized for fiscal year 2009 for VH–71A Executive Helicopter Development (PE 64273N), the Secretary may obligate no funding for Increment Two efforts until: (1) the Defense Department completes VH–71A unit cost reporting requirements as prescribed by section 2433 of title 10, United States Code; and (2) the Secretary of the Navy submits the VH–71A report described above to the congressional defense committees.

Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle

Military threats to amphibious operations have forced the Navy and Marine Corps to develop a concept of operations, referred to as Operational Maneuver from the Sea, for launching an amphibious assault from over the horizon. The Navy and Marine Corps are fielding the full capability required to launch amphibious assaults from 25 miles at sea—with one critical exception: the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV). Designed to rapidly transport marines ashore and maneuver to inland objectives, the EFV is the missing component of the Marine Corps' amphibious assault triad, which also includes the Landing Craft Air Cushion and the MV–22 Osprey.

Under current plans, the EFV will not achieve Initial Operational Capability (IOC) until 2015 and Full Operational Capability (FOC) until 2025—about 35 years after the EFV program entered development. Without the EFV, amphibious assault operations would require the Navy to bring amphibious ships and escorts close to shore to disembark the aged Advanced Amphibious Vehicles, exposing the ships and the marines to anti-access threats. The committee is very concerned that the EFV program plan places the Marine Corps' primary mission capability—amphibious operations—at risk for an unacceptably long duration.

The committee understands that the EFV program has experienced serious developmental delays and cost growth, which have added years to the schedule. The program is emerging from a critical Nunn-McCurdy cost breach, and the restructured program has added 4 years of further development prior to a full-rate production decision. The program's cost challenges, however, are compounded

by the protracted production schedule planned for the vehicle. The Marine Corps projects that its budget will permit a production rate limited to 55 vehicles per year once full-rate production begins in 2016. This low rate of production will delay full fielding while discarding potential cost benefits afforded by more economic rates of procurement.

The committee believes that greater priority must be given to achieving EFV Full Operational Capability within the Department of Defense's equation for balancing requirements with developmental risk and budget constraints. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to evaluate cost and risk for alternatives that would improve upon current EFV Initial Operational Capability projections, and accelerate Full Operational Capability to meet the 2020 threat baseline. The Secretary shall report the results of this evaluation to the congressional defense committees with submission of the fiscal year 2010 budget request. The report shall include an assessment of total program cost, annual budget requirements, and technical risk for the accelerated program, and compare these results with the program of record. Additionally, the report shall provide an assessment of the operational impact and risk to amphibious assault capabilities associated with delaying FOC to 2025.

Global Positioning System

The committee is concerned that the space, ground control, and user equipment segments of the Global Positioning Satellite system (GPS) program are not well synchronized. The committee notes that the ground control needed to utilize the M-code on the GPS IIR satellites will not be fully available until after the last of the GPS IIR satellites is launched and the user equipment will not be fully fielded until after the first of the M-code GPS IIR satellites reaches the end of its useful life. The first M-code GPS IIR satellite was launched in September 2005. The M-code is a special code to allow military users to continue using GPS signals in an area of operation while jamming other signals.

Looking ahead to the GPS III satellites, the committee notes that the possibility for a similar disconnect among space, ground control, and user equipment is significant. The Air Force reduced anticipated funding in the early years and the GPS schedule is compressed with very little margin. Moreover, the contract award is late, with the space segment originally scheduled for award in 2007. The committee is concerned that adequate management attention be paid to the GPS program to minimize additional risks to the program.

Improved commercial imagery integration

The committee notes that the government is investing substantial funds in the commercial imagery industry to meet important operational requirements of the combatant commands and the intelligence community. However, the tasking, processing, exploitation, and dissemination (TPED) systems for commercial imagery and imagery collected by government-owned assets are not integrated, which causes commercial imagery resources to be underutilized and other inefficiencies. The government needs to be able

to task commercial imagery collection against specific areas without revealing that fact to the world, to be able to share commercial imagery within the national security community freely, and to routinely and automatically task commercial satellites when they are the logical choice to satisfy a requirement. These needs will become critical if the administration and Congress decide to shift a larger proportion of imagery collection requirements to the commercial sector.

Accordingly, the committee directs that, as feasible within available funding, the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency and the National Reconnaissance Office complete the tasking prototype effort, including an integrated constellation optimization tool; integrate commercial imagery data streams into the existing national dissemination network; and begin systems engineering and development to enable SECRET-level operations within the commercial-data provider facilities and networks.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Explanation of tables

The following tables provide the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title III of this Act. The tables also display the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2009 budget request for operation and maintenance programs, and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts.

These tables are incorporated by reference into this Act as provided in section 1002 of this Act. The Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Operation and Maintenance, Army	31,243,092	39,368	31,282,460
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	34,922,398	-110,800	34,811,598
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,597,254	10,100	5,607,354
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	35,902,487	-657,900	35,244,587
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	26,091,864	-165,300	25,926,564
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,642,341	300	2,642,641
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,311,085		1,311,085
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	213,131		213,131
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,142,892		3,142,892
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	5,875,546	34,300	5,909,846
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	5,879,576	4,350	5,883,926
US Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, Defense	13,254		13,254
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster And Civic Aid	83,273		83,273
Cooperative Threat Reduction	414,135	20,000	434,135
Environmental Restoration, Army	447,776		447,776
Environmental Restoration, Navy	290,819		290,819
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	496,277		496,277
Environmental Restoration, Defense	13,175		13,175
Environmental Restoration Formerly Used Sites	257,796		257,796
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	9,101		9,101
TOTAL TITLE III -- BY APPROPRIATION	**154,847,272**	**-825,582**	**154,021,690**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Operation and Maintenance, Army			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		LAND FORCES			
2020	010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,259,183		1,259,183
2020	020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	107,517		107,517
2020	030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	606,827		606,827
2020	040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	963,864		963,864
2020	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,244,612		1,244,612
2020	060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,013,851	3,000	1,016,851
		Unmanned aircraft systems concept development		[3,000]	
		LAND FORCES READINESS			
2020	070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,821,481		1,821,481
2020	080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	624,053	2,000	626,053
		Shipping containers		[2,000]	
2020	090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	737,303		737,303
		LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
2020	100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,309,710	21,600	7,331,310
		Life cycle logistics contracting		[21,600]	
2020	110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	2,093,829	7,768	2,101,597
		Barracks repairs		[7,768]	
2020	120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	301,149		301,149

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2020	130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	262,556		262,556
2020	140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	274,654		274,654
2020	150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM			
2020	160	RESET			
2020	170	COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS	282,990		282,990
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**18,903,579**	**34,368**	**18,937,947**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
		MOBILITY OPERATIONS			
2020	180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	204,559		204,559
2020	190	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	122,273		122,273
2020	200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS			
		TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**326,832**		**326,832**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING			
2020	210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	121,985		121,985
2020	220	RECRUIT TRAINING	90,999		90,999
2020	230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	66,512		66,512
2020	240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	441,264		441,264

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING			
2020	250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	825,237		825,237
2020	260	FLIGHT TRAINING	781,761		781,761
2020	270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	130,208		130,208
2020	280	TRAINING SUPPORT	852,545		852,545
		RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING			
2020	290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	645,968		645,968
2020	300	EXAMINING	148,274		148,274
2020	310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	244,844		244,844
2020	320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	223,957		223,957
2020	330	JUNIOR ROTC	149,329		149,329
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**4,722,883**		**4,722,883**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SECURITY PROGRAMS			
2020	340	SECURITY PROGRAMS	876,020		876,020

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS			
2020	350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	552,629	50,000	602,629
		Redistribution of Equipment		[50,000]	
2020	360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	630,145		630,145
2020	370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	510,326		510,326
2020	380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	450,394	25,000	475,394
		Ammunition inspections and warehousing		[25,000]	
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
2020	390	ADMINISTRATION	768,681		768,681
2020	400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,154,085		1,154,085
2020	410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	276,925		276,925
2020	420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	195,129		195,129
2020	430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,152,968		1,152,968
2020	440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	233,680		233,680
2020	450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	58,345		58,345
		SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS			
2020	460	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	408,788		408,788
2020	470	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	21,683		21,683
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**7,289,798**	**75,000**	**7,364,798**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	998	Computing services		-50,000	-50,000
	998	Logistics Modernization Program		-20,000	-20,000
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army	**31,243,092**	**39,368**	**31,282,460**
		Operation and Maintenance, Navy			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
1804	010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	3,873,884		3,873,884
1804	020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	969,661		969,661
1804	030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	53,272		53,272
1804	040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	120,305		120,305
1804	050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	494,832		494,832
1804	060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,127,774	63,000	1,190,774
1804	070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	142,618		142,618
		SHIP OPERATIONS			
1804	080	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,536,837	3,000	3,539,837
		Damage control management		[3,000]	
1804	090	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	689,893		689,893
1804	100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	4,139,996		4,139,996
1804	110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,167,411		1,167,411

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT			
1804	120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	633,376		633,376
1804	130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	85,349		85,349
1804	140	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	160,175		160,175
1804	150	WARFARE TACTICS	397,763		397,763
1804	160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	315,803		315,803
1804	170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	783,689		783,689
1804	180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	186,860		186,860
1804	190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,256		3,256
1804	200	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	152,167		152,167
1804	210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	261,105		261,105
		WEAPONS SUPPORT			
1804	220	CRUISE MISSILE	131,692		131,692
1804	230	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,046,422		1,046,422
1804	240	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	64,298		64,298
1804	250	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	478,103	9,000	487,103
		MK 45 gun depot overhauls		[9,000]	
1804	260	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	321,921		321,921
		BASE SUPPORT			
1804	270	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	893,448		893,448
1804	280	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,734,146		1,734,146
1804	290	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,158,483		4,158,483

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**28,124,539**	**75,000**	**28,199,539**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
		READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES			
1804	300	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	394,729		394,729
		ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS			
1804	310	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	7,276		7,276
1804	320	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	110,268		110,268
		MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS			
1804	330	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	27,650		27,650
1804	340	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,419		2,419
1804	350	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	25,473		25,473
		TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**567,815**		**567,815**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING			
1804	360	OFFICER ACQUISITION	142,175		142,175
1804	370	RECRUIT TRAINING	11,136		11,136
1804	380	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	116,985		116,985
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
1804	390	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	540,855		540,855
1804	400	FLIGHT TRAINING	518,077		518,077
1804	410	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	170,486		170,486
1804	420	TRAINING SUPPORT	155,533		155,533
		RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION			
1804	430	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	272,498		272,498
1804	440	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	163,077		163,077
1804	450	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	95,959		95,959
1804	460	JUNIOR ROTC	50,494		50,494
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**2,237,275**		**2,237,275**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
1804	470	ADMINISTRATION	735,822		735,822

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1804	480	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	4,213		4,213
1804	490	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	109,968		109,968
1804	500	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	163,568		163,568
1804	510	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	278,085		278,085
1804	520	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	381,511		381,511
1804	530	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES			
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT			
1804	540	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	257,008		257,008
1804	550	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS			
1804	560	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	240,991		240,991
1804	570	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	595,050		595,050
1804	580	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	60,723		60,723
1804	590	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	17,378		17,378
1804	600	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	79,615		79,615
		INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS			
1804	620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	504,649		504,649
		SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS			
1804	680	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	6,570		6,570
		CANCELLED ACCOUNTS			
1804	690	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
1804	700	JUDGMENT FUND			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		OTHER PROGRAMS			
1804	999	OTHER PROGRAMS	557,618		557,618
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**3,992,769**		**3,992,769**
	998	Unobligated Balances		-70,000	-70,000
	998	Computing services		-50,000	-50,000
	998	Overstatement of civilian pay		-65,800	-65,800
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy	**34,922,398**	**-110,800**	**34,811,598**
		Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
1106	010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	759,814	2,500	762,314
		Marine Corps shelters		[2,500]	
1106	020	FIELD LOGISTICS	611,660	7,600	619,260
		Mobile corrosion protection		[7,600]	
1106	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	86,422		86,422

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		USMC PREPOSITIONING			
1106	040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	73,725		73,725
1106	050	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	5,217		5,217
		BASE SUPPORT			
1106	060	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	803,530		803,530
1106	070	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,940,671		1,940,671
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**4,281,039**	**10,100**	**4,291,139**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING			
1106	080	RECRUIT TRAINING	15,361		15,361
1106	090	OFFICER ACQUISITION	411		411
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
1106	100	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	56,106		56,106
1106	110	FLIGHT TRAINING	361		361
1106	120	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	22,882		22,882
1106	130	TRAINING SUPPORT	312,339		312,339
		RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION			
1106	140	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	238,900		238,900
1106	150	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	64,080		64,080

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1106	160	JUNIOR ROTC	17,740		17,740
		BASE SUPPORT			
1106	170	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	55,737		55,737
1106	180	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	155,530		155,530
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**939,447**		**939,447**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
1106	190	SPECIAL SUPPORT	282,043		282,043
1106	200	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	30,662		30,662
1106	210	ADMINISTRATION	45,545		45,545
		BASE SUPPORT			
1106	220	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION	3,169		3,169
1106	230	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	15,349		15,349
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**376,768**		**376,768**
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	**5,597,254**	**10,100**	**5,607,354**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Operation and Maintenance, Air Force			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
3400	010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	4,158,181	47,900	4,206,081
		B-52 flying hours		[47,900]	
3400	020	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	290,744		290,744
3400	030	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	680,109		680,109
3400	040	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,545,613		1,545,613
3400	050	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,711,951		1,711,951
3400	060	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,751,194	-448,000	2,303,194
		F-15 excess to requirement		[-497,000]	
		B-2 excess to requirment		[-2,000]	
		B-52 depot maintenance		[48,000]	
		Engine trailer life extension		[3,000]	
3400	070	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,142,947		1,142,947
3400	080	BASE SUPPORT	2,434,047	2,100	2,436,147
		Land mobile radios		[2,100]	
		COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS			
3400	090	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	1,167,875	2,800	1,170,675
		National Security Space Institute		[2,800]	
3400	100	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	277,681		277,681
3400	110	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	674,169		674,169

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3400	120	JCS EXERCISES			
3400	130	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HQ	215,775		215,775
3400	140	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	546,822	-10,000	536,822
		Threat finance		[-10,000]	
		SPACE OPERATIONS			
3400	150	LAUNCH FACILITIES	340,385		340,385
3400	160	LAUNCH VEHICLES	33,390		33,390
3400	170	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	228,617		228,617
3400	180	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	91,067		91,067
3400	190	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	326,784		326,784
3400	200	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	191,764		191,764
3400	210	BASE SUPPORT	675,821		675,821
		COCOM			
3400	220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	626,787		626,787
3400	230	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	195,714		195,714
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**20,307,437**	**-405,200**	**19,902,237**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
		MOBILITY OPERATIONS			
3400	240	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	3,228,790		3,228,790
3400	250	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	91,392		91,392
3400	260	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	181,713		181,713
3400	270	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	308,895		308,895
3400	280	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	378,429		378,429
3400	290	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	242,505		242,505
3400	300	BASE SUPPORT	622,960		622,960
		TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**5,054,684**		**5,054,684**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING			
3400	310	OFFICER ACQUISITION	88,547		88,547
3400	320	RECRUIT TRAINING	16,557		16,557
3400	330	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	108,730		108,730
3400	340	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	79,052		79,052
3400	350	BASE SUPPORT	95,807		95,807
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
3400	360	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	420,590		420,590
3400	370	FLIGHT TRAINING	948,787		948,787

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3400	380	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	178,749		178,749
3400	390	TRAINING SUPPORT	114,435		114,435
3400	400	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	14,711		14,711
3400	410	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	223,960		223,960
3400	420	BASE SUPPORT	648,618		648,618
		RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION			
3400	430	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	196,140		196,140
3400	440	EXAMINING	5,242		5,242
3400	450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	206,608		206,608
3400	460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	161,089		161,089
3400	470	JUNIOR ROTC	74,558		74,558
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,582,180**		**3,582,180**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS			
3400	480	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	917,794	1,000	918,794
		Advanced ultrasonic inspections		[1,000]	
3400	490	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	666,546		666,546
3400	500	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	295,355		295,355
3400	510	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	68,869		68,869
3400	520	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	313,182		313,182
3400	530	BASE SUPPORT	1,192,616		1,192,616

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
3400	540	ADMINISTRATION	226,665		226,665
3400	550	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	576,493		576,493
3400	560	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	231,919		231,919
3400	570	ARMS CONTROL	38,669		38,669
3400	580	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	851,904		851,904
3400	590	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	23,851		23,851
3400	600	CIVIL AIR PATROL	24,445		24,445
3400	610	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	51,377		51,377
3400	620	BASE SUPPORT	358,164		358,164
		SECURITY PROGRAMS			
3400	630	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,085,224		1,085,224
		SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS			
3400	640	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	35,113		35,113
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**6,958,186**	**1,000**	**6,959,186**
	998	Unobligated Balances		-72,000	-72,000
	998	Computing services		-50,000	-50,000
	998	Overstatement of civilian pay		-131,700	-131,700
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	**35,902,487**	**-657,900**	**35,244,587**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
0100	010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	406,141		406,141
0100	020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	3,652,060		3,652,060
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**4,058,201**		**4,058,201**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
0100	030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	120,726		120,726
		RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION			
0100	040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	79,960		79,960
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	**200,686**		**200,686**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
0100	050	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE			
0100	060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	107,987	5,200	113,187

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Starbase		[5,200]	
0100	090	DEFENSE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY	156,652		156,652
0100	100	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	418,006		418,006
0100	110	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE			
0100	120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,227,626	-45,000	1,182,626
		SORTS		[-20,000]	
		NECC		[-25,000]	
0100	140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES	31,905		31,905
0100	150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	345,838		345,838
0100	160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	213,808		213,808
0100	170	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	16,731	13,700	30,431
		Expand research in North Korea		[13,700]	
0100	180	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY AGENCY	33,468		33,468
0100	190	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	355,331		355,331
0100	200	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY	2,007,089		2,007,089
0100	210	DOD HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	557,029		557,029
0100	220	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,066,462		1,066,462
0100	230	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	880,024	-100,000	780,024
		Global train and equip program		[-100,000]	
0100	240	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	452,531		452,531
0100	260	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	50,654		50,654
0100	270	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,709,174	36,200	1,745,374
		Defense Readiness Reporting System		[16,200]	
		REPI		[20,000]	
0100	280	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	519,508		519,508

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		OTHER PROGRAMS			
0100	999	OTHER PROGRAMS	11,683,154		11,683,154
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**21,832,977**	**-89,900**	**10,059,923**
	998	Impact aid		30,000	30,000
	998	Impact aid for children with disabilites		5,000	5,000
	998	Special assistance to local eduction agencies		10,000	10,000
	998	Unobligated Balances		-70,400	-70,400
	998	Computing services		-50,000	-50,000
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	**26,091,864**	**-165,300**	**25,926,564**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		LAND FORCES			
2080	010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,567		1,567
2080	020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	16,419		16,419
2080	030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	484,460		484,460
2080	040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	173,583		173,583
2080	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	508,322		508,322
2080	060	AVIATION ASSETS	61,030		61,030
		LAND FORCES READINESS			
2080	070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	254,901		254,901
2080	080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	87,541	4,800	92,341
		Mobile corrosion protection		[4,800]	
2080	090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	108,191		108,191
		LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
2080	100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	548,086		548,086
2080	110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	255,912		255,912
2080	120	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	13,531		13,531
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**2,513,543**	**4,800**	**2,518,343**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
2080	130	ADMINISTRATION	70,806		70,806
2080	140	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	6,189		6,189
2080	150	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,491		8,491
2080	160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	43,312		43,312
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**128,798**		**128,798**
	998	Military technician cost avoidance		-4,500	**-4,500**
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	**2,642,341**	**300**	**2,642,641**
		Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
1806	010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	604,501		604,501
1806	020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	16,083		16,083
1806	030	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	3,156		3,156
1806	040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	144,515		144,515
1806	050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	427		427

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		SHIP OPERATIONS			
1806	060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	55,920		55,920
1806	070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	595		595
1806	080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	62,629		62,629
		COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT			
1806	090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	14,834		14,834
1806	100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	122,567		122,567
		WEAPONS SUPPORT			
1806	110	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,385		5,385
		BASE SUPPORT			
1806	120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	92,327		92,327
1806	130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	61,680		61,680
1806	140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	111,296		111,296
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,295,915**		**1,295,915**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
1806	150	ADMINISTRATION	3,341		3,341
1806	160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	9,002		9,002
1806	170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,396		2,396
1806	180	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS			
1806	190	OTHER SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	431		431
		CANCELLED ACCOUNTS			
1806	200	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**15,170**		**15,170**
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	**1,311,085**		**1,311,085**
		Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
1107	010	OPERATING FORCES	54,848		54,848
1107	020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	11,640		11,640
1107	030	TRAINING SUPPORT	29,296		29,296

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		BASE SUPPORT			
1107	040	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	16,174		16,174
1107	050	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	68,065		68,065
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**180,023**		**180,023**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
1107	060	SPECIAL SUPPORT	7,616		7,616
1107	070	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	815		815
1107	080	ADMINISTRATION	11,316		11,316
1107	090	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,712		8,712
		BASE SUPPORT			
1107	100	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,649		4,649
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**33,108**		**33,108**
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	**213,131**		**213,131**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
3740	010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,150,860		2,150,860
3740	020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	115,971		115,971
3740	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	379,452		379,452
3740	040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	92,969		92,969
3740	050	BASE SUPPORT	277,350		277,350
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**3,016,602**		**3,016,602**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
3740	060	ADMINISTRATION	71,059		71,059
3740	070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	25,392		25,392
3740	080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	22,513		22,513
3740	090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,625		6,625
3740	100	AUDIOVISUAL	701		701
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**126,290**		**126,290**
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	**3,142,892**		**3,142,892**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		LAND FORCES			
2065	010	MANEUVER UNITS	905,866	11,500	917,366
		Aircraft humidity protection		[5,000]	
		Expandable light air mobility shelters		[6,500]	
2065	020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	159,765		159,765
2065	030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	553,548		553,548
2065	040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	267,183		267,183
2065	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	41,141		41,141
2065	060	AVIATION ASSETS	852,986		852,986
		LAND FORCES READINESS			
2065	070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	316,359	14,000	330,359
		Extended Cold Weather Clothing System		[1,000]	
		Rapid data management system		[9,500]	
		Weapons skills trainer		[3,500]	
2065	080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	120,210	8,800	129,010
		Emergency satellite communications		[4,000]	
		Mobile corrosion protection		[4,800]	
2065	090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	367,551		367,551

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
2065	100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	756,579		756,579
2065	110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	500,933		500,933
2065	120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	504,977		504,977
2065	130	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	87,089		87,089
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**5,434,187**	**34,300**	**5,468,487**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
2065	140	ADMINISTRATION	124,769		124,769
2065	150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	50,668		50,668
2065	160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	7,679		7,679
2065	170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	258,243		258,243
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**441,359**		**441,359**
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	**5,875,546**	**34,300**	**5,909,846**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
3840	010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,580,927	4,350	3,585,277
		Controlled humidity protection		[3,600]	
		Crypto-linguist intelligence officer initiative		[750]	
3840	020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	670,554		670,554
3840	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	691,199		691,199
3840	040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	300,101		300,101
3840	050	BASE SUPPORT	594,733		594,733
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**5,837,514**	**4,350**	**5,841,864**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
3840	060	ADMINISTRATION	31,234		31,234
3840	070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	10,828		10,828
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**42,062**		**42,062**
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	**5,879,576**	**4,350**	**5,883,926**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line Number	Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
0104	010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	13,254		13,254
0819	010	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	83,273		83,273
0134	010	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	414,135	20,000	434,135
0810	020	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	447,776		447,776
0810	030	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	290,819		290,819
0810	040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	496,277		496,277
0810	050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	13,175		13,175
0811	060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	257,796		257,796
0118	070	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	9,101		9,101
0141	080	IRAQ FREEDOM FUND			
0838	090	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS, DEFEN			
4965	100	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND			
0833	110	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE			
		TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**2,025,606**	**20,000**	**2,045,606**
		TOTAL TITLE III -- OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	**154,847,272**	**-825,582**	**154,021,690**

Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions

Expansion of cooperative agreement authority for management of natural resources to include off-installation mitigation (sec. 311)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to enter cooperative agreements for the management of natural resources outside of Department of Defense installations, if the cooperative agreements benefit the Department by relieving or eliminating current or anticipated restrictions on military activities.

Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for certain costs in connection with Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington (sec. 312)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse the Environmental Protection Agency for certain costs incurred in connection with Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington.

Comprehensive program for the eradication of the brown tree snake population from military facilities in Guam (sec. 313)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Department of Defense to establish a comprehensive program to control and, to the extent practicable, eradicate the brown tree snake (Boiga irregularis) population from military facilities in Guam and prevent their spread to other areas.

The committee is concerned about the ecological and economic risks posed by the inadvertent introduction of the brown tree snake from Guam to other areas in the Pacific region and the United States. Force stationing changes in the Pacific planned by the Department over the next several years will significantly increase the number of department facilities and activities on Guam, resulting in an equally significant increase in military traffic to and from the island. The Department has the responsibility to control and, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that its facilities and activities do not contribute to the spread of the brown tree snake to other areas.

Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot issues

Authority to consider depot-level maintenance and repair using contractor furnished equipment or leased facilities as core logistics (sec. 321)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the military departments to count workload performed by Government employees using contractor furnished equipment, or in facilities leased to the Government, as sustaining a core logistics capability under section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, if that work is being performed pursuant to a public-private partnership as defined by section 2474 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 2474 encourages private sector investment at Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence. This private sector investment

may include facilities or equipment. This proposed change would authorize partnered workloads performed by Government employees using contractor-furnished equipment or leased facilities to be counted as core.

Minimum capital investment for certain depots (sec. 322)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 332 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) to require the Department of Defense to report the separate levels of capital investment for Navy and Marine Corps depots. The committee also recommends the addition of the following Army arsenals to the list of covered depots:

Watervliet Arsenal, New York
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas

Subtitle D—Reports

Additional information under annual submissions of information regarding information technology capital assets (sec. 331)

The committee recommends a provision that would synchronize the information the Department of Defense provides to both Congress and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regarding major Department of Defense information technology (IT) investments. The committee believes that the change recommended in this provision will make the IT budget justification documents more usable to Congress and the public, and increase the transparency of the Department's IT programs.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Mitigation of power outage risks for Department of Defense facilities and activities (sec. 341)

The February 2008 report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on DOD Energy Strategy found that, "critical national security and homeland defense missions are at an unacceptably high risk of extended outage from failure of the [commercial electricity] grid and other crucial national infrastructure." The task force recommended that the Department of Defense take several actions to assess and reduce risk to critical missions at fixed installations and activities from the loss of commercial power.

The Department is in the process of evaluating the task force report and is developing a comprehensive energy strategy. However, the committee is concerned that, despite numerous vulnerability studies, the extent of technical and operational risks to specific critical missions are not adequately assessed, or plans for their mitigation programmed. This incomplete assessment coupled with the trend over the last several years to place more defense installations onto the commercial power grid suggests that Department infrastructure energy plans may not be synchronized with an up-to-date technical and operational risk evaluation.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive technical and operational risk assessment for mission critical Department installations, facilities, and activities; to develop integrated prioritized plans to eliminate or mitigate risks; and to establish goals to mitigate or eliminate the greatest and most urgent risks. The committee further recommends that the Secretary provide the defense committees an annual report on the Department's integrated prioritized plans and progress on efforts to mitigate or eliminate risks to mission critical installations, facilities, and activities.

Increased authority to accept financial and other incentives related to energy savings and new authority related to energy systems (sec. 342)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the authority of the Secretary of Defense to accept financial and other incentives related to energy savings and energy systems. The provision would authorize the acceptance of such incentives in connection with the construction of an energy system using solar energy or other renewable forms of energy.

Recovery of improperly disposed of Department of Defense property (sec. 343)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the sale or other disposition of military or Department of Defense (DOD) property except in accordance with statutes and regulations governing such property. If property is disposed of in violation of this prohibition, the person holding the property would have no right or title to, or interest in, the property, and the property would be subject to seizure by appropriate law enforcement officials. Under the provision, the appropriate federal district court would have jurisdiction to determine whether property was improperly disposed of and is subject to seizure.

The DOD has informed the committee that the absence of a comprehensive statute has complicated law enforcement efforts to recover military and DOD property that has been misappropriated or that was the subject of unauthorized disposition by members of the armed forces, DOD civilians, contractors, and others. For example, the DOD reports that ceramic plate inserts for body armor, night vision goggles, and munitions list items that were reported as lost or misplaced by Navy personnel have later been found for sale on the Internet. Recently published reports indicate that military equipment offered for sale on the Internet also includes infrared patches used to identify U.S. troops on the battlefield, as well as spare parts for Chinook helicopters and F–14 fighters. In one case, there was even an attempt to sell a Navy airplane over the Internet.

The provision recommended by the committee would address this problem by establishing a comprehensive statutory approach to the improper disposal of military and DOD property and facilitating the recovery of such property regardless of to whom it was furnished and who was responsible for its improper disposal.

Budget Items

Army

Computing services

The committee recommends a total reduction of $200.0 million from service and defense-wide operation and maintenance accounts that support the procurement and delivery of computing services. The reductions include a $50.0 million decrease each from Army, Navy, Air Force, and defense-wide accounts. The committee does not intend for these reductions to be assessed against Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) computing services activities. The committee directs the services to aggressively explore increased opportunities to utilize DISA computing services and eliminate redundant, wasteful service-specific computing services activities.

The committee notes that consolidation of computing services activities, such as reductions in numbers of computing centers, data storage systems, and electronic file servers, has saved the Department of Defense an estimated $200.0 million or more annually since 1990, according to DISA. Further, a June 2007 independent assessment of DISA's computing services noted that they ". . . provided world-class computing services that enable the DOD community to better execute their missions," and compared DISA's services favorably to general government, federal, and workload peers. The assessment also recommended continuing assessment of organizational staffing, structure, and realignment, as well as continued maturation of data center processes. Finally, the committee notes that uncoordinated, Department-wide deployment of servers, mainframes, data warehouses, web sites, and other computing services has resulted in inefficiencies, underutilization of computing infrastructure, and interoperability difficulties.

The committee recommends that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration initiate independent, comparative benchmarking studies of computing services across the Department of Defense to inform and accelerate the consolidation of the provision of computing services to increase efficiency, improve services, and reduce costs.

Unmanned aircraft systems concept development

The budget request included $1.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for aviation assets, but provided no funds for unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) concept development. The committee supports the efforts of the Army's Aviation Warfighting Center at Fort Rucker, Alabama to develop current and future UAS concepts that will meet joint and Army operational objectives. The committee expects that the Army's UAS concept development will be consistent with the Department of Defense's roles and missions review, as required by section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). This increase is not intended to prejudice or influence that report. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in OMA for UAS concept development.

Shipping containers

The budget request included $204.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for strategic mobility, but provided no funds for shipping containers. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in OMA for the purchase of shipping containers.

Life cycle logistics contracting

The budget request included $7.3 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for base operations support. These funds include the cost of providing logistics support to Army forces operating around the world. The committee is aware of the Army's challenges in contracting for base operation services, including shelter, utilities, food, water, and sanitization, to meet the logistics needs of forward deployed forces. The committee recommends an increase of $21.6 million in OMA for the Army Contracting Agency to improve its life cycle acquisition planning, solicitation, and negotiation activities.

Facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization

The budget request included $2.1 billion for facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization for the Army. The committee recommends an increase of $7.8 million for restoration or modernization of barracks.

Second destination transportation

The budget request included $552.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for service-wide and second destination transportation. These funds support the cost of line haul, over-ocean, and inland transportation for worldwide movement of Army supplies and equipment to and from depots, between commands, and to overseas commands by civilian and military air and surface modes. Additional funds allow the Army to redistribute more equipment and supplies to correct unit shortages and increase readiness. The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million in OMA for second destination transportation.

Ammunition inspections and warehousing

The budget request included $450.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for ammunition management. These funds support the management of operations within the life cycle of conventional ammunition, including procurement administration, storage, distribution, maintenance, and demilitarization. Additional funds allow the Army to reduce backlogs in ammunition inspections and re-warehousing efforts. The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in OMA for ammunition management.

Navy

Unobligated Operation and Maintenance balances

The committee notes that the challenges associated with operations in Iraq and Afghanistan create a difficult fiscal management situation, especially for the Army and Marine Corps. However, the Department of Defense continues to under-execute its Operation

and Maintenance (O&M) appropriations for the active and reserve components. According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Department of Defense had $247.3 million in average yearly unobligated balances for fiscal years 2003 through 2007. The military departments had $1.1 billion in average yearly unobligated balances for fiscal years 2003 through 2007.

The committee recalls that 3 years ago the Department began to reduce the O&M portion of its annual funding request and future-years defense program before submission to Congress based, in part, on the GAO analysis of unobligated balances. The Department also underfunds important maintenance and activities in its annual request in anticipation of supplemental appropriations. Whether made available in annual or supplemental appropriations, the Department and services must ensure that taxpayer dollars are appropriately managed to provide the best possible readiness for the force and avoid the expiration of obligating authority. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $212.4 million to the Department's O&M accounts, as follows: Operation and Maintenance, Navy, $70.0 million; Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, $72.0 million; and Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, $70.4 million.

Overstatements of civilian personnel pay requirements

Analysis performed by the Government Accountability Office based on the services' civilian personnel end strength data as of February 2008, projects that the Department of Defense civilian personnel costs are overstated for fiscal year 2009 by $565.3 million. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $65.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy, and a decrease of $131.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force for overstatement of civilian personnel pay.

Naval aircraft depot maintenance

The budget request included $34.9 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy but only $1.1 billion for aircraft depot maintenance. The Navy identified a shortage of resources for aircraft depot maintenance for fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends an increase of $63.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy for aircraft depot maintenance.

Damage control management

The budget request included $3.5 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN) for mission and other ship operations, but provided no funds for the development and installation of an improved damage control inventory management and stowage system for amphibious ships. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in OMN for development of a damage control management system for amphibious ships.

MK 45 gun depot overhaul

The budget request included $478.1 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN) for weapons maintenance, but provided no funds for MK 45 5" gun depot overhauls. The committee rec-

ommends an increase of $9.0 million in OMN for MK 45 depot overhauls.

Marine Corps

Marine Corps shelters

The budget request included $759.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) for operational forces, but provided no funds for the Family of Shelters and Tents (FST). The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in OMMC for FST.

Mobile corrosion protection Marine Corps

The budget request included $502.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) for field logistics activities. The committee recommends an increase of $7.6 million in OMMC for mobile corrosion protection and abatement.

Air Force

B–52 flying hours

The budget request included $2.8 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for flying hours. The committee recommends an increase of $47.9 million in OMAF for B–52 squadron flying hours. The Air Force failed to include adequate funding in the budget request to meet the requirements of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to maintain 76 B–52 bombers in a common configuration and included this funding on the Air Force unfunded priorities list.

F–15 depot maintenance

The budget request included $35.9 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force of which $2.7 billion is for aircraft depot maintenance. The Air Force depot maintenance request includes $497.0 million for F–15 repairs related to a structural problem identified in an aircraft mishap in November 2007. After inspections of the F–15 fleet the number of aircraft requiring major repair was not as anticipated, therefore funds requested for fiscal year 2009 exceed the requirement. The committee recommends a reduction of $497.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force for F–15 depot maintenance.

B–52 depot maintenance

The budget request included $2.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance Air Force (OMAF) for depot maintenance. The committee recommends an increase of $48.0 million in OMAF for B–52 aircraft depot maintenance. The Air Force failed to include adequate funding in the budget request to meet the requirements of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to maintain 76 B–52 bombers in a common configuration and included this funding on the Air Force unfunded priorities list.

B–2 depot maintenance

The budget request included $35.9 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) of which $2.7 billion is for aircraft depot maintenance. The committee notes that B–2 Bomber scheduled workload for fiscal year 2009 will be less due to the loss of an aircraft in a flight mishap on Guam in February 2008. The committee recommends a reduction of $2.0 million in OMAF.

Engine trailer life extension program

The budget request included $2.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for depot maintenance, but provided no funds for engine trailer life extension. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in OMAF to begin the re-manufacturing and refurbishing of Air Force engine trailers.

Land mobile radios

The budget request included $2.4 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for air operations base support, but provided no funds for land mobile radios. Upgrades to the radio system used at Nellis Test and Training Range are necessary to comply with required federal communication standards. The committee recommends an increase of $2.1 million in OMAF for land mobile radios.

National Security Space Institute

The budget request included $19.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for the National Security Space Institute (NSSI). The committee recommends an increase of $2.8 million for the NSSI. The NSSI, which is operated by the Air Force, is the space education and professional development center for the Department of Defense. The additional funding will allow the NSSI to continue to reinstate one advanced course, sustain one advanced course, and establish distance learning programs. This program is on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list.

Advanced ultrasonic inspection of aging aircraft structures

The budget request included $917.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for logistics operations, but included no funds for advanced ultrasonic inspection of aging aircraft. Ultrasonic inspection of the Air Force's aging fleet would provide a non-destructive means to determine the structural condition of aircraft, saving time and money. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in OMAF for advanced ultrasonic inspection techniques.

Defense-wide

Expanded prisoner of war/missing in action research in North Korea

The budget request did not include funding to cover the costs associated with resumption of recovery operations in North Korea for the remains of prisoners of war/missing in action (POW/MIA) personnel. The committee recommends an increase of $13.7 million for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide.

The Under Secretary of Defense for Policy recently reported to Congress on the organization, management, and budgeting of the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command (JPAC). In that report, he stated that "JPAC is funded to meet its current mission, excluding operations in North Korea, if those should be resumed at some point."

The committee notes that cooperation with North Korea to recover the remains of U.S. POW/MIAs was suspended by the United States in 2005. The committee views this program as an important humanitarian effort that should proceed. Since time is a factor for the families of the POW/MIAs, the committee urges the Department of Defense to begin talks with the North Korean military regarding how to resume recovery operations at the earliest possible time.

Defense Security Cooperation Agency

The budget request included $880.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency. Of this amount, $500.0 million was requested for the Global Train and Equip program to build the security capacity of foreign forces to meet urgent or emerging threats. Section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 1206 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), authorizes the Global Train and Equip program at a level of $300.0 million through September 30, 2008. The Global Train and Equip program is reauthorized under this Act through fiscal year 2011 at a level of $400.0 million in each fiscal year. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $100.0 million to OMDW for the Global Train and Equip program.

Status of Operational Readiness and Training System

The budget request included $89.2 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Global Command and Control System (GCCS). The committee is aware that this program includes funds to continue to support fielding and upgrades of the legacy Status of Operational Readiness and Training Systems (SORTS) that is currently being replaced by the Department of Defense's objective system, the Defense Readiness and Reporting System. The committee recommends a decrease of $20.0 million in OMDW for SORTS.

Defense Readiness Reporting System

The budget request included $4.9 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide for the Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS). The committee recommends an increase of $16.2 million for the acceleration of the development and deployment of DRRS.

The committee is aware of the challenges associated with the accurate, reliable, and timely measurement and reporting of the readiness of military forces. The current readiness reporting system, Global Status of Resources and Training System (GSORTS), is inadequate to meet the demands of the force rotation strategy that supports operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the world. The Department of Defense (DOD), Joint Staff, and U.S. Joint

Forces Command lack the visibility of deployed and non-deployed forces' capabilities and readiness required to manage global military commitments.

In June 2002, DOD issued a directive establishing the DRRS, a capabilities-based, adaptive, near-term readiness reporting system. The directive requires all components to align their readiness reporting processes with DRRS. Since then, we understand DOD and the services have taken a number of steps but that DRRS is not yet fully operational and aligned with the services' reporting processes. As a result, DOD's most recent quarterly readiness report to Congress contains both DRRS and GSORTS data.

The committee supports the Department's development of DRRS as an important management modernization and replacement for GSORTS. However, the committee is concerned that the Department has yet to successfully plan, organize, resource, and execute tests and full deployment for DRRS's within the Global Command and Control System. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees a report not later than March 1, 2009 on its plan to accelerate the full deployment of DRRS and retire GSORTS. The committee also directs that the Government Accountability Office evaluate the DRRS program, DOD's plan, and identify factors affecting DOD's ability to fully develop and implement DRRS and retire GSORTS.

Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative

The budget request included $39.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI). The committee is encouraged that this is $10.0 million more than requested in fiscal year 2008.

The committee believes that the military departments should continue to pursue voluntary agreements with other public and private entities as authorized under section 2684a of title 10, United States Code, to prevent the development or use of property that would be incompatible with the mission of an installation, and preserve habitat that is compatible with environmental requirements that might otherwise result in current or anticipated environmental restrictions on military bases.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in OMDW for the REPI and directs that the military departments give priority to projects that benefit critical mission training sites that have the greatest potential to prevent or reduce encroachment through the creation of a compatible use buffer zone.

STARBASE Academies

The budget request included $108.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for Civil Military Programs, but did not provide sufficient funds to sustain the operations of the 60 existing STARBASE Academies. The committee recommends an increase of $5.2 million in OMDW for STARBASE.

Army Reserve

Mobile corrosion protection Army Reserve

The budget request included $87.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (OMAR) for land forces systems readiness. The committee recommends an increase of $4.8 million in OMAR for mobile corrosion protection and abatement.

Army Reserve military technician cost avoidance

The budget request included $2.6 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (OMAR). Operation and maintenance accounts ordinarily fund military technician pay and benefits as civilian pay. When mobilized and serving on active duty, however, this compensation is paid by military personnel appropriations. Based on an analysis of the services' actual military technician mobilization data, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) projects that the Army Reserve could realize $14.9 million in cost avoidance in fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends a decrease of $4.5 million in OMAR for military technician cost avoidance.

Army National Guard

Aircraft humidity protection

The budget request included $905.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for maneuver units, but provided no funds for aircraft humidity protection. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has found that the readiness and safety of military equipment can be severely degraded by corrosion. The most cost-effective means of combating corrosion is prevention. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in OMARNG for aircraft controlled humidity protection.

Expandable Light Air Mobility Shelters

The budget request included $905.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for maneuver units but provided no funds for Expandable Light Air Mobility Shelters (ELAMS). The committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million in OMARNG for the procurement of ELAMS.

Extended Cold Weather Clothing System

The budget request included $316.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for force readiness operations support, but included no funds for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing System (ECWCS). The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in OMARNG for ECWCS.

Rapid Data Management System

The budget request included $316.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for force readiness operations support, but provided no funds for the Rapid Data Management System (RDMS). RDMS is an integrated data collection and management system that allows first responders to gather data during field operations. It was successfully tested and used by the Marine Corps during Exercise COBRA GOLD 2007, and is cur-

rently used by the American Red Cross. The committee recommends an increase of $9.5 million in OMARNG for RDMS.

Mobile corrosion protection Army National Guard

The budget request included $120.2 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for land forces systems readiness activities. The committee recommends an increase of $4.8 million in OMARNG for mobile corrosion protection and abatement.

Weapons Skills Trainer

The budget request included $316.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for force readiness operations support, but included no funds for the Weapons Skills Trainer (WST). The committee notes the high mobilization rates of members of the National Guard. Individual and unit weapons training are enhanced by the availability of a multilevel weapons simulator such as the WST. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in OMARNG for the Weapons Skills Trainer.

Emergency satellite communications

The budget request included $120.2 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for land forces systems readiness. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in OMARNG for additional authorized Joint Incident Scene Communication Capability packages required for disaster response.

Air National Guard

Controlled humidity protection

The budget request included $3.6 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG) for air operations, but provided no funds for controlled humidity protection. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has found that the readiness and safety of military equipment can be severely degraded by corrosion. The Department of Defense spends billions of dollars annually to address corrosion damage that could be avoided with increased prevention and mitigation technology such as controlled humidity protection. The committee recommends an increase of $3.6 million in OMANG for controlled humidity protection.

Crypto-linguist and intelligence officer initiative

The budget request did not include sufficient funding for airborne crypto-linguists to conduct training and related activities. The committee recommends an increase of $750,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard for airborne crypto-linguists.

Items of Special Interest

Assessment of plans for contracting support in combatant command operational plans

The committee notes the inadequacy of initial planning and execution related to contracting support for contingency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Assumptions with respect to the scope and

duration of post-conflict stability operations made by the Department of Defense left military planners with little justification to provide for more robust reconstruction and civil-military logistics and the contracting support necessary for efficient and effective execution.

The committee believes that contingency plans must have comprehensive, detailed, and realistic contracting support plans that meet the operational requirements of the force before, during, and after combat operations. The Department appears to be applying the lessons of Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom and notes the recent publication of Chairman, Joint Chief of Staff Manual 3133.03C (CJCSM 3133.03C) providing planning guidance that requires combatant commanders to include contracting support plans in their contingency operations plans.

The committee directs that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) conduct an assessment of the implementation of the directives contained in CJCSM 3133.03C. In conducting this assessment the GAO shall also evaluate the contracting support plans for those combatant command operations plans as reported in the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress (QRRC) as required by section 482 of title 10, United States Code. The GAO should base its assessment of contracting support plans on the requirements of CJCSM 3133.03C but shall also include an evaluation of each plan's assumptions, comprehensiveness, feasibility, adequacy of executable detail, resources required and available, contracting related operational risk at each phase of the plan, and any other aspect of contracting support planning useful to this review. The GAO shall provide this assessment to the congressional defense committees not later than September 30, 2009.

Combatant Commander Initiative Fund

The budget request included $75.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund (CCIF). The committee notes that this fund is intended to make small amounts of monies available promptly to combatant commanders to enable them to meet unexpected contingencies and take advantage of opportunities that arise but that are not amenable to the time-consuming reprogramming process. The statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189) directs that these funds "may only be used for activities for which funding is not available in a timely fashion under existing authorizations and appropriations." The committee urges the Department of Defense to preserve the flexibility of this fund, consistent with the intent of Congress, by refraining from programming these funds at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Funding for the CCIF reflects an increase of $50.0 million over the fiscal year 2008 level for this fund. The committee believes that priority in the use of this $50.0 million in additional funding should be given to enabling geographic combatant commanders to respond to unanticipated emergencies in their respective areas of responsibility by providing urgent humanitarian relief and reconstruction assistance, particularly in foreign countries where U.S. armed forces are engaged in a contingency operation. The authority

to use the CCIF to provide urgent and unanticipated humanitarian relief and reconstruction assistance is under the authority added to section 166a(b)(6) of title 10, United States Code, by section 902 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

The committee notes that the statement of managers accompanying Public Law 109–364 urged the Department to develop guidance for the use of the additional authority provided by section 902 of that act to ensure that the authority could be used quickly and without bureaucratic delay under urgent circumstances. That statement of managers also urged that such guidance include procedures for coordinating with the relevant Department of State country team as a precondition for providing assistance under this authority. The committee is unaware of the Department having developed such guidance and again urges the Department to do so, consistent with the statement of managers' recommendations.

The committee also notes that the additional authority provided under section 902 is not intended for use in Afghanistan or Iraq so long as Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) authority is available for use in those countries.

The committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after consultation with the combatant commanders, to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives by October 31, 2009, providing a detailed description of the activities funded by the CCIF during fiscal year 2009, and an assessment of the benefits derived from those activities.

Commercial satellite communications

The committee notes that approximately 80 percent of the Department of Defense satellite communications capacity is currently provided by commercially operated satellites. These services are purchased on an as-needed basis, predominately with funds made available through supplemental appropriations acts or other short-term funding. While the percentages have varied, the Department of Defense estimates that as much as 50 percent of satellite communications capabilities in the long-term could be provided using commercially operated satellites. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to review the Defense Department commercial satellite communications requirements and determine the most efficient and reliable way to acquire commercial satellite communications capabilities. This review should include the most appropriate funding approach for sustained and surge requirements and opportunities to involve the commercial satellite industry in planning to ensure the capability will be available when and where it is needed.

Defense Information Systems Agency working capital fund management

The committee notes that section 321 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) gave the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) greater flexibility to utilize working capital funds (WCF) in small modernization projects for its systems. Congress noted that the rate of techno-

logical advances in information systems represents a major challenge to DISA as it attempts to keep pace with commercial technology and provide better service to its defense customers. The authority provided was intended to help address those challenges, by enabling DISA to use flexible WCF funds to make investments that would replace outdated, unsupported software and hardware systems, and other equipment to maintain network performance and functionality.

The committee notes that there are no mechanisms currently available within the DISA WCF to raise capital in order to make the investments permitted under the authority granted last year. Further, unlike other WCF activities, DISA utilizes funding from direct appropriations for technology refreshment and modernization purposes. The committee notes that dependence on the direct authorization and appropriation of funds for systems operated and maintained using WCFs is inconsistent with the WCF concept itself. The committee further notes that requiring DISA to build technology refreshment into the Defense Information Systems Network (DISN) customer rate structure, similar to the mechanisms other working capital funds use, could increase usage costs for the DISA customer base.

The committee recognizes the contradiction between the new authority and current DISA WCF practices and operations. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of DISA to report to the congressional defense committees no later than April 1, 2009 on planned mechanisms to continue to invest in timely, flexible, technology refreshment and modernization on its systems; an analysis of the current DISN rate structure and customer billing mechanisms and their adequacy for providing sufficient funding for technology refreshment needs; and any suggested changes to WCF authorities or DISN rate structures and mechanisms that may be necessary to provide warfighters with the most current, highest performance information systems possible.

Funding for military morale, welfare, and recreation programs

The availability of appropriated funds for military morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) programs is a continuing concern to the committee. As the committee learned from hearing testimony given this year, many military family organizations share this concern. Programs funded through MWR programs, such as child care and youth programs, libraries, and fitness centers, have always been an important and critical benefit for our military families. Now, in light of the multiple and lengthy deployments many military families have been facing over the past few years, the programs provided through these funds are more important than ever. These types of programs and benefits are also vital retention tools. While funds for MWR have increased slightly over the past few years, the committee believes that each of the military departments should consider increasing the amount of funds that support MWR programs, in order to ensure the best quality of life possible for our military families.

Long-range facilities and construction planning at Army ammunition plants and arsenals

The committee notes the absence of long-range planning for the recapitalization and modernization of Army ammunition plants and arsenals nationwide. In many cases, these ammunition plants and arsenals, operating in facilities that have not been upgraded in decades, serve as the sole producer of critical components that are absolutely essential to the mission of the Department of the Army. The committee further notes that other Department of Defense industrial operations such as depots have developed comprehensive long-range modernization plans that benefit from a mandatory level of recapitalization funding each year required by Congress. These long-range plans are essential to ensure that Department of the Army industrial operations can meet current and future mission requirements with effective, efficient systems and equipment that are safe, secure, and comply with environmental regulations.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army develop a comprehensive long-range plan for each ammunition plant and arsenal. Long-range plans should establish a detailed investment strategy and priorities to: correct unsafe, hazardous, or environmentally harmful working conditions; upgrade deteriorated facilities to an adequate condition; modernize equipment and manufacturing processes to industry standards; and incorporate investments in new technology that will improve efficiencies in production. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary to submit a report to the defense committees no later than 180 days after bill enactment and annually thereafter with the budget request for a period of 5 years detailing the following:

(1) the investment master plan for each ammunition plant and arsenal;

(2) the status of the implementation of such plans to date at each plant and arsenal; and,

(3) the amount contained in the budget request that is proposed to be applied to the investment strategy for each ammunition plant or arsenal.

Standards for deployable shelters

The committee recognizes the need for maximum interoperability among the services and with civilian organizations for certain types of equipment that support both contingency military operations and homeland defense missions. Deployable expeditionary facilities, such as shelters and tents used for housing, medical care, and other combat service support functions should meet minimum safety standards and be fully interoperable for joint operations, peacekeeping efforts, refugee support, and homeland defense missions. In certain cases the military services have developed standards, such as the U.S. Air Force Operational Requirements Document (ORD) CAF 316–92–II/IIIB, to ensure that shelters and tents meet consistent, interoperable safety and security standards. The committee is concerned that all the military services may not have a consistent standard to guide acquisition of these critical equipment items.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, not later

than May 1, 2009, assessing whether the Department of Defense criteria, requirements, and acquisition policies for the acquisition of deployable shelters acquired for troop housing, medical care, and other combat service support functions meet adequate structural, environmental, and security standards, and that, to the maximum extent practicable, such standards will facilitate optimal interoperability between the military and civil support functions.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active-duty end strengths for fiscal year 2009, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2008 authorization	2009 request	2009 recommendation
Army	525,400	532,400	532,400
Navy	329,098	325,300	325,300
Marine Corps	189,000	194,000	194,000
Air Force	329,563	316,600	316,771

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) authorized active-duty end strength for the Army at 525,400 and for the Marine Corps at 189,000. Additional authority was provided in section 403 of that act to increase active-duty end strength for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 by up to 22,000 for the Army and 13,000 for the Marine Corps above the fiscal year 2008 authorized levels of 525,400 and 189,000, respectively.

The committee supports the Army and Marine Corps efforts to increase their active-duty end strength and commends the Army for its efforts to achieve an active-duty end strength of 547,400 by 2010 rather than 2012 as originally planned. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have severely stressed the nation's ground forces. In the past year, the Army extended troop rotations to 15 months, with only 12 months dwell time between deployments. With the ongoing commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan, the growth in the Army and Marine Corps is clearly necessary to assist in alleviating the burden of multiple lengthy deployments. The committee recommends an active-duty end strength for fiscal year 2009 for the Army and Marine Corps of 532,400 and 194,000, respectively.

The committee recommends an additional 171 active-duty personnel for the Air Force above the budget request to support the operation and maintenance of 76 B–52 aircraft.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2009, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2008 authorization	2009 request	2009 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	351,300	352,600	352,600
The Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000
The Navy Reserve	67,800	66,700	66,700
The Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600
The Air National Guard of the United States	106,700	106,700	106,756
The Air Force Reserve	67,500	67,400	67,400
The Coast Guard Reserve	10,000	10,000	10,000

The authorizations contained in this section include an increase of 56 personnel for the Air National Guard. The committee believes these additional personnel should be used to enhance essential training and readiness missions.

End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the Reserves (sec. 412)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize full-time support end strengths for fiscal year 2009, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2008 authorization	2009 request	2009 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	29,204	29,950	29,950
The Army Reserve	15,870	16,170	16,170
The Navy Reserve	11,579	11,099	11,099
The Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261
The Air National Guard of the United States	13,936	14,337	14,360
The Air Force Reserve	2,721	2,733	2,733

The committee recommends increases of 746 in the Army National Guard, 300 in the Army Reserve, 401 in the Air National Guard, and 35 in the Air Force Reserve over levels approved for fiscal year 2008. The committee supports increases in full-time support manning consistent with requested levels to increase readiness in the reserve components. The authorizations contained in this section include an increase of 23 personnel for the Air National Guard. The committee believes these additional personnel should be used to enhance essential training and readiness missions.

The committee also recommends a decrease from the fiscal year 2008 level of 480 in the Navy Reserve, consistent with reductions in both active Navy and Navy Reserve end strength. The committee recommends an end strength for the Marine Corps Reserve equal to the fiscal year 2008 level, consistent with the budget request.

End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize end strengths for military technicians (dual status) for fiscal year 2009, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2008 authorization	2009 request	2009 recommendation
The Army Reserve	8,249	8,395	8,395
The Army National Guard of the United States	26,502	27,210	27,210
The Air Force Reserve	9,909	10,003	10,003
The Air National Guard of the United States	22,553	22,452	22,459

The authorizations contained in this section include an increase of 7 personnel for the Air National Guard. The committee believes these additional personnel should be used to enhance essential training and readiness missions.

Fiscal year 2009 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2009, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2008 authorization	2009 request	2009 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	1,600	1,600	1,600
The Army Reserve	595	595	595
The Air National Guard of the United States	350	350	350
The Air Force Reserve	90	90	90

Maximum number of Reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, as of September 30, 2009, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2008 authorization	2009 request	2009 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	17,000	17,000	17,000
The Army Reserve	13,000	13,000	13,000
The Navy Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200
The Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000
The Air National Guard of the United States	16,000	16,000	16,000
The Air Force Reserve	14,000	14,000	14,000

Increased end strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve and military technicians (dual status) of the Army National Guard (sec. 416)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional Active Guard and Reserve (AGR) end strength for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve, and additional end strength for Army National Guard military technicians (dual status). The provision would also require that this additional end

strength be funded out of funds appropriated for fiscal year 2009 by titles XV or XVI of this Act.

The committee notes that full-time support for Army reserve component soldiers and units, including AGR personnel and military technicians, is critical to the readiness of the reserve components. The Department of the Army has continued to increase the number of personnel assigned to provide full-time support to its reserve components and seeks a fiscal year 2013 end state of 32,060 AGR personnel in the National Guard, 16,261 AGR personnel in the Army Reserve, 28,380 military technicians (dual status) in the National Guard, and 8,395 military technicians (dual status) in the Army Reserve. This provision would authorize the Department to accelerate attainment of these levels by the end of fiscal year 2009. The committee expects the Department to update a 1999 manpower study that evaluates the number of AGR and military technician personnel required to achieve adequate full-time support to its reserve components in light of the increased operational use of the reserve components since that study's completion, and to include discussion of this requirement in its evaluation of the recommendations of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves.

Modification of authorized strengths for Marine Corps Reserve officers on active duty in the grades of major and lieutenant colonel to meet new force structure requirements (sec. 417)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 12011 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the limit on the number of Marine Corps majors and lieutenant colonels authorized to serve on full-time reserve component duty at the end of any fiscal year.

Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations

Military personnel (sec. 421)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the amounts authorized to be appropriated for military personnel accounts of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2009.

Budget Items

Military personnel funding changes

The amount authorized to be appropriated for military personnel programs in section 421 of this Act includes the following changes from the budget request: (1) an increase of $316.0 million to increase the pay raise for military personnel by an additional 0.5 percentage point; (2) an increase of $12.5 million for increased active-duty Air Force end strength levels; (3) an increase of $3.3 million to reflect increased Air National Guard end strength levels; and (4) a reduction of $1.1 billion to reflect anticipated unobligated balances, which is described in more detail elsewhere in this report.

Military personnel unobligated balances

The Department of Defense has consistently underexecuted its military personnel funding since fiscal year 1995 for active and reserve members. The Government Accountability Office estimates the average potential unexpended balances for fiscal year 2009, based on the most recent data from recent years, to be $1.1 billion. The committee recommends a decrease of $1.1 billion to the military personnel accounts to reflect these anticipated unobligated balances.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

Modification of distribution requirements for commissioned officers on active duty in general and flag officer grades (sec. 501)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 525 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 16.3 percent to 16.4 percent the percentage of general and flag officers in a military service that may be appointed above the grade of major general or rear admiral, and to exclude from this limitation those reserve general or flag officers on active duty under a call or order to active duty specifying a period of active duty of not longer than 3 years.

Modification of limitations on authorized strengths of general and flag officers on active duty (sec. 502)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 526 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to designate up to 324 general and flag officer positions as joint duty assignments that would be excluded from the limitation on the number of general and flag officers in each service and would specify the minimum number of officers required to serve in these positions for each service. The provision would realign the number of general and flag officers authorized to serve on active duty in the Army from 302 to 222 officers; in the Navy from 216 to 159 officers; in the Air Force from 279 to 206 officers; and in the Marine Corps from 80 to 59 officers. The provision would also repeal section 721 of title 10, United States Code, which limits the number of general and flag officers authorized to serve in positions outside their own service.

The provision would also establish goals for the number of general officers and flag officers in the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services who serve in acquisition positions and who have significant contracting experience. The October 31, 2007, report of the Commission on Army Acquisition and Program Management in Expeditionary Operations (the "Gansler Commission") attributed contracting failures in Iraq and Afghanistan, in significant part, to the Army's lack of general officers in the contracting field. The report states:

> The Army's difficulty in adjusting to the singular problems of Kuwait, Iraq and Afghanistan is in large part due to the fact that there are no Generals assigned to contracting responsibilities. This is a decade-old blight: the cutbacks began in 1991, and no general officers have held an Army contracting position since 1998. In a military en-

> vironment (especially in an expeditionary environment), the number and level of the Generals associated with a discipline reflects its importance. A General is held accountable for his or her leadership. Today, the Secretary of the Army cannot replace a General and obtain a new start for Army contracting—the Army has no Generals doing contracting.

The findings of the Gansler Commission are symptomatic of a broader decline in the number of acquisition and contracting positions across the Department of Defense. In fiscal year 2000, 104 general officers—roughly 12 percent of all general officers in DOD—served in acquisition positions. By fiscal year 2007, DOD had only 73 general officers serving in such positions—despite the fact that DOD's acquisition spending had almost doubled in the interim.

Without increasing the number of general officers serving in these positions, DOD is unlikely to reverse the ongoing decline in its acquisition workforce and revitalize its acquisition and contracting practices. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense, the secretaries of the military departments, and the chiefs of staff to significantly increase the number of general officers serving in acquisition and contracting positions in the near future.

Clarification of joint duty requirements for promotion to general or flag grades (sec. 503)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 619a of title 10, United States Code, to provide that with certain exceptions, an officer must be designated as a joint qualified officer, rather than a joint specialty officer, in accordance with section 661 of title 10, United States Code, before being eligible for promotion to general or flag officer.

Modification of authorities on length of joint duty assignments (sec. 504)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 664 of title 10, United States Code, to align prescribed joint duty assignment lengths with the joint qualification system implemented pursuant to section 516 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), to take into account multiple joint experiences in satisfying joint duty assignment requirements.

Technical and conforming amendments relating to modification of joint specialty requirements (sec. 505)

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical and conforming amendments to sections 663, 665, and 667 of title 10, United States Code, to replace references to joint specialty officers with officers designated as joint qualified officers.

Eligibility of reserve officers to serve on boards of inquiry for separation of regular officers for substandard performance and other reasons (sec. 506)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1187 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize reserve offi-

cers to serve as members of boards of inquiry convened to consider whether regular officers should be retained on active duty. This implements a recommendation of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves regarding elimination of policies which unnecessarily distinguish reserve component personnel from their active-duty counterparts and thereby impede full integration.

Modification of authority on Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps (sec. 507)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 5046 and 525 of title 10, United States Code, to require that an officer, while serving as the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, shall serve in the grade of major general. The provision would also exclude an officer serving in this grade and position from the limitation on the authorized number of officers serving in grades above brigadier general in the Marine Corps.

Increase in number of permanent professors at the United States Air Force Academy (sec. 508)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 9331 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 21 to 25 the number of permanent professors at the Air Force Academy.

Service creditable toward retirement for thirty years or more of service of regular warrant officers other than regular Army warrant officers (sec. 509)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1305 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the retirement of a regular warrant officer of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard 60 days after the date on which the officer completes 30 years of active service.

Modification of requirements for qualification for issuance of posthumous commissions and warrants (sec. 510)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 1521 and 1522 of title 10, United States Code, to replace the condition for a posthumous commission or warrant that the death be in the line of duty with a requirement for a certification by the secretary concerned that, at the time of death, the member was qualified for appointment to the next higher grade.

Subtitle B—Enlisted Personnel Policy

Increase in maximum period of reenlistment of regular members of the armed forces (sec. 521)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 505(d) of title 10, United States Code, and section 308(a) of title 37, United States Code, to increase from 6 to 8 years the maximum period of reenlistment of regular members of the armed forces.

Subtitle C—Reserve Component Management

Modification of limitations on authorized strengths of reserve general and flag officers in active status (sec. 531)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 12004 of title 10, United States Code, to exclude from the limitations on the numbers of reserve general and flag officers in an active status those reserve general and flag officers serving in joint duty assignments. The number of reserve general and flag officers excluded could not exceed 20 percent of the number of authorized flag and general officers authorized for the service concerned.

Extension to other reserve components of Army authority for deferral of mandatory separation of military technicians (dual status) until age 60 (sec. 532)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 10216(f) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Air Force to implement personnel policies that would allow a military technician (dual status) who continues to meet the requirements for dual status to continue to serve until the technician reaches age 60 and attains eligibility for an unreduced annuity. Currently, this requirement applies only to the Secretary of the Army.

Increase in mandatory retirement age for certain Reserve officers to age 62 (sec. 533)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 12647 and 14702 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the mandatory retirement age from age 60 to age 62 for commissioned officers assigned to the Selective Service System or as property and fiscal officers; Army National Guard officers assigned to a headquarters or headquarters detachment of a State; and reserve officers of the Army or Air Force who are required to maintain membership in a Selected Reserve unit or organization as a condition of continued employment as a National Guard or reserve technician.

Authority for vacancy promotion of National Guard and Reserve officers ordered to active duty in support of a contingency operation (sec. 534)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 14317 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the promotion of reserve component officers who are recommended for promotion to fill a position vacancy under section 14315 of title 10, United States Code, and who are ordered to active duty in support of a contingency operation.

Authority for retention of reserve component chaplains and medical officers until age 68 (sec. 535)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 14703(b) of title 10, United States Code, and section 324(a) of title 32, United States Code, to authorize reserve component chaplains and medical officers to be retained in an active status until the date on which the officer becomes 68 years of age.

Modification of authorities on dual duty status of National Guard officers (sec. 536)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 325 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize all National Guard officers, not just those in command of National Guard units, to retain their state status while serving on active duty when authorized by the President and with the consent of the Governor or the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard as applicable. The provision would also allow the consent or authorization to be given in advance for the purpose of establishing the succession of command of a unit.

Modification of matching fund requirements under National Guard Youth Challenge Program (sec. 537)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 509(d) of title 32, United States Code, to clarify that the limitation on assistance provided by the Department of Defense to a State National Guard Youth Challenge Program may not be construed as a limitation on the amount of assistance that may be provided by other sources.

Report on collection of information on civilian skills of members of the reserve components of the armed forces (sec. 538)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by March 1, 2009, on the feasibility, uses, and cost effectiveness of collecting information about skills, qualifications, and professional certifications possessed by members of the reserve components.

The Commission on the National Guard and Reserves recommended that the Department of Defense develop a standardized system for developing and maintaining a "civilian skills database" that is consistent with standardized database formats, such as that used by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to allow worldwide interoperability. The committee believes that collection of this information should be considered for inclusion in the Reserve Components Common Personnel Data System pursuant to Department of Defense Instruction 7730.54, dated March 31, 2008.

Subtitle D—Education and Training

Authority to prescribe the authorized strength of the United States Naval Academy (sec. 551)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 6954 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that the authorized strength of the Brigade of Midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy is 4,400 midshipmen or such lower number as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

Tuition for attendance of certain individuals at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology (sec. 552)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 9314(c) of title 10, United States Code, to require the United States Air Force Institute of Technology to charge tuition for in-

struction of civilians from the military departments, other components of the Department of Defense, and other federal agencies, and to use these funds to defray the costs of such instruction.

Increase in stipend for baccalaureate students in nursing or other health professions under Health Professions Stipend Program (sec. 553)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 16201 of title 10, United States Code, to equate the authority for the stipend paid to baccalaureate students in nursing or other health professions under the Health Professions Stipend Program for health care professionals in reserve components to the amount of the stipend paid to participants in the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship Program under section 2121(d) of title 10, United States Code.

Clarification of discharge or release triggering delimiting period for use of educational assistance benefit for reserve component members supporting contingency operations and other operations (sec. 554)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 16164 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that only service members who separate under honorable conditions are eligible to use the educational benefits in chapter 1607 of title 10, United States Code, for a period of 10 years after separation. The provision aligns eligibility under this section with the eligibility requirements for the post-separation use of educational benefits under chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code.

Payment by the service academies of certain expenses associated with participation in activities fostering international cooperation (sec. 555)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 101 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the superintendents of the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy, in the interest of international cooperation, to pay certain expenses of officers, students, and representatives of foreign countries visiting the service academy concerned.

The provision would also authorize payment of per diem at a rate lower than the rate authorized by the Joint Federal Travel Regulations to United States Military Academy cadets, United States Air Force Academy cadets, or United States Naval Academy midshipmen who travel or study abroad in a program to enhance language skills or cultural understanding. The service academies' language and cultural immersion programs generally include cadets and midshipmen staying with families or living in university dormitories with some meals provided. This provision would authorize the academies to determine the appropriate amount of compensation for missed meals and incidentals under these circumstances.

Subtitle E—Defense Dependents' Education Matters

Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the armed forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 561)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $30.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for continuation of the Department of Defense assistance program to local educational agencies that are impacted by enrollment of dependent children of military members and civilian employees of the Department of Defense. The committee also recommends authorization of $10.0 million in OMDW, for assistance to local educational agencies with significant changes in enrollment of military and civilian school-aged dependent children due to base closures, force structure changes, or force relocations.

Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 562)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for impact aid payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(d)), using the formula set forth in section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), for continuation of the Department of Defense's assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents with severe disabilities.

Transition of military dependent students among local educational agencies (sec. 563)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 574(d) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), to require the Secretary of Defense to work collaboratively with the Secretary of Education in any efforts to ease the transition of military dependent students between Department of Defense dependent schools, schools of local educational agencies, and other schools. This provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use funds of the Department of Defense Education Activity for this purpose.

Subtitle F—Military Family Readiness

Authority for education and training for military spouses pursuing portable careers (sec. 571)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1784 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out programs to provide training and education to spouses of members of the armed forces on active duty who are pursuing portable careers.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

Department of Defense policy on the prevention of suicides by members of the armed forces (sec. 581)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive policy designed to prevent suicide by members of the armed forces. The policy would ensure that investigations, analyses, and appropriate data collection occur across the military departments on the causes and factors surrounding suicides by members of the armed forces, and that information from those studies contributes to the development of effective strategies to educate members of the armed forces in preventing suicides and suicide attempts. The committee believes that uniform data collection by the military services will facilitate analysis of events in the aggregate for trends and patterns that may lead to improved strategies to prevent suicides and suicide attempts.

The committee is particularly concerned about the increase in the rate of suicide within the United States Army from 2004 through 2007, which is higher than historic Army rates. Active Army suicide rates have doubled from 9.8 per 100,000 in 2001 to 19.7 per 100,000 in 2007. Suicide attempts resulting in medical evacuation or hospitalization have also increased from 263 in 2004 to 948 in 2006. A general officer steering committee appointed to address the rise in suicides in the Army has reaffirmed and expanded the Army's suicide prevention strategies.

To take advantage of any new developments in suicide prevention, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to initiate a review of the Army's suicide prevention program. This review shall include participation by non-Department of Defense and non-Department of Veterans Affairs experts on suicide prevention. The Secretary shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives no later than September 1, 2008 on the results of this review. The report shall include the findings and recommendations of the review and a description of any changes or modifications to the Army suicide prevention program made as a result of the review.

Relief for losses incurred as a result of certain injustices or errors of the Department of Defense (sec. 582)

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section 127e to title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to provide relief to a member or former member of the armed forces who, in the determination of the secretary concerned, has suffered imprisonment pursuant to a court-martial conviction as a result of an injustice or error on the part of the Department of Defense or any of its employees acting in their official capacity. The relief provided may include the payment of moneys, including interest, from funds available for emergency and extraordinary expenses under section 127 of title 10, United States Code.

Paternity leave for members of the armed forces (sec. 583)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize up to 21 days of leave for a male service member whose spouse gives birth to a child. The leave would be in addition to any other leave to which the service member is entitled.

Enhancement of authorities on participation of members of the armed forces in international sports competitions (sec. 584)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 717 of title 10, United States Code, to include the Military World Games as an international sports competition in which members of the armed forces may be authorized to participate. The provision would increase the maximum amounts from $3.0 million to $6.0 million that the Secretary of Defense may apportion among the military departments, and from $100,000 to $200,000 for the Coast Guard and Department of Homeland Security, that may be spent during each successive 4-year period beginning on October 1, 2008, for participation in certain international sports competitions. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than October 1, 2009, a report setting forth a comprehensive plan for participation in and planning for hosting of international sports activities, competitions, and events.

The committee believes that participation by military members in and Department of Defense support of international sports competitions is important and should be funded through appropriated funds rather than non-appropriated sources needed for morale, welfare, and recreation activities. The events sponsored by the International Military Sports Council (CISM) such as the Military World Games, in particular, also serve as security cooperation activities that foster military-to-military contact and promote Western values. The Department, however, must comprehensively set forth its plan for funding and supporting the various international sports competitions in which service members participate.

Pilot programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the armed forces (sec. 585)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to conduct pilot programs to evaluate the need for more flexibility in career patterns of a limited number of active-duty officers and enlisted members. Under the pilot programs, selected service members would leave active duty for a period of up to 3 years, and then return to active duty in the same grade and years of service that they held at the time they were inactivated. Time spent while inactivated would not count toward retirement eligibility, computation of retired pay, or years of service. The authority to conduct pilot programs under this authority would commence January 1, 2009 and end December 31, 2014. The provision would require the secretaries of the military departments to submit interim reports in 2010 and 2012. The Secretary of Defense would be required to submit a final report no

later than March 1, 2015 evaluating all the pilot programs conducted under this authority.

Prohibition on interference in independent legal advice by the Legal Counsel to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (sec. 586)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 156(d) of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit any officer or employee of the Department of Defense from interfering with the ability of the Legal Counsel to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to give independent legal advice to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Items of Special Interest

Enhancing family support for the National Guard and reserve

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments for the increased priority for family support programs presented in testimony in review of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2009. In particular, the Army would devote $1.5 billion for family support programs in fiscal year 2009, with the goal of better meeting family needs for child care, youth programs, and community recreation.

The committee remains concerned about the adequacy of support for family members of the National Guard and reserve, especially for the families of the nearly 500,000 members who have deployed. The final report of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves (January 2008) correctly focused on identifying the needs and gaps in service to reserve component family members.

The committee applauds the Department of Defense's efforts to implement the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program authorized in section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) in all States during fiscal year 2009. The committee believes that the Department should increase efforts to publicize the Military OneSource program, a valuable but under-utilized resource which can help overcome the challenge of geographic isolation for families of the National Guard and reserve. The committee also urges the Secretary to promote partnerships among the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs and State and local community mental health programs in order to increase access for Guard and reserve members and their families to quality mental health services.

The committee notes that for fiscal year 2009, as in previous years, the Department continues to rely on supplemental appropriations for a significant portion of the funding of critical family support programs, including counseling and child care. The committee reiterates its belief that family support programs are enduring requirements for the all volunteer force, and its expectation that family support programs will be fully integrated into the Department's annual budget process and future-years defense plan.

Financial literacy

The committee recognizes that our nation's military personnel and their families can face financial challenges as a result of the demands of service, including deployments overseas. To add to this, service members and their families have been the target of aggressive predatory lending practices.

Recent press reports have highlighted the fact that financial readiness is increasingly becoming an issue for many military families. In addition, military families themselves have identified increased financial education and literacy as a need.

The committee believes that early education on fiscal responsibility may help younger generations of military family members avoid financial stress. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense Education Activity to develop a comprehensive, research-based financial literacy curriculum for grades kindergarten through 12.

Legislative fellows from the Department of Defense

The Secretary of Defense has recently directed an increase in the number of legislative fellows from 26 to 100 by 2009 and extended offers for their assignment to the members assigned to 14 congressional committees. This sudden growth in the number of legislative fellows must be implemented in a manner that takes into account the needs of the Department of Defense and the professional development needs of each officer selected. The committee notes that, while a legislative fellowship can be a valuable experience, officer availability for professional development opportunities outside the Department is already severely compressed to meet a growing list of institutional requirements and for rotational forces in all services. In the case of fellows, this is compounded by the requirement for follow-on utilization assignments as required by controlling Department of Defense regulations.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to perform a critical review of how the legislative fellowship program is organized, resourced, managed, and controlled within the Department of Defense and the military departments. The Secretary should articulate with greater clarity the institutional and professional development goals and objectives of the legislative fellows program. The Secretary should also establish how the program will be evaluated in meeting these goals and objectives. Given competing demands on officer manpower, the Secretary should establish a coherent policy to ensure that the officers selected for a legislative fellowship opportunity are career-oriented officers whose experience as a fellow will be utilized appropriately in their future military assignments.

The Secretary's review should specify the numbers of fellows by military department who will be assigned each year, and the billets and positions in the Department of Defense and military departments for which a legislative fellowship assignment is a prerequisite or provides essential professional development. Additionally, the review shall provide a plan setting forth the criteria for selection, assignment, pre-fellowship training, monitoring and evaluation of performance, and post-fellowship assignments. The review should discuss the methods that will be used to ensure that officers who are assigned as legislative fellows will be assigned to

utilization tours that are fully consistent with their competitive categories and career progression requirements. The Secretary shall report the results of this review to the congressional defense committees not later than May 1, 2009.

Premium conversion and flexible spending account options for service members

The Senate report accompanying S. 1042 (S. Rept. 109–69) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 contained a requirement directing the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees a plan to evaluate and implement premium conversion and flexible spending account programs for uniformed service members. On May 15, 2007, the Department of Defense (DOD) submitted its report, concluding that "DOD must determine how PC/FSA benefit programs under a cafeteria plan might work best for each component, and whether, when, and how to offer those programs." The report recognized that there were no statutory barriers to implementation of these programs, but failed to commit to providing these programs to service members. Premium conversion and flexible spending account programs remain unavailable to service members, though they are available to federal employees, and are widely available in the civilian sector. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2008 detailing the Department's plan to implement these programs for both active-duty and Selected Reserve members, or explaining the Department's decision not to offer these programs in spite of the advantages they offer.

The committee continues to believe that active-duty members and Selected Reserve members should be able to use premium conversion to pay dental insurance premiums, and Selected Reserve personnel should be able to use it to pay TRICARE Reserve Select premiums. The committee also continues to believe that active-duty and Selected Reserve members should have access to flexible spending account options that allow them to pay for out-of-pocket medical and dental expenses, dependent care expenses, and child care services.

Report on implementation of Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives by October 1, 2008, a status report on the implementation of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program. The report shall include a description, by State, of accomplishments for fiscal year 2008, and those planned for fiscal year 2009. The report shall also include an identification of current and future resource requirements, including personnel, necessary to implement and execute the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program, as well as a plan for full implementation and oversight of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program in all States.

The committee expects that the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, serving as Executive Agent, will ensure that the program is carried out based on uniform program require-

ments throughout the United States, and in a manner that equitably serves both National Guard and reserve personnel as required by section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public law 110–181).

Secretary of Defense review of deferment from deployment policy following birth of a child

Current Department of Defense (DOD) policy governing military personnel assignments requires that for a minimum of 4 months after the birth of a child, "a military mother shall be deferred from assignment to a dependent-restricted overseas tour or an unaccompanied overseas tour when concurrent travel is denied" (Department of Defense Instruction 1315.18). The secretary of the military department, however, may extend the deferment based on force readiness needs. Army and Air Force policies provide for the minimum 4-month deferment from deployment. The Marine Corps currently defers deployment for 6 months, and the Navy for 1 year.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of policies concerning deferment from deployment of service members following the birth of a child. The review shall include an assessment of the impact of service policies on military readiness, including recruitment and retention of female service members, and the desirability of a uniform policy for all military services. The review shall take into account such factors as differing conditions during deployment and the manpower requirements of each service, the medical and psychological readiness of military members to deploy, policies regarding family care plans, and policies responding to personal hardship following childbirth, such as a newborn with special medical treatment needs.

In conducting the review, the Secretary shall consult with public and private sector experts, such as the U.S. Health Resources and Services Administration, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, and the American Academy of Family Physicians, to ensure that Department of Defense assignment policies for female service members following childbirth are informed by the most current scientific and clinical expertise regarding the well-being of new mothers and infants.

The committee directs the Secretary to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the results of this review by May 1, 2009. The report shall describe changes to DOD or service policies as a result of the review.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

Fiscal year 2009 increase in military basic pay (sec. 601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a pay raise for members of the uniformed services of 3.9 percent, 0.5 percent above the pay raise recommended in the budget request, to become effective on January 1, 2009.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for Reserve forces (sec. 611)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus; the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus; the special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high priority units; the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service; the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service; and the Selected Reserve enlistment bonus for persons with prior service.

Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the nurse officer candidate accession bonus; the repayment of education loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve; the accession bonus for registered nurses; incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists; special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties; the accession bonus for dental officers; the accession bonus for pharmacy officers; the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties; and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

Extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending their period of active service; the nuclear career accession bonus; and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

Extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays (sec. 614)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus; assignment incentive pay; the reenlistment bonus for active members; the enlistment bonus; the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills; the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage; the accession bonus for officer candidates; the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high priority units; and income replacement for reserve members experiencing extended and frequent mobilizations.

Extension of authorities relating to payment of referral bonuses (sec. 615)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the health professions referral bonus and the Army referral bonus under sections 1030 and 3252 of title 10, United States Code, respectively.

Permanent extension of prohibition on charges for meals received at military treatment facilities by members receiving continuous care (sec. 616)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 402 of title 37, United States Code, to make permanent the prohibition on charges for meals received at military treatment facilities by members receiving continuous care.

Accession and retention bonuses for the recruitment and retention of psychologists for the armed forces (sec. 617)

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section 301f to title 37, United States Code, authorizing a multiyear retention bonus for uniformed psychologists in the maximum amount of $25,000 per year for up to 4 years. The provision would also add a new section 302m to title 37, United States Code, authorizing an accession bonus for uniformed psychologists of up to $400,000 for an active-duty commitment of at least 4 years.

The Report of the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health found that the number of active-duty psychologists is insufficient and likely to decrease further without substantial intervention. According to the report, data from post-deployment health reassessments show that 38 percent of soldiers and 31 percent of marines report psychological problems. These bonuses, in conjunction with existing benefits, are intended to help overcome critical shortages in the number of uniformed psychologists.

Authority for extension of maximum length of service agreements for special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service (sec. 618)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 312 of title 37, United States Code, to eliminate the 3, 4, and 5 year options currently in law, and require only that the period of continuation be at least 3 years with the objective of providing

more flexibility in administering the nuclear officer continuation pay.

Incentive pay for members of precommissioning programs pursuing foreign language proficiency (sec. 619)

The committee recommends a provision that would create a new section 316a of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay incentive pay to an individual pursuing foreign language proficiency while enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps or the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class. The individual must participate in an approved language immersion program, study abroad, or academic course that involves instruction in a foreign language of strategic interest to the Department of Defense. The incentive pay may not exceed $3,000 per year per individual. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to report to the Office of Management and Budget and the congressional defense committees by January 1, 2010, and annually thereafter, on the payment of incentive pay under this section.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

Shipment of family pets during evacuation of personnel (sec. 631)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 406 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize transportation, including the payment of shipment and quarantine costs, of two household pets in cases of evacuation from a permanent station located in a foreign area.

Special weight allowance for transportation of professional books and equipment for spouses (sec. 632)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 406 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize a special weight allowance of up to an additional 500 pounds for professional books and equipment belonging to the spouses of service members ordered to make a change of permanent station. The provision would take effect October 1, 2009.

Travel and transportation allowances for members of the reserve components of the armed forces on leave for suspension of training (sec. 633)

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section 411k to title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for service members on active duty for more than 30 days to travel from a temporary duty station back to their permanent duty station and back again during times when training is suspended at the temporary duty station for a period of 5 days or more.

Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits

Presentation of burial flag to the surviving spouse and children of members of the armed forces who die in service (sec. 641)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1482 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the presentation of a burial flag to the surviving spouse of a deceased service member when the surviving spouse is not otherwise entitled to a flag as the person designated to direct the disposition of the remains. The provision would also authorize the presentation of a burial flag to each child of a deceased service member.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Separation pay, transitional health care, and transitional commissary and exchange benefits for members of the armed forces separated under surviving son or daughter policy (sec. 651)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide service members separated under the Department of Defense surviving son or daughter policy with separation pay under section 1174 of title 10, United States Code; transitional health care under section 1145 of title 10, United States Code; and transitional commissary and exchange benefits under section 1146 of title 10, United States Code.

Items of Special Interest

Aviation career incentive pay

The committee has received reports of officers qualified for aviation service missing their "gate" thresholds for continued eligibility for receipt of aviation career incentive pay (ACIP) due to non-flying assignments, including "in lieu of" or individual augmentee assignments in Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy to review their ACIP programs, their assignment of officers qualified for aviation service to non-flying duty assignments, and the effect of these assignments on these officers' continued eligibility for ACIP. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2009 on the results of this review.

Travel allowances for family of service members with serious psychiatric conditions

The committee notes that section 411h of title 37, United States Code, authorizes the secretaries of the military departments to pay travel and transportation allowances for family members of service members who are seriously injured, seriously ill, or in a situation of imminent death when the attending physician or surgeon and the commander or head of the military medical facility concerned determine that the family's presence may contribute to the service member's health and welfare.

The committee strongly believes that service members who suffer from serious psychiatric conditions meet the seriously injured or seriously ill threshold under section 411h of title 37, United States Code, and that family members of such service members should be eligible for travel and transportation allowances in accordance with that section. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by June 1, 2008 on the Department of Defense policies regarding the eligibility of family members of such service members to receive travel and transportation allowances under that section.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—TRICARE Program

Calculation of monthly premiums for coverage under TRICARE Reserve Select after 2008 (sec. 701)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to base the actuarial calculation of the amount of monthly premiums paid by members of the Selected Reserve for health care coverage under the TRICARE Reserve Select (TRS) program on the reported costs of providing benefits. For 2009, the premium amount would be based on the reported program costs for 2006 and 2007. For each year after 2009, the premium amount would be based on the actual cost of providing benefits during calendar years preceding that year.

The committee is concerned that, according to a Government Accountability Office review of the Department of Defense's cost of implementing the TRS program for members of the Guard and reserve required by the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), "The premium for individual coverage under tier 1 was 72 percent higher than the average cost per plan of providing benefits through the program. Similarly, the premium for family coverage under tier 1 was 45 percent higher than the average cost per plan of providing benefits."

The provision reflects the Comptroller General's recommendation that the Department should stop basing TRS premium adjustments only on the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program's Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan, and use instead the reported costs of providing benefits when adjusting premiums in the future.

The committee is also concerned that learning how to use TRICARE is difficult for newly eligible beneficiaries, especially those in the reserve components. The committee agrees with the recommendation in the January 2008 report of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves that information materials about TRICARE need to be redesigned, in both print and electronic format, to be more user-friendly, especially for first time users. The committee directs that the Secretary of Defense report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by February 1, 2009 on programs and plans to achieve such improvements during fiscal year 2009.

Subtitle B—Other Health Care Authorities

Enhancement of medical and dental readiness of members of the armed forces (sec. 711)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1074a(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to require the sec-

retary of each military department to provide to members of the Selected Reserve who are assigned to units scheduled for deployment within 75 days after mobilization annual medical screenings, a full physical examination for members who are over the age of 40 every 2 years, and annual dental screenings and dental care required to ensure that a member meets the dental standards required for deployment. These services are to be provided at no cost to the member. The provision would also authorize the secretaries concerned to provide the same services to other members of the Selected Reserve and to a member of the Individual Ready Reserve with a deployment responsibility, if those services are necessary to ensure that members meet applicable standards of medical and dental readiness.

The committee notes that section 1074a(f) of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the secretaries of the military departments to provide any medical and dental screening and care necessary to meet applicable medical and dental standards for deployment to members of the Ready Reserve who have been notified that they will be called or ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days. The provision would clarify that operation and maintenance funds available to the reserve components may be used to achieve these goals.

The provision would also amend section 1076a(e) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive, in whole or in part, during a time of national emergency, the requirement for members of the Selected Reserve enrolled in the TRICARE dental insurance program to pay copayments for restorative care necessary to meet dental readiness standards, in order to facilitate readiness of a unit or individual scheduled for deployment.

The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by March 1, 2009 on the policies and procedures to ensure medical and dental readiness of members of the armed forces, including a description of the manner in which each military department applies such standards with respect to performance evaluation and promotion.

The committee believes that the medical and dental readiness of the reserve components must be strengthened in order to support their increasing operational roles. Of particular concern is the lack of dental readiness of the reserve components. According to the Department of Defense, in the first quarter of 2008, 57 percent of the Army National Guard and 50 percent of the Army Reserve members were dental class III or IV, and thus would not meet deployability standards, compared with 10 percent of the Navy Reserve, 11 percent of the Air National Guard, 15 percent of the Air Force Reserve, 22 percent of the Marine Corps Reserve, and 26 percent of the Coast Guard Reserve.

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has established an expanded Reserve Health Readiness Program to help meet these needs, but believes that more needs to be done. The provision is intended to clarify the committee's intent that funds available to the reserve components for operation and maintenance may be used for the purpose of improving medical readiness, and to underscore the committee's belief that individuals and

commanders should be held accountable for meeting all applicable medical and dental readiness standards.

Additional authority for studies and demonstration projects relating to delivery of health and medical care (sec. 712)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1092(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct additional studies and demonstrations relating to the delivery of health and medical care, which may include:

(1) projects to provide awards and incentives to TRICARE covered service members and beneficiaries who obtain certain health promotion and disease prevention health care services;

(2) projects to provide awards and incentives to individual health care professionals to encourage improved quality and effectiveness of health care services;

(3) projects to improve the medical and dental readiness of the reserve components; and

(4) projects to improve the continuity of health care services for family members of mobilized members of the reserve components, including payment of a stipend for continuation of employer-provided health coverage.

Travel for anesthesia services for childbirth for dependents of members assigned to very remote locations outside the continental United States (sec. 713)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1040(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay travel expenses for a dependent of a service member assigned to a very remote location outside the continental United States who requires or elects anesthesia services for childbirth to a location in the United States.

Under current law, payment of travel expenses is authorized for required medical attention that is not available in the locality in order to travel to the nearest medical facility in which adequate medical care is available. The provision would clarify that anesthesia services for childbirth should be included in the scope of required medical attention.

Subtitle C—Other Health Care Matters

Repeal of prohibition on conversion of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions (sec. 721)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal subsection (a) of section 721 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which prohibits the military departments from converting any military medical or dental position to a civilian medical or dental position through September 30, 2012. The provision would also restore subsections (a) and (b) of section 742 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), which require certification by the secretary of a military department that any planned conversion will not increase the cost or decrease the

quality of care or access to military health care, and requires a review by the Comptroller General of these certifications.

The Department of Defense has informed the committee that the prohibition ". . . has created chaos in planned personnel actions in FY 2008, essentially guaranteeing a detrimental impact on medical staffing levels and access to care . . ." The provision recommended by the committee would repeal this prohibition.

However, the committee continues to believe that the military departments did not adequately address the certification requirements contained in section 742 of Public Law 109–364 when it was in effect. The committee remains concerned that planned conversions may increase costs, decrease access to care, decrease quality of care, or negatively impact recruitment and retention of military personnel. Therefore, the provision would restore this certification requirement.

In planning any future conversions of military medical or dental positions to civilian medical or dental positions, the committee expects the military departments to fully assess all aspects of the conversions, including those concerns listed above. The committee also expects the departments to supply these certifications to the committee in accordance with applicable deadlines.

The language in subsection (b) of section 721 of Public Law 110–181 requiring the military departments to restore any positions converted between October 1, 2004, and September 30, 2008 that have not yet been filled by a civilian back to military positions remains in effect.

Items of Special Interest

Chiropractic care for members of the armed forces

Section 702 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) required the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to provide chiropractic health care services and benefits for all members of the armed forces on active duty. Although all active-duty service members are eligible for this benefit, services are available only at designated military treatment facilities: 17 medical facilities in the Army, 13 in the Navy, and 19 in the Air Force. Services are not available to members who are deployed or assigned to any overseas location other than Alaska and Hawaii.

The committee is concerned that the extreme physical demands of military service resulting from Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, compounded by injuries which have been incurred, may have increased the requirement for chiropractic services for service members, including those assigned to overseas locations. A September 2005 report by the Comptroller General found that although the Department of Defense had implemented the chiropractic benefit, the Department had not monitored whether the benefit meets current or future demand from active-duty personnel.

In response to the increased physical demands on our service members, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study to reassess the requirement for chiropractic services for members on active duty. The committee directs that the study

should include, but not be limited to, surveys of service members, unit commanders, and medical treatment facility personnel, and a review of injury data for active-duty service members since 2001. In particular, the surveys and assessment shall include the needs of members assigned to units outside of the continental United States. The Secretary shall report the results of the study to congressional defense committees by June 1, 2009.

Comptroller General study on medical personnel requirements, shortfalls, and actions needed to resolve medical personnel shortages

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense continues to experience significant shortfalls in physician, dentist, nurse, and other allied health specialties. With the demand for military medical care rising, due to ongoing contingency operations, restructuring of forces, and the planned growth of the Army and Marine Corps, medical shortfalls must be resolved. Military and civilian health care professionals are needed to support contingency operations, and provide medical training, research, and care for military families, retirees, and their families.

A report by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs in May 2007, "Department of Defense Military Medical Recruiting and Retention," confirmed that significant shortfalls exist throughout the military medical departments, and committed to working with the military departments to identify funding for accession bonuses and special pay and incentive authorities enhanced in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The report also described the initiation of a human capital management plan for the military health system. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), Congress enhanced authorities for the hiring of civilian health care professionals by utilizing compensation authorities available to the Department of Veterans Affairs under title 38, United States Code.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to conduct a study of the medical and dental personnel requirements of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, including their reserve components, in order to meet their medical mission in support of contingency operations, deliver high quality health care to eligible beneficiaries, and support necessary training and research. The Comptroller General shall evaluate medical workforce planning efforts throughout the Department of Defense to determine those medical specialty areas that have experienced the largest gaps between identified needs and fill rates; challenges that hinder the achievement of medical personnel goals, both military and civilian; and the plans of each military department and the Department of Defense to resolve medical personnel shortfalls.

The Comptroller General shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2009 containing the results of the study and such recommendations as the Comptroller General deems appropriate.

Mental health and traumatic brain injury

The committee applauds the work of Army medical department behavioral health researchers who continue their study of the mental health needs of soldiers and marines in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Like the Mental Health Advisory Team (MHAT) studies which have preceded it, the MHAT V, conducted in October and November 2007, brought to light important findings about the mental health needs of deployed forces, in particular the high risk factors associated with multiple and lengthy deployments. Soldiers reported significant barriers in access to mental health care, including an insufficient number of behavioral health providers. Several studies, including the June 2007 report of the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health, "An Achievable Vision," have called for more effective behavioral health treatment and care for service members and their families across a broad continuum of care, including prevention, intervention, and treatment. Though psychological injuries are not new to warfare, most experts believe that the need for behavioral health services in the future will increase, especially as research reveals more about clinical approaches to mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends provisions which would improve incentives to recruit and retain mental health providers in the military, as well as streamline the hiring of civilian behavioral health providers. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to work with the military departments to identify funding needed to take full advantage of improved recruiting and retention incentives to increase the supply of behavioral health professionals who support members of the armed forces and their families.

Modification of security clearance questionnaire to reduce stigma for seeking mental health care

The Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health reported in June 2007 that the stigma associated with seeking mental health care in the military "represents a critical failure of the community that prevents service members and their families from getting the help they need when they need it most. Further, stigma is of particular concern in the military because of the degree to which military members may bear responsibility for lives beyond their own." The Task Force identified concerns by service members that self-identification relating to mental health care would impede their careers or efforts to obtain a security clearance and recommended that the Department of Defense "work to clarify those mental health conditions that must be reported because they are indicative of defects in judgment, reliability, or emotional stability that are potentially disqualifying or raise significant security concerns."

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for revising the Department of Defense Standard Form 86 (SF86) questionnaire for national security positions regarding mental and emotional health to implement the recommendation of the Task Force. In a memorandum dated April 18, 2008, the Secretary of Defense informed all Department of Defense components that the Department

had "successfully advocated a revision to Question 21 on the SF86 regarding mental and emotional health," and directed the following revised question 21 be used until the Office of Personnel and Management publishes an updated SF86:

> Mental health counseling in and of itself *is not a reason* to revoke or deny a clearance.
>
> In the last 7 years, have you consulted with a health care professional regarding an emotional or mental health condition or were you hospitalized for such a condition? Answer 'No' if the counseling was for any of the following reasons and was not court-ordered:
>
> • Strictly marital, family, grief not related to violence by you; or
>
> • Strictly related to adjustments from service in a military combat environment.

The committee also commends the Under Secretaries of Defense for Intelligence and Personnel and Readiness for their affirmation in a memorandum to all individuals completing the SF86 that "Seeking professional care for these mental health issues should not be perceived to jeopardize an individual's security clearance. On the contrary, failure to seek care actually increases the likelihood that psychological distress could escalate to a more serious mental condition, which could preclude an individual from performing sensitive duties."

By advocating and achieving this long overdue change, the Secretaries have fulfilled the responsibilities that all leaders bear to reduce the stigma associated with seeking mental health care.

Organ and tissue donor program

The committee is pleased that it is Department of Defense (DOD) policy to encourage all DOD beneficiaries to donate organs and tissue. Information about organ and tissue donation is provided to officer candidates during initial training and to new recruits after completion of basic training and before arrival at their first duty station. All members of the armed forces have recurring opportunities to elect to be organ or tissue donors while serving and upon retirement from military service. The committee recommends that the Department continue efforts to encourage military personnel and their families to become organ donors.

The military health system participates in the National Organ Procurement and Transportation Network to facilitate and coordinate the donation of organs and tissues, the recovery of donated organs and tissues, and the matching of donors and recipients. All inpatient military treatment facilities are required to maintain a Memorandum of Understanding, in coordination with military transplant centers and local organ procurement organizations, to provide organ and tissue procurement services.

DOD regulations require that an individual's election to be an organ or tissue donor be recorded in medical information systems, personnel data systems, and on the individual's DOD-issued identification card. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, no later than March 1, 2009, on the fea-

sibility of including an individual's election to be an organ or tissue donor on his or her military identification tags.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs

Inclusion of major subprograms to major defense acquisition programs under acquisition reporting requirements (sec. 801)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to designate as major subprograms of a major defense acquisition program (MDAP) two or more categories of end items to be delivered under the MDAP that differ significantly from each other in form and function. If the Secretary chooses to designate major subprograms under this provision, program acquisition unit costs and procurement unit costs would be reported to Congress for each of the major subprograms, rather than for the MDAP as a whole. Other key information would be reported to Congress both for the MDAP as a whole and for each of the major subprograms.

The underlying assumption for unit cost reporting is that the quantity of items to be provided is relatively uniform in terms of cost and functionality. The committee recognizes that such uniformity may not be present in the case of a "system of systems," such as the Future Combat Systems and the Ballistic Missile Defense System, which includes multiple end items that differ significantly from each other in form and function. The provision recommended by the committee would authorize the Secretary to break the MDAP into major subprograms only in such cases, to ensure the rational and consistent reporting of unit costs. The committee notes that this authority does not apply to multiple variants of a single system.

Inclusion of certain major information technology investments in acquisition oversight authorities for Major Automated Information System programs (sec. 802)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 144A of title 10, United States Code, to require the Department of Defense to extend reporting requirements for information technology acquisitions to cover both Major Automated Information System (MAIS) programs and other major information technology investments. Under current law, these reporting requirements apply only to MAIS programs.

Configuration steering boards for cost control under major defense acquisition programs (sec. 803)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the secretaries of the military departments to establish configuration

steering boards (CSBs) to control costs on major defense acquisition programs. CSBs would be responsible for reviewing any proposed changes to program requirements or system configuration that could have the potential to adversely impact program cost or schedule and for recommending changes that have the potential to improve program cost or schedule in a manner consistent with program objectives. The committee expects any CSB decisions with regard to program requirements pursuant to subsection (c)(2) of this provision to be signed personally by the Chairman of the CSB.

In its March 2008 report on selected weapon programs, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that changes in program requirements often have a significant adverse impact on cost and schedule. According to GAO:

> Unsettled requirements in acquisition programs can create significant turbulence. Sixty-three percent of the programs we received data from had requirement changes after system development began. These programs encountered cost increases of 72 percent, while costs grew by 11 percent among those programs that did not change requirements.

On July 30, 2007, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics directed the secretaries of the military departments to address this problem by establishing CSBs to control requirements. The Under Secretary's memorandum states that:

> The CSBs will review all requirements changes and any significant technical configuration changes which have the potential to result in cost and schedule impacts to the program. Such changes will generally be rejected, deferring them to future blocks or increments. Changes may not be approved unless funds are identified and schedule impacts are mitigated.

The committee understands that the implementation of CSBs by the military departments has been uneven. By institutionalizing the CSB process, the provision recommended by the committee would ensure that CSBs become an effective mechanism for cost control on major defense acquisition programs.

Subtitle B—Acquisition Policy and Management

Internal controls for procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense by certain non-defense agencies (sec. 811)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense (DOD) to conduct joint reviews with the inspectors general of certain non-defense agencies to determine whether procurements conducted by the non-defense agencies on behalf of DOD have been conducted in compliance with defense procurement requirements.

Section 802 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), section 817 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364),

and section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) contained similar requirements for joint audits.

The provision recommended by the committee would modify requirements adopted in previous years by: (1) Deleting the requirement for follow-up audits of contracts awarded through the Department of the Treasury and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and (2) adding a new requirement for joint audits of contracts awarded through the Department of Commerce and the Department of Energy.

Contingency contracting corps (sec. 812)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a contingency contracting corps to ensure that the Department of Defense has the capability, when needed, to support contingency contracting actions in a deployed environment.

Expedited review and validation of urgent requirements documents (sec. 813)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the military departments to ensure that urgent requirements documents developed by operational field commanders are presented to appropriate authorities for review and validation not later than 60 days after the documents are submitted.

Over the last several years, operational commanders in Iraq have identified urgent operational needs for mine-resistant, ambush-protected vehicles (MRAPs), non-lethal laser dazzlers, and other critical equipment. The committee is aware of allegations that requests for some of these items not only went unmet, but were not even presented to senior officials responsible for validating the requests for periods in excess of a year. While the military services must continue to have the flexibility to balance competing needs and determine what equipment to acquire, urgent operational needs identified by commanders in the field should at a minimum receive a speedy review and response by responsible officials.

Incorporation of energy efficiency requirements into key performance parameters for fuel consuming systems (sec. 814)

The February 2008 report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on DOD Energy Strategy found that the Department of Defense had taken limited action on recommendations from a similar Defense Science Board energy study in 2001 with respect to energy efficiency and investments in weapons systems. The task force concluded that the Department "systematically underestimates" the full cost of fuel in the life cycle costs of weapons systems and that the Department fails to value or emphasize the benefits of fuel efficiency in its requirements, budgeting, or acquisition processes. The task force argues that demand-side remedies provide the greatest opportunity to reduce cost and operational risk in fuel consumption and availability.

The committee notes that the Department is in the early stages of considering changes to the acquisition process with respect to en-

ergy related requirements and the calculation and consideration of the fully burdened cost of fuel for current and future systems. The task force, however, recommended that the Department accelerate the implementation of new standards, or key performance parameters, for energy efficiency in the research, development, and acquisition of future weapons systems. For example, designs for the manned ground combat vehicles of the Army's Future Combat System will use hybrid electric drive with the potential for significant operational risk reduction and fuel costs savings.

The committee believes that the Department should respond aggressively to the task force's recommendations for emphasizing energy efficiency in the modification of current or development of future fuel consuming systems. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to develop acquisition policies, regulations, and directives, and a plan for their implementation, that would require program managers to incorporate energy efficiency requirements into the key performance parameters for military systems. The committee further recommends that the Under Secretary provide the defense committees a report on the Department's implementation plans and accomplishments with its future budget submissions.

Subtitle C—Amendments Relating to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

Multiyear procurement authority for the Department of Defense for the purchase of alternative and synthetic fuels (sec. 821)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the head of a defense agency to enter into multiyear contracts, for a period of up to 10 years, for the purchase of alternative or synthetic fuels. Such a contract would be authorized only if: (1) the agency head determines, on the basis of a business case analysis, that the proposed contract is economical and cost-effective; and (2) the contract specifies that the life cycle greenhouse gas emissions associated with the production and combustion of the fuels to be provided under the contract are not greater than such emissions from conventional petroleum-based fuels that are used in the same application. The Secretary of Defense would be required to prescribe regulations providing specific standards for determinations to be made by agency heads.

The committee notes that: (1) the cost-effectiveness requirements recommended by the committee are comparable to those applicable to multiyear contracts for major weapon systems; and (2) the greenhouse gas requirement recommended by the committee is identical to the standard in section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140). Representatives of both the Department of Defense and private sector companies seeking to develop alternative and synthetic fuel resources have stated that technology is available to meet the greenhouse gas requirements.

Modification and extension of pilot program for transition to follow-on contracts under authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 822)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 4 years the authority granted in section 847 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) for the Department of Defense to carry out a pilot program for the transition of non-traditional defense contractors from prototype transactions to follow-on contracts. The provision would also ensure that the transition authority may be used for technologies developed under research projects carried out pursuant to section 2371 of title 10, United States Code.

Exclusion of certain factors in consideration of cost advantages of offers for certain Department of Defense contracts (sec. 823)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense (DOD) to ensure that a company seeking a DOD contract does not receive a competitive advantage as a result of a proposal that reduces costs through the use of overseas subsidiaries or other similar corporate structures that enable it to avoid the payment of taxes to the Federal or State government for or on behalf of employees of the company (or any subsidiary or affiliate of the company).

The committee understands that this provision would apply to efforts to avoid the payment of federal social security and medicare taxes, and State unemployment taxes, for or on behalf of employees. It would not apply to other taxes, such as corporate taxes, which are not paid for or on behalf of employees.

Subtitle D—Department of Defense Contractor Matters

Database for Department of Defense contracting officers and suspension and debarment officials (sec. 831)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to establish and maintain a database of information regarding the integrity and contract performance of Department of Defense (DOD) contractors for use by DOD acquisition officials in making responsibility determinations, past performance evaluations, and other contract decisions.

Ethics safeguards for employees under certain contracts for the performance of acquisition functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions (sec. 832)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that each Department of Defense (DOD) contract (or task or delivery order) in excess of $500,000 that calls for the performance of acquisition functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions include a contract clause addressing potential personal conflicts of interests of contractor employees who will be responsible for the performance of such functions.

The required contract clause would require covered contractors to prohibit employees from conducting work for DOD with respect to

a program, company, contractor, or other matter in which the employees have a financial interest; obtain and review financial disclosure statements from employees; prohibit employees from accepting gifts from companies affected by work that they are performing for DOD; prohibit employees from using non-public government information for personal gain; take appropriate steps to enforce these requirements; and promptly report any violations to the appropriate contracting officer.

The provision requires DOD to develop an appropriate definition of the term "financial interest" that is similar to the definition in statutes and regulations applicable to federal employees. The committee expects the implementing regulations to encompass both direct and indirect financial interests, as well as both actual and apparent conflicts of interest.

In March 2008, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report entitled "Additional Personal Conflict of Interest Safeguards Needed for Certain DOD Contractor Employees." GAO determined that contractor employees often work alongside DOD employees and perform critical acquisition tasks, such as the development of contract requirements, advising or assisting on source selection, and making award-fee determinations.

Yet, DOD lacks a Department-wide policy requiring safeguards against personal conflicts of interest by such contractor employees. GAO recommended that DOD institute such safeguards and reported that this recommendation was supported by DOD oversight officials, officials of the Office of Government Ethics, members of an expert panel on contracting, and many program managers. The provision recommended by the committee would require DOD to implement the GAO recommendation.

Information for Department of Defense contractor employees on their whistleblower rights (sec. 833)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that contractor employees are informed of their whistleblower rights and protections under section 2409 of title 10, United States Code.

Subtitle E—Matters Relating to Iraq and Afghanistan

Performance by private security contractors of inherently governmental functions in an area of combat operations (sec. 841)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to revise the regulations issued pursuant to section 862 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to ensure that private security contractors are not authorized to perform inherently governmental functions in an area of combat operations.

"Inherently governmental functions" are defined in Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 and in the Federal Acquisition Regulation to include those functions that are "so intimately related to the public interest as to mandate performance by government personnel." Such functions include activities that "significantly affect the life, liberty, and property of private persons."

Paragraph E2.1.4 of Department of Defense (DOD) Instruction 1100.22 provides that security provided for the protection of people and property in uncontrolled or unpredictable high threat areas outside the United States entails a wide range of capabilities, some of which are inherently governmental and others of which may be provided by contractors. In particular, paragraph E2.1.4.1.4 states:

> Security operations that involve more than a response to hostile attacks typically entail substantial discretion and are inherently governmental. For example, security operations that are performed in highly hazardous public areas where the risks are uncertain, could require deadly force that is more likely to be initiated by U.S. forces than occur in self defense. Security operations that require immediate decisions on the appropriate course of action or the acceptable level of risk typically require substantial discretion and are inherently governmental particularly when the outcome could significantly affect the life, liberty, or property of private persons or international relations. Such operations typically require on-the-spot judgments on the appropriate level of force, acceptable level of collateral damage, and whether the target is 'friend or foe.' They also require protocols on the use of force that permit discretion for 'preemptive' attacks. Such high risk operations require military training and discipline . . . and are designated for military performance.

Despite this guidance, it appears that private security contractors in Iraq have frequently engaged in activities that "are performed in highly hazardous public areas where risks are uncertain," "could require deadly force that is more likely to be initiated by U.S. forces than occur in self defense," "require immediate decisions on the appropriate course of action or the acceptable level of risk," and "require on-the-spot judgments on the appropriate level of force, acceptable level of collateral damage, and whether the target is 'friend or foe.'"

The provision recommended by the committee would address these problems by codifying the standards in DOD Instruction 1100.22, making these standards uniformly applicable to all private security contractors operating in an area of combat operations, and requiring contracting agencies to put appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure compliance with these standards.

Additional contractor requirements and responsibilities relating to alleged crimes by or against contractor personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 842)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 861 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to require the development of mechanisms to ensure that: (1) contractors are required to report alleged crimes by or against their employees in Iraq and Afghanistan to appropriate investigative authorities; and (2) contractor employees receive appropriate victim and witness assistance in connection with such alleged crimes.

Over the last several months, a number of contractor employees who were victims of rape or sexual assault in Iraq have publicly alleged that they received little or no help from either contractor or government officials. Several of these women testified before congressional committees that they were "ignored or disciplined" by company officials to whom they reported the alleged assaults, and that they were actively discouraged from reporting anything to the government.

In one case, a woman working for a defense contractor reported that she was gang-raped by a co-worker and a soldier at a U.S. base in Iraq. Her supervisors, she testified, tried to discourage her from reporting the assault. Rather than supporting her, the woman's employer submitted her to extensive questioning, then required her to sign an inaccurate statement of facts before allowing her to move between bases.

In another case, a woman working in Iraq for the same contractor reported that she was sexually assaulted by a male co-worker who was never charged.

The provision recommended by the committee is intended to ensure that contractor employees who are the victims of similar assaults in the future are not deprived of their legal rights, and receive the help that they need and the investigative assistance that they deserve.

Clarification and modification of authorities relating to the Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 843)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the co-chairmen of the Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan established pursuant to section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to exercise waiver authority under section 8344(i)(1) or section 8468(f)(1) of title 5, United States Code, to ensure that federal retirees serving as members or staff of the Commission may be paid for their work on behalf of the Commission without forfeiting retired pay.

Comprehensive audit of spare parts purchases and depot overhaul and maintenance of equipment for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 844)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Army Audit Agency, the Naval Audit Service, and the Air Force Audit Agency to conduct comprehensive audits of spare parts purchases and depot overhaul and maintenance of equipment for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Expedited hiring authority for the defense acquisition workforce (sec. 851)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to designate any category of acquisition positions within the Department of Defense as shortage category positions. A shortage category designation would enable the Depart-

ment of Defense to use direct hiring authority, substantially shortening the period of time required to fill the positions.

Section 853 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) extended direct hiring authority for acquisition positions in all federal agencies other than the Department of Defense. The provision recommended by the committee would provide the same authority, for the same period, to the Department of Defense.

Specification of Secretary of Defense as "secretary concerned" for purposes of licensing of intellectual property for the defense agencies and defense field activities (sec. 852)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that the Secretary of Defense is the "secretary concerned" for the purpose of licensing intellectual property for the defense agencies and defense field activities pursuant to section 2260 of title 10, United States Code.

Repeal of requirements relating to the military system essential item breakout list (sec. 853)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), which requires the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to the congressional defense committees listing essential items, assemblies, and components of military systems and identifying where they are produced. The committee has been unable to identify a purpose for this reporting requirement.

Items of Special Interest

Contracting officer representatives

The committee notes that Department of Defense (DOD) employees serving as contracting officer representatives (CORs) play a critical role in the acquisition process both inside and outside the United States. According to the October 31, 2007, report of the Commission on Army Acquisition and Program Management in Expeditionary Operations, Army CORs in Iraq and Afghanistan have not received the training that they need. The report states:

> CORs represent the "last tactical mile" of expeditionary contracting. However, CORs are assigned * * * as an "extra duty," requiring no experience. A COR is often a young Soldier who does not have any experience as a COR. * * * Although being a COR would ideally be a career-enhancing duty, the COR assignment is often used to send a young Soldier to the other side of the base when a commander does not want to have to deal with the person. Additionally, little, if any training is provided. To further compound matters, generally all COR training is geared for a low-operations, low-risk tempo, so it is barely adequate. Despite this, there are still too few CORs. Moreover, COR turnover is high, frequently leaving many gaps in contract coverage.

As a result of these failures, the Commission found, there are often "no resources trained to monitor and ensure that the contractor is performing and providing the services needed by the warfighter." In some cases, the Army had difficulty knowing whether a contractor had performed at all.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by no later than September 30, 2008, on the steps that the Department is taking to ensure that it can field an adequate number of appropriately trained CORs to monitor the performance of contracts both inside and outside the United States.

Database and after-action reports for multiyear contracts

In March 2008, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report on multiyear procurements by the Department of Defense (DOD). The GAO report recommended that DOD: (1) implement a central database to track multiyear procurements for major weapon systems; and (2) conduct after-action assessments at the conclusion of such multiyear procurements to determine their effectiveness in achieving predicted benefits while managing associated risks. The GAO report recommended that after-action assessments address any major deviations between the costs and savings predicted and the costs and savings actually achieved.

DOD concurred with GAO's recommendations and has started to implement both the database and the after-action assessments. The committee expects the Department to complete the implementation of both recommendations in a timely manner and to use the database and the after-action assessments to inform decisions on future multiyear procurements.

Past performance information

For more than a decade, the Federal Acquisition Regulation has required contracting officials to consider information on the past performance of offerors when making contract award decisions. The committee continues to believe that past contract performance can be an important indicator of the likelihood that an offeror will successfully perform a similar contract in the future.

In several recent contract award decisions, however, it appears that the past performance information considered by contracting officials may have been seriously flawed. For example, the winning bidder on a recent Army ammunition contract valued at more than $300.0 million received top ratings for its past performance, even though the company was managed by a 22-year-old and had never previously performed a contract valued at more than $20.0 million. Similarly, the winning bidder on a recent Air Force communications contract was given top ratings for past performance, even though it was a new company that had never previously performed any similar work.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to review methods used by the Department of Defense to collect, standardize, access, and evaluate past performance information and to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by no later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act on

steps that the Department plans to take to improve the use of such information.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management

Modification of status of Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Chemical and Biological Defense Programs (sec. 901)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 142 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Chemical and Biological Defense is equivalent to an assistant secretary of defense. The committee notes that this important position has been vacant for over 18 months.

Participation of Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense on Defense Business System Management Committee (sec. 902)

The committee recommends a provision that would make the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense the Vice Chairman of the Defense Business System Management Committee. This is a conforming change to section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which established the position of the Deputy Chief Management Officer, and would ensure that the statutory reporting chain for the Business Transformation Agency is consistent with the reporting chain for the Director of that Agency.

Repeal of obsolete limitations on management headquarters personnel (sec. 903)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal caps on the number of personnel employed in headquarters activities of the military departments and defense agencies, as requested by the Department of Defense.

Section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) repealed the Department-wide limitation on the number of personnel in headquarters activities. However, limitations on the number of personnel in headquarters activities of the military departments and defense agencies continue to impede the Department's ability to meet new demands and expanded requirements in the most cost-effective manner possible.

General Counsel to the Inspector General of the Department of Defense (sec. 904)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for a General Counsel to the Department of Defense Inspector General who would serve at the discretion of the Inspector General, report exclusively to the Inspector General, and be independent of the Of-

fice of General Counsel of the Department of Defense. The committee understands that the Inspectors General of other federal agencies have general counsels who report only to them. The availability of such independent legal advice is critical to the successful performance of the Inspector General's function of carrying out independent audits and investigations to identify problems and deficiencies in the programs and operations of the Department.

Assignment of forces to the United States Northern Command with primary mission of management of the consequences of an incident in the United States homeland involving a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear device, or high-yield explosives (sec. 905)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that: (1) the Department of Defense should make every effort to help protect the Nation from the threat of a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive (CBRNE) attack; (2) efforts to establish forces to manage the consequences of CBRNE incidents should receive the highest level of attention within the Department; and (3) the additional forces needed for CBRNE consequence management should be identified, trained, equipped, and assigned to U.S. Northern Command as soon as possible. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit three reports to the congressional defense committees describing the progress made toward assigning such forces to U.S. Northern Command. The provision specifies a number of elements to be included in the reports.

The committee notes that the Department has directed that a full-time, dedicated CBRNE consequence management force be trained and equipped by the end of fiscal year 2008, and that two additional such forces are to be established by the end of the next 2 fiscal years. The Department has begun the process of establishing these CBRNE consequence management forces, which will be assigned to U.S. Northern Command.

The committee observes that the Commission on the National Guard and the Reserves and the Government Accountability Office have been critical of the capacity of the Department to respond to domestic CBRNE incidents. The committee believes that establishing the CBRNE consequence management forces under U.S. Northern Command is an essential step in enhancing the ability of the Nation to respond to such incidents.

Business transformation initiatives for the military departments (sec. 906)

The committee recommends a provision that would require each military department to carry out a business transformation initiative and to establish an Office of Business Transformation (OBT) to assist in that effort.

Over the last 4 years, the Department of Defense (DOD) has demonstrated a commitment to business systems modernization by establishing a Defense System Management Committee, a Business Transformation Agency, and a new federated architecture for DOD business systems. However, the military departments have not yet followed DOD's lead in establishing new governance structures to

address business transformation; have not yet developed comprehensive enterprise architectures and transition plans consistent with statutory requirements; and continue to rely upon stovepiped structures to implement piecemeal reforms.

The committee expects the new OBTs to lead cross-domain governance of business transformation efforts and to ensure that business solutions optimize the military department's business operations as a whole rather than the operations of separate functional elements of the department. OBTs should be staffed with functional and technical experts who are able to establish working level relationships with the functional elements and ensure that their needs are addressed within a comprehensive end-to-end business architecture. The provision recommended by the committee would authorize the Directors of Business Transformation to direct specific actions by such functional elements when necessary to carry out a business transformation initiative.

Subtitle B—Space Matters

Space posture review (sec. 911)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Director of National Intelligence, to conduct a comprehensive review of the space posture of the United States. The review would cover a 10-year period beginning February 1, 2009. The Secretary would be required to submit the report no later than December 1, 2009.

The committee is concerned that most military space capabilities are being modernized simultaneously. Almost all of these modernization programs have exceeded their schedule and cost estimates, some significantly. The growth in and demands on the space budget are occurring at a time when Air Force Space Command is trying to improve space situational awareness capabilities, and the space community in general is concerned about possible threats to space systems. The review in the recommended provision would emphasize the increased focus on space awareness and control activities. In completing the review the committee directs the Secretary and the Director to look at the comparative funding levels for both space situational awareness and satellite protection programs and the satellite modernization programs.

The provision would also direct a review of the export control regime with respect to space systems and technologies.

Subtitle C—Defense Intelligence Matters

Requirement for officers of the armed forces on active duty in certain intelligence positions (sec. 921)

The committee recommends a provision that would require, effective October 1, 2008, that the principal deputy to the senior service intelligence officer be a commissioned officer of the armed forces on active duty.

Each of the military services assigns a senior active duty military officer of flag or general officer rank to serve as the senior intelligence adviser to the Chief of Staff or Chief of Naval Operations. However, the services are not consistent in assigning military offi-

cers as the deputy to the senior service intelligence officers, with uneven results. This provision would correct that situation.

Transfer of management of Intelligence Systems Support Office (sec. 922)

As discussed elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a provision that would transfer management of the Intelligence Systems Support Office and other projects and activities currently conducted by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (OUSDI) to other components of the Department of Defense. This provision would ensure consistent application of OUSDI policy regarding OUSDI execution of development, acquisition, and operational support programs.

Program on advanced sensor applications (sec. 923)

The committee is troubled that the Department of Defense (DOD) has not complied with section 215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). Section 215 directed that the Department transfer funds within 60 days of enactment to the Advanced Sensor Applications Program (ASAP), a deadline reached on March 28, 2008, without any action by the Department.

The committee is cautiously optimistic that DOD is gaining an understanding of the facts about the ASAP and its importance. With that understanding, DOD appears to be moving towards compliance with congressional direction for sustaining funding for the ASAP for fiscal year 2008 and to identify funding for fiscal year 2009.

However, without official notification of action to comply with section 215, the committee must act to preserve its interest in this matter. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would establish the ASAP within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

The committee remains concerned that the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USDI) intends to transfer the program to elements of the Navy that have attempted strenuously to terminate the program, and to sever the existing partnership with an ally. The USDI's position has been that it is inappropriate for the USDI to oversee the execution of a program involving scientific and engineering assessment of intelligence data, and that the Navy should have total responsibility for this activity.

The committee has two fundamental problems with USDI's position. The first is that transferring total program responsibility to the Navy is inconsistent with the mandate Congress established for the ASAP long ago and has maintained consistently since.

This mandate is for the Department to conduct a scientific and engineering assessment of potential anti-submarine warfare (ASW) threats that is parallel to, but independent of, the Submarine Security Program run by the Navy. To ensure independence, Congress has always insisted that this effort be sponsored by an Office of the Secretary of Defense organization, even while supporting execution by Navy elements with an ASW mission. Transferring the program entirely to the Navy subjects the program to pressures arising from various institutional biases. Also, despite long experience with its

own submarine security program, which like the ASAP is neither an intelligence nor an acquisition program, the Navy's Office of Naval Intelligence and acquisition community appear determined to put the ASAP program into one category or the other.

The second problem is that the USDI sponsors and executes, albeit through an Air Force program element, a large number of operational support activities and research and development (R&D) programs. Indeed, USDI has long maintained a significant budget for R&D that it uses to delve into diverse topics it deems to be of special interest. If there is no place for the ASAP in USDI, then USDI should not be conducting these other activities either.

The budget request included no funds in PE 63714D8Z for the ASAP. The committee recommends an authorization of $20.0 million for ASAP. The committee recommends a reduction of $10.0 million to the request for the Intelligence Systems Support Office (ISSO) (PE 11815F), and a reduction of $10.0 million from the request in Air Force Operation and Maintenance funds for the Threat Financing program executed by ISSO.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

General transfer authority (sec. 1001)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the transfer of up to $5.0 billion of funds authorized in division A of this Act to unforeseen higher priority needs in accordance with normal reprogramming procedures. This is the amount contained in the administration's fiscal year 2009 budget request. Transfers of funds between military personnel authorizations would not be counted toward the dollar limitation in this provision.

Incorporation into Act of tables in the report of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate (sec. 1002)

The committee recommends a provision that would incorporate the funding tables in this report into the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 and make the items in each such funding table binding on agency heads, subject to reprogramming in accordance with established procedures.

Consistent with the previously expressed views of the committee, the provision would also require that decisions by agency heads to commit, obligate, or expend funds on the basis of such funding tables be based on authorized, transparent, statutory criteria, and merit-based decisionmaking in accordance with the requirements of sections 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code. Under these provisions, the presumption in favor of competitive, merit-based awards may be overcome only by a provision of law that specifically refers to section 2304 or section 2374, identifies the particular non-Federal Government entity involved, and states that award to the entity is required notwithstanding the policy favoring merit-based selection.

On January 29, 2008, the President signed Executive Order 13457, which states that agency decisions to commit, obligate, or expend funds may not be "based on language in any report of a committee of Congress, joint explanatory statement of a committee of conference of the Congress, statement of managers concerning a bill in the Congress, or any other non-statutory statement or indication of views of the Congress, or a House, committee, Member, officer, or staff thereof."

The consistent practice of the Committee on Armed Services has been to include broad categorical authorizations in bill language—such as $10.0 billion for Army research, development, test, and evaluation or $25.0 billion for Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation—while specifying the particular programs for which this money is authorized in funding tables in the committee report accompanying the bill. These tables are placed before the committee in mark-up, are subject to amendment by the com-

mittee, and are approved by the committee when the bill is reported to the floor. It is, and has been, the intent of the committee that these funding decisions are binding upon the executive branch.

The provision recommended by the committee would ensure the force and effect of funding decisions made by the committee by incorporating the funding tables reflecting those decisions into the bill.

The committee notes that the table included in the bill in compliance with Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate—which discloses information on members requesting funding items, suggested recipients, and suggested locations of performance—is not a funding table, is not binding on the executive branch, and is not incorporated into the bill by this provision.

United States contribution to NATO common-funded budgets in fiscal year 2009 (sec. 1003)

The resolution of ratification for the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic contained a provision (section 3(2)(c)(ii)) requiring a specific authorization for U.S. payments to the common-funded budgets of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for each fiscal year, beginning in fiscal year 1999, in which U.S. payments exceed the fiscal year 1998 total. The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the U.S. contribution to NATO common-funded budgets for fiscal year 2009, including the use of unexpended balances from prior years.

Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

Government rights in designs of Department of Defense vessels, boats, craft, and components developed using public funds (sec. 1011)

The committee recommends a provision that would affirm that the government's rights in the designs of vessels, boats, craft, and components developed for the Department of Defense (DOD) using public funds in whole or in part are governed exclusively by the requirements of section 2320 of title 10, United States Code or, in certain cases, the agreement pursuant to which the development was undertaken.

Section 2320 provides that: (1) in the case of items developed by a contractor or subcontractor exclusively with government funds, the government has unlimited technical data rights; and (2) in the case of items developed with mixed government and private funding, rights in technical data are determined by negotiation and generally include government-purpose rights. The continued application of section 2320 and the DOD implementing regulations should ensure that DOD is not required to purchase the same data rights more than once.

Reimbursement of expenses for certain Navy mess operations (sec. 1012)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to fund from agency operating accounts the cost of meals on United States naval and naval auxiliary vessels

for non-military personnel. For the purposes of this provision, this includes nongovernmental organization (NGO) and host and partner nation participants in civil-military operations and foreign national patients treated during the conduct of civil-military operations, as well as their escorts.

Recent humanitarian relief missions executed by the USNS MERCY and other vessels have successfully fostered a positive image of America worldwide. Project Hope and other NGOs, host and partner nations, joint services, and U.S. Government agencies participated in these missions, providing medical services including the treatment of foreign national patients onboard and ashore. These participants have been required to pay for their meals. There is no specific statutory authority to waive such meal payment or to use general operation and maintenance appropriated funds to pay for official visitor/guest messing.

As a result of the success of these missions, the Department of the Navy plans future deployments that will include the conduct of civil-military operations, including delivery of medical, dental, veterinary, and engineering services to underserved populations in Southeast Asia, Africa, and other places. The Department of the Navy has determined that the participation of NGOs and host and partner nations is vital to the successful execution of these important missions, that their contribution far outweighs the cost of messing, and that it is not in the government's best interests to assess these participants and patients messing costs. To the extent future official visitor/guest messing costs are anticipated, an alternative to emergency or extraordinary expense funding—which has been covering these costs to date—would be appropriate.

The Department of Defense has informed the committee that the Department of the Navy estimates the fiscal year 2009 cost of these operations at about $700,000.

Subtitle C—Counter-Drug Activities

Extension of authority for joint task forces to provide support to law enforcement agencies conducting counterterrorism activities (sec. 1021)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend authority for joint task forces to use counterdrug funds to support law enforcement agencies conducting counterterrorist activities.

The committee directs the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Counternarcotics Affairs to provide an annual briefing about the use of this authority to the committee.

The committee notes that if the Department of Defense (DOD) or the law enforcement agencies do not have sufficient funds for counterterrorist activities, funding should be sought for those purposes. The base budget for DOD counterdrug activities has remained constant over about the last decade, and while the committee supports using funds to address counterdrug and counterterrorist threats simultaneously, the committee urges DOD to be mindful of counterdrug priorities.

Two-year extension of authority for use of funds for unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1022)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by 2 years the authority to use counterdrug funds to support the Government of Colombia's unified campaign against narcotics cultivation and trafficking, and against terrorist organizations involved in such drug trafficking activities.

The committee has provided funding since fiscal year 2000 to support Colombia's effort to defeat the narco-terrorists threatening the Colombian state and stability in the region. The Colombian Government has moved from Plan Colombia to Plan Patriota, the military campaign to retake control of all municipalities in Colombia, to the current third phase, Plan Consolidacion. This plan, which should stretch to the end of 2009, aims to establish governance and ensure that military gains are irreversible. Meanwhile, the military campaign to defeat the narco-terrorists continues, along with the demobilization of the paramilitaries. President Uribe's administration, with U.S. help, is also making efforts to improve human rights, and create employment opportunities for the over 30,000 demobilized paramilitaries.

The committee applauds the military progress that Colombian forces, with U.S. assistance, have achieved and encourages the Colombian Government to continue to increase its emphasis on socioeconomic reform and development, human rights, and to further improve military professionalization and proficiency.

Subtitle D—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

Procurement by State and local governments of equipment for homeland security and emergency response activities through the Department of Defense (sec. 1031)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand the categories of equipment that may be purchased through the Department of Defense (DOD) by State and local governments to include consequence management equipment for homeland security and emergency response activities, as requested by DOD.

Enhancement of the capacity of the United States Government to conduct complex operations (sec. 1032)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a Center for Complex Operations. This center would facilitate the activities of a consortium made up of education and training institutions from across the U.S. Government. These activities, including conferences, seminars, and other information exchanges, would allow the center to identify topics of importance for the leadership of the U.S. Government and the complex operations community. The objective would be to enhance the training and education of military personnel and their civilian counterparts across different agencies, and to increase unity of effort in complex operations. The provision would define complex operations as stability, security, transition and reconstruction operations; counterinsurgency operations; and irregular warfare.

The committee notes that such a center does currently exist. Express authorization for the center would allow for the center to be funded collectively by the Departments of Defense and State, U.S. Agency for International Development, and other departments and agencies, rather than having to rely on discrete partner funding for each activity. This would facilitate greater interagency cooperation and allow for smooth execution of activities. This legislation would also allow the center to receive funding from other agencies, states, or other foreign and domestic entities.

Crediting of admiralty claim receipts for damage to property funded from a Department of Defense working capital fund (sec. 1033)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide that payments received by the United States in settlement of an admiralty claim for damage or loss to property that is operated and maintained using monies from a Department of Defense working capital fund account would be credited to the working capital fund which was used to operate and maintain the damaged or lost property.

Minimum annual purchase requirements for airlift services from carriers participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (sec. 1034)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Department of Defense to guarantee higher minimum levels of business than are currently authorized by law to United States air carriers participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF). This provision was included in the set of provisions in the authorization request of the Department of Defense.

Section 356 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required the Secretary of Defense to provide for an independent assessment of the viability of the CRAF program. Section 356 required a report on a number of issues. This direction asked for the assessment to make specific recommendations for improving the CRAF program, including assessing potential incentives for increasing participation in the CRAF program. One potential method for increasing participation specifically identified was the option of establishing a minimum annual purchase amount during peacetime. Although the report was supposed to be delivered to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2008, the Department has indicated that this report will not be ready until later this year.

In anticipation that the report could recommend establishing minimum annual purchase amounts during peacetime, the committee believes that the legislative option for doing so this year should remain open.

Termination date of base contract for the Navy-Marine Corps Intranet (sec. 1035)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Navy flexibility in extending the termination date of the current Navy-Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) contract by 1 month. The Navy is currently finalizing requirements and developing an acqui-

sition strategy for the Next Generation Enterprise Network (NGEN), a program that will provide computing services and infrastructure to significant portions of the Navy and Marine Corps upon termination of the current NMCI program. The committee has some concern about the compressed nature of the NGEN selection process and schedule and the lack of direct engagement with industry on requirements, technical issues, and acquisition strategy and expects these to be addressed over the coming months.

The committee believes that providing authority to extend the current NMCI contract will enable the Navy to be better able to run a full, fair, and open selection process that results in the best value for the government and meets Navy requirements. The committee believes the extension will also smooth the transition of provision of services under the current NMCI program and the NGEN program. Finally, the extension will enable the Navy to better adjust activities to reflect the potential of a late appropriation in fiscal year 2011 that could cause disruption of services to Navy and Marine Corps personnel and organizations.

Prohibition on interrogation of detainees by contractor personnel (sec. 1036)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide that the interrogation of detainees during or in the aftermath of hostilities is an inherently governmental function that cannot be transferred to private sector contractors. The provision would become effective 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, to provide the Department of Defense (DOD) time to comply.

DOD guidance documents in effect through 2005 provided that "How enemy prisoners of war (POWs), terrorists, and criminals are treated when captured, in transit, confined, and interrogated during or in the aftermath of hostilities entails the discretionary exercise of government authority" and "cannot be transferred to the private sector." In 2006, however, this guidance was revised to expressly authorize the use of contractors to perform interrogations.

According to reports of investigations conducted by Major General Antonio M. Taguba and Major General George R. Fay, contract interrogators are alleged to have participated in some of the abuses at Abu Ghraib prison 4 years ago. At that time, the Acting Secretary of the Army testified that the Army was planning "to build additional force structure so that operational and theater level intelligence functions will be performed in-house in the future." Four years later, the Department of Defense still has almost 100 contractor employees conducting interrogations of detainees.

The interrogation of detainees during or in the aftermath of hostilities entails the exercise of substantial discretion in applying government authority and is likely to have a significant impact on the life and liberty of the individuals questioned. The committee concludes that the conduct of such interrogations is an inherently governmental function that should be performed exclusively by military or civilian employees of the Department.

Notification of Committees on Armed Services with respect to certain nonproliferation and proliferation activities (sec. 1037)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Departments of Defense, Energy, State, and Commerce, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to keep the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to their activities to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the Director of National Intelligence to keep the committees currently informed with respect to the current activities of foreign nations that are of significance from the proliferation standpoint.

Sense of Congress on nuclear weapons management (sec. 1038)

The committee recommends a provision that would set forth the sense of Congress finding that the unauthorized transfer of nuclear weapons from Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, to Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, in August 2007; the unauthorized transfer of classified intercontinental ballistic missile parts, discovered in March 2008; and a lack of training and staffing for nuclear matters, demonstrate a lack of attention by the Department of Defense (DOD) to nuclear issues in general. In addition, the provision would set forth the sense of Congress that safety and security of nuclear weapons and related equipment should be a high priority for the United States; that the President should take steps to nominate an individual to fill the position of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Chemical and Biological Defense Programs; and that the Secretary of Defense should establish a senior position in the DOD Office of Policy at an assistant secretarial or deputy under secretarial level with responsibility for nuclear policy issues.

The three reviews of the nuclear weapons transfer incident concluded that attention to nuclear matters has substantially eroded over the last decade. This erosion in turn, has led to inattention to nuclear procedures and policies. The three review teams made over 100 recommendations to address the many problems. The committee will be watching closely how DOD and the Air Force implement these recommendations.

Sense of Congress on Joint Department of Defense-Federal Aviation Administration Executive Committee on Conflict and Dispute Resolution (sec. 1039)

As discussed at length elsewhere in this report, there is an urgent need for the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to work more effectively together to resolve problems and issues that impede DOD unmanned aerial systems (UAS) from operating in the National Airspace (NAS). DOD and the FAA signed a memorandum of agreement (MOA) in September 2007 creating a working relationship to address technical, procedural, and policy issues regarding UAS access to the NAS. The FAA has created an Unmanned Aircraft Program Office and the DOD has created a UAS Task Force and UAS Senior Steering Group. These steps, while important, have not produced

the rate of progress necessary to sustain and grow vital UAS support to the combatant commands. It is the committee's judgment that national security could be adversely affected without more vigorous efforts.

The committee believes that a formal DOD-FAA committee should be established at a senior level to ensure progress by the military services and the FAA in meeting their obligations under the MOA, to resolve disputes, and to make the agreements necessary for DOD to carry out its plans to field very large numbers of UAS and utilize them effectively.

More broadly, senior DOD and FAA officials agree that there are multiple, important issues that require higher-level and sustained policy attention. One example is the ongoing discussions over fee-for-service aerial refueling. The committee is encouraged by recent efforts to resolve conflicts over type ratings for aerial refueling aircraft, but much work remains to be done. A senior-level body for conflict resolution could pave the way for more streamlined, safety-conscious interactions and more effective national policy development.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should seek an agreement with the Administrator of the FAA to establish a Joint Executive Committee at the level of the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety (AAAS) and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD/AT&L). Such a Committee could serve as the focal point for dispute resolution and policy development, and a mechanism for identifying solutions to a range of mutual issues.

Sense of Congress on sale of new outsize cargo, strategic lift aircraft for civilian use (sec. 1040)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should:

(1) review the benefits and feasibility of pursuing a commercial-military cargo initiative for the C–17 aircraft and determine whether such an initiative is in the national interest; and

(2) if the Secretary determines that such an initiative is in the national interest, take appropriate actions to coordinate with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to achieve the type certification for such aircraft required by section 21.27 of title 14, Code 12 of Federal Regulations.

The FAA has informed the committee that no fewer than six commercial operators have expressed interest in procuring a commercial variant of the C–17 aircraft. According to officials within the FAA, the FAA cannot initiate a type certification review that would be required to allow C–17 commercial operations on its own initiative. Some other government entity, such as the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Congress, etc., would have to decide that it would be in the national interest and so inform the FAA before it could begin such a review. This provision would encourage the Secretary of Defense to decide whether it would be in the national interest.

Subtitle E—Reports

Repeal of requirement to submit certain annual reports to Congress regarding allied contributions to the common defense (sec. 1051)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal certain annual reporting requirements relating to the contributions of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members to the common defense. The committee believes these reporting requirements are outdated, and impose an unnecessary burden on the executive branch. The committee notes that relevant information on allied contributions is provided in a number of annual reports to Congress, such as those on the NATO Prague Capabilities Commitment and the NATO Response Force agreements, and other sources.

Report on detention operations in Iraq (sec. 1052)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on detention operations at theater internment facilities and reintegration centers in Iraq since January 1, 2007. The report would require detailed information on changes in detention policies and procedures intended to incorporate counterinsurgency doctrine into detention operations and programs to prepare detainees for reintegration upon their release.

The committee urges the Department of Defense to assess thoroughly the impact of the revised detention and reintegration policies and procedures in Iraq. The committee believes that the revised U.S. detention policies and procedures implemented in Iraq since 2007 could provide valuable lessons for U.S. detention practices elsewhere. The committee strongly encourages the Department to integrate these lessons into Department directives, joint doctrine, exercises, and training for detention and interrogation operations.

Strategic plan to enhance the role of the National Guard and Reserves in the national defense (sec. 1053)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategic plan to enhance the role of the National Guard and reserves in the national defense, including the transition of the reserve components of the armed forces from a strategic force to an operational force. The provision would require the Secretary to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the plan not later than July 1, 2009.

The Report of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves is a comprehensive evaluation of the reserve components of the armed forces that recognizes that legislative and policy changes have not kept pace with the changes in the use of the National Guard and reserves. This report contains 95 recommendations that must be evaluated and considered for implementation. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategic plan that considers the role of the National Guard and reserves that takes into account the findings and recommendations of this Com-

mission; the findings and recommendations of the report of the Center for Strategic and International Studies on "The Future of the National Guard and Reserves"; S. 2760 of the 110th Congress, the National Guard Empowerment and State-National Defense Integration Act of 2008; and current policies of the Department of Defense.

The committee greatly appreciates the contributions of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves and the Center for Strategic and International Studies that lead to a greater understanding of the issues involved in the increased use of the reserve components. The committee intends to ensure that the issues raised are fully considered and acted on as appropriate, taking into account the primacy of the Department of Defense's combat responsibilities.

Review of nonnuclear prompt global strike concept demonstrations (sec. 1054)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to conduct a review of the prompt global strike technologies that will be demonstrated beginning in fiscal year 2010. The report would set forth the cost of the demonstration, identify any legal, treaty, or policy related issues that might be associated with the concept demonstrated or the demonstration itself, and whether and to what extent there is a possibility that the concept or the demonstration itself could be confused with a nuclear weapons system. In addition, the report would set forth a description of the types of targets against which the concept demonstrated might be used. The report would be submitted to the congressional defense committees no later than 30 days after the date on which the budget is submitted.

Review of bandwidth capacity requirements of the Department of Defense and the intelligence community (sec. 1055)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a joint review of the current and future bandwidth capacity requirements of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the intelligence community over the next 10 years. The review would also include a discussion of any mitigation concepts, including operational or technical options that might be used to address bandwidth capacity shortfalls. Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Director would be required to submit a report setting forth the results of the review to the congressional defense committees and the intelligence committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Secretary and the Director should include and fully address in the review all means by which bandwidth is provided, including ground, aerial, and satellite options.

The provision would also direct the Secretary and the Director to establish a formal process, for each major defense acquisition or major system acquisition program, to ensure during the Milestone

B or key decision point B phase of the acquisition process, that the bandwidth requirements of each such system can be met.

The committee is concerned that there is a disconnect between the bandwidth requirements of major systems such as unmanned aerial vehicles and other intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance systems, and the Army Future Combat System, and the ground and space systems required to meet those requirements.

Subtitle F—Wounded Warrior Matters

Modification of utilization of veterans' presumption of sound condition in establishing eligibility of members of the armed forces for retirement for disability (sec. 1061)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 1201 and 1203 of title 10, United States Code, to adopt the same presumption of sound condition used by the Department of Veterans Affairs in accordance with section 1111 of title 38, United States Code, that a disability is incurred while on active duty if the disability was not noted at the time of a member's entrance on active duty unless clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the disability existed before the member's entrance on active duty and was not aggravated by active military service.

Inclusion of service members in inpatient status in wounded warrior policies and protections (sec. 1062)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1602(7) of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181)) to include inpatient service members in the definition of a "recovering service member" for purposes of policies and protections for wounded warriors.

Clarification of certain information sharing between the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs for wounded warrior purposes (sec. 1063)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1614(b)(11) of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181)) to require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to implement a process for transferring medical records of a recovering service member from the Department of Defense to the Department of Veterans Affairs when the transfer is authorized by regulations implementing the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996.

Additional responsibilities for the wounded warrior resource center (sec. 1064)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1616(a) of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181)), to require the Secretary of Defense to provide referrals for legal assistance where appropriate to wounded warriors, their families, and primary caregivers.

The committee has been made aware of certain cases where family or legal guardians of incapacitated wounded warriors were in need of legal assistance to help with future financial and estate planning and other needs on behalf of the service member. The committee believes that the wounded warrior center established by section 1616 should be a comprehensive resource not only for wounded warriors, but for their families and caregivers as well. Therefore, the committee directs that referral information be made available where appropriate upon request. The committee notes that the intent of this provision is not to create a new entitlement for legal assistance.

Responsibility for the center of excellence in the prevention, diagnosis, mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of traumatic brain injury to conduct pilot programs on treatment approaches for traumatic brain injury (sec. 1065)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1621(c) of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181)) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct pilot programs to promote or assess the efficacy of treatment approaches for all forms of traumatic brain injury, to include mild traumatic brain injury.

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) have numerous efforts underway to conduct research on effective clinical approaches to mitigating the consequences of traumatic brain injury, including potential pharmacological approaches. One such potential candidate is the drug progesterone, for which according to the Department of Defense (DOD), future studies are planned by NIH. The committee encourages the Department to continue research efforts on potential clinical drug candidates to treat traumatic brain injury under the auspices of the DOD Center of Excellence in the Prevention, Diagnosis, Treatment, and Rehabilitation of Traumatic Brain Injury, to include participation, as appropriate, in clinical trials conducted by the National Institutes of Health.

Center of excellence in the mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of traumatic extremity injuries and amputations (sec. 1066)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly establish a center of excellence in the mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of traumatic extremity injuries and amputations, as well as a comprehensive plan and strategy for how the center should approach these issues. The provision would also require the Secretaries of Defense and Veterans Affairs to jointly submit to Congress annual reports on the activities of the center.

The committee believes there is a need for targeted medical research to help military surgeons find new limb-sparing techniques to save injured extremities, avoid amputations, and preserve and restore the function of injured extremities.

Three-year extension of Senior Oversight Committee with respect to wounded warrior matters (sec. 1067)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly take actions to continue the operations of the Senior Oversight Committee established to address concerns related to the treatment of wounded, ill, and injured members of the armed forces and veterans until September 30, 2011.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

Military salute for the flag during the national anthem by members of the armed forces not in uniform and by veterans (sec. 1081)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 301 of title 36, United States Code, to authorize members of the armed forces and veterans to render a military salute in the same manner as members of the armed forces in uniform during a rendition of the national anthem.

Modification of deadlines for standards required for entry to military installations in the United States (sec. 1082)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1069 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to extend deadlines established for the development and implementation of standards for access to military installations in the United States. The Department of Defense has informed the committee that it is unable to develop and implement the required standards in the time provided.

Items of Special Interest

Compliance with Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate

In accordance with the requirements of Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, this report includes a table listing additional funding for items requested by Senators, along with the intended recipient and intended location of performance for those spending items. The information in this table will be posted on the website of the Committee on Armed Services after the committee votes to report the bill.

In addition, the committee has requested that each member requesting additional funding for items in this bill provide a certification that neither the Senator nor the Senator's immediate family has a pecuniary interest in the item, as required by Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The committee has received the requested certification from each Senator requesting funding for items that is provided in this bill. These certifications will also be posted on the website of the Committee on Armed Services after the committee votes to report the bill.

By including a table of requested funding items in the report and posting Member certifications relative to such funding items on the committee website, the committee takes no position as to which of these items, if any, meet the definition of a congressionally directed

spending item, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit in Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The committee directs the Department of Defense to use all applicable competitive, merit-based procedures in the award of any new contract, grant, or other agreement entered into with funds authorized to be appropriated by this bill. No provision in the bill or report shall be construed to direct funds to any particular location or entity unless the provision expressly so provides.

Fully interoperable electronic health information for the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs

The committee notes that 5 years have passed since the May 2003 recommendation of the President's Task Force to Improve Health Care Delivery for Our Nation's Veterans that the Department of Defense (DOD) and Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) should "develop and deploy by fiscal year 2005 electronic medical records that are interoperable, bidirectional and standards-based." According to a report of the Comptroller General dated April 30, 2008, although some progress has been made, the goal to develop interoperable electronic medical records has been only partially achieved.

In July 2007, the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors found that the Departments had continued to develop independent, stand-alone systems, and recommended that DOD and VA move rapidly to make all essential health information available to clinicians, working toward a "fully interoperable information system that will meet the long-term administrative and clinical needs of all military personnel over time."

Section 1635 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2008 (Public Law 108–181) required the establishment of a joint DOD and VA Program Office to "develop and implement electronic health record systems or capabilities that allow for full interoperability of personal health care information" between the DOD and VA by September 30, 2009.

The committee is concerned that the Departments are moving too slowly in the development of milestones and plans needed to achieve this important statutory requirement, and that initial plans for the Joint Program Office characterized its role as "management oversight" rather than the directive, accountable entity intended by Congress. The committee intends to closely scrutinize the Departments' progress and application of resources toward achievement of the long overdue goal of fully interoperable electronic health information for the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs.

Interagency coordination and participation in post-conflict stability and reconstruction operations

Recent and ongoing experience in Iraq and Afghanistan continues to highlight the need for effective interagency coordination and participation in post-conflict stability and reconstruction operations. The committee remains concerned that the civilian agencies of the U.S. Government do not have all of the resources and authorities, or the institutional cultures, necessary to be able to de-

ploy personnel and expertise to situations such as those we are currently facing in Iraq and Afghanistan. While this challenge has received much needed attention in recent years, and while improvements have been made, it is clear that making and sustaining the needed institutional changes will be a years-long process. In the meantime, Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Iraq and Afghanistan remain understaffed. The civilian agencies of government have not been able to recruit sufficient personnel to fill PRT requirements. While the Department of Defense (DOD) has deployed personnel to fill the gaps, DOD has struggled to recruit personnel with the appropriate skills for those positions. In addition, DOD funds are being used for urgent humanitarian and reconstruction assistance because the agencies normally responsible for those functions—the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development—are underfunded and lack authorities that allow for sufficient flexibility to respond to urgent, unanticipated requirements.

The committee notes the many studies on these matters that have been completed or are currently underway in think tanks and nongovernmental organizations, including a report on the national security interagency system that was required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which is to be provided to Congress and the President by September 1, 2008. The committee further notes that many new authorities have been provided to DOD in the area of foreign military assistance precisely to provide near-term solutions to systemic problems that demand longer-term and thoroughly considered solutions. It is clear that the next administration will have to grapple with these challenges. The committee looks forward to reviewing any proposals that emerge over the coming year and to working with other committees of Congress and the executive branch to help ensure that our national security and civilian agencies of government are well configured, resourced, and institutionally inclined to work together so that the U.S. Government can effectively promote its interests and accomplish its objectives when conducting post-conflict stability and reconstruction operations.

National cyber security initiative

The committee applauds the administration for developing a serious, major initiative to begin to close the vulnerabilities in the government's information networks and the nation's critical infrastructure. The committee believes that the administration's actions provide a foundation on which the next president can build.

However, the committee has multiple, significant issues with the administration's specific proposals and with the overall approach to gaining congressional support for the initiative.

A chief concern is that virtually everything about the initiative is highly classified, and most of the information that is not classified is categorized as "For Official Use Only." These restrictions preclude public education, awareness, and debate about the policy and legal issues, real or imagined, that the initiative poses in the areas of privacy and civil liberties. Without such debate and awareness in such important and sensitive areas, it is likely that the initiative will make slow or modest progress. The committee strongly

urges the administration to reconsider the necessity and wisdom of the blanket, indiscriminate classification levels established for the initiative.

The administration itself is starting a serious effort as part of the initiative to develop an information warfare deterrence strategy and declaratory doctrine, much as the superpowers did during the Cold War for nuclear conflict. It is difficult to conceive how the United States could promulgate a meaningful deterrence doctrine if every aspect of our capabilities and operational concepts is classified. In the era of superpower nuclear competition, while neither side disclosed weapons designs, everyone understood the effects of nuclear weapons, how they would be delivered, and the circumstances under which they would be used. Indeed, deterrence was not possible without letting friends and adversaries alike know what capabilities we possessed and the price that adversaries would pay in a real conflict. Some analogous level of disclosure is necessary in the cyber domain.

The committee also shares the view of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence that major elements of the cyber initiative request should be scaled back because policy and legal reviews are not complete, and because the technology is not mature. Indeed, the administration is asking for substantial funds under the cyber initiative for fielding capabilities based on ongoing programs that remain in the prototype, or concept development, phase of the acquisition process. These elements of the cyber initiative, in other words, could not gain approval within the executive branch if held to standards enforced on normal acquisition programs. The committee's view is that disciplined acquisition processes and practices must be applied to the government-wide cyber initiative as much as to the ongoing development programs upon which the initiative is based.

The committee also concludes that some major elements of the cyber initiative are not solely or even primarily intended to support the cyber security mission. Instead, it would be more accurate to say that some of the projects support foreign intelligence collection and analysis generally rather than the cyber security mission particularly. If these elements were properly defined, the President's cyber security initiative would be seen as substantially more modest than it now appears. That is not to say that the proposed projects are not worthwhile, but rather that what will be achieved for the more than $17.0 billion planned by the administration to secure the government's networks is less than what might be expected.

Finally, the committee concludes that, for all its ambitions, the cyber initiative sidesteps some of the most important issues that must be addressed to develop the means to defend the country. These tough issues include the establishment of clear command chains, definition of roles and missions for the various agencies and departments, and engagement of the private sector.

Additional information on the cyber initiative is contained in the classified annex to this report.

Nuclear security

In the wake of the Labor Day weekend unauthorized transfer of nuclear weapons from Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, to Barksdale, Louisiana, discussed in more detail elsewhere in this report, the Air Force included a long list of nuclear security related items on the unfunded priorities list of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. The long list totals approximately $122.0 million and ranges from $30,000 to operate security cameras that have already been installed, to building roads. Many of these items have significant out-year costs as well. The committee is aware that there are needed security enhancements but has declined to include additional funds for any of the items on the list. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a rational plan to fund needed nuclear security enhancements and to submit that plan to the congress with the fiscal year 2010 budget. The committee expects that the funding to support the plan will be included in the Air Force fiscal year 2010 budget request.

Nutrition and dietary care for seriously ill and injured service members

The committee believes that dietary care of seriously ill and injured service members is an important element of quality care. Appropriate dietary and nutritional care reduces the risk of illness, mitigates the physical effects of extended periods of recovery, and leads to improved health outcomes for ill and injured soldiers. The committee is concerned that although dietary care is carefully controlled for hospital inpatients, access to such services for those in an outpatient status, including service members in warrior recovery or transition units, is hampered by limited dietary personnel resources, and reliance on referrals by medical and non-medical personnel of service members for dietary and nutritional care.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the service secretaries, to conduct a review of the adequacy of dietary and nutritional services to seriously ill and injured service members. The review shall include:

(1) an assessment of the requirements for military and civilian dieticians, based on the full range of service member needs, from common dietary challenges to the unique needs of patients recovering from burn or blast injuries, in both inpatient and outpatient settings;

(2) analysis of current staffing capabilities of the military departments for providing dietary and nutrition services;

(3) identification of any gaps in such staffing;

(4) analysis of training of medical and non-medical case managers to identify service members in need of treatment for dietary and nutritional problems;

(5) an assessment of the adequacy of screening for dietary and nutritional needs for recovering service members; and

(6) analysis of referral procedures for service members in an outpatient status.

The Secretary shall submit a report on the results of this review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2009. The report shall also include a plan for appropriate improvements in training and referral proce-

dures for case managers, unit commanders, and health care personnel, and such other recommendations and actions as the Secretary deems appropriate for improving the availability of dietary and nutritional services for seriously ill and injured soldiers, in particular those in an outpatient status.

The committee reiterates its expectation that the Secretary shall ensure that any health care service required by an active-duty service member shall be provided where and when it is needed under the supplemental health and dental care programs, regardless of any policy concerning access or benefits in effect for the TRICARE program.

Recovery care coordinators and medical care case managers for seriously wounded and ill service members

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs have begun to hire recovery care coordinators and medical care managers to improve assistance in care and transition of wounded and ill service members and veterans. The committee is concerned that the training and hiring of these personnel is not proceeding as rapidly as needed, and as a result, care management needs, especially of those who were wounded early in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, are not being met.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense, in collaboration with the Department of Veterans Affairs, to explore opportunities to establish partnerships among Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities, as well as with public and private sector universities, to assist in training medical care case management personnel needed to support America's returning wounded and ill service members. One example of an existing partnership which can be built upon to provide such training is in Augusta, Georgia, with the Dwight D. Eisenhower Army Medical Center at Fort Gordon, the Charlie Norwood Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, and the Medical College of Georgia School of Nursing. Such model partnerships can be a means of identifying best practices in both care and care management for our wounded warriors, and may provide a foundation for improved care and training efforts where needed elsewhere.

Refugee crisis in Iraq

The committee continues to monitor closely the ongoing refugee crisis in Iraq, a crisis resulting from the U.S. invasion of Iraq. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), there are approximately 2.8 million Iraqis displaced internally—1.5 million of them after the Samarra bombings in February 2006, and two million more in neighboring states, particularly Jordan and Syria.

The committee notes that the continuing ethno-sectarian violence across Iraq is forcing thousands more to leave their homes every month. However, the committee notes that recent reports from UNHCR indicate that new displacement is continuing at a slower pace than in previous years. The slowdown is due to a number of factors including closed borders in the region and in provinces where internally displaced persons (IDPs) are not allowed to enter

their territories. Other factors include the presence of more homogenous communities, districts, and neighborhoods; exhaustion of resources for many families; and a decrease in violence. Despite these improvements, given the U.S. role and stake in the conflict, the committee believes the United States must continue to play a significant role in addressing the plight of displaced Iraqis, particularly those highly vulnerable religious minorities.

In recent years, the National Defense Authorization Act has included legislation to permit the Department of Defense to assist those Iraqis who have helped the United States to sustain and manage its presence. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), the committee included a provision expanding the Iraqi special immigrant visa program. The committee has noted that the special immigrant status provisions for certain Iraqis are first and foremost intended to help those Iraqis who have provided faithful and valuable service to the United States Government. The provisions are meant to help and reward those Iraqi workers for their assistance to the U.S. Government. Under the special immigrant program, applicants are required to prove that they have experienced or are experiencing an ongoing serious threat as a result of their employment by the U.S. Government.

There is strong evidence that Iraqis who have assisted the United States have experienced ongoing serious threats because of their service to the United States. Many have been killed, or have had family members killed. Others have been threatened. The committee expects that, absent unusual circumstances, Iraqis who have assisted the United States mission in Iraq will meet this statutory standard.

United States Africa Command

The committee supports the Department of Defense (DOD) decision to stand up a new United States Combatant Command for the continent of Africa, known as AFRICOM. The committee recognizes the increasing strategic significance of Africa and that Africa will continue to pose one of the greatest potential instability challenges in the world. The large ungoverned areas in Africa, HIV/AIDS epidemic, corruption, weak governance, and poverty that exist throughout the continent are challenges that affect nearly every country in Africa.

The DOD has referred to AFRICOM as the new model for combatant commands as AFRICOM would have all the roles and responsibilities of a traditional geographic combatant command, including the ability to lead military operations, but would also include a broader "soft power" mandate to establish and maintain a stable security environment. AFRICOM will include a larger civilian component than other combatant commands. It will incorporate personnel from a variety of U.S. Government agencies outside of the Department of Defense. This new interagency model will require a significant amount of support from non-DOD departments and agencies of the U.S. Government.

While the committee supports DOD's decision to create a combatant command that relies more heavily on a whole government approach, the committee is concerned that the other departments and

agencies of government are not adequately resourced to support this model. It is the committee's understanding that AFRICOM is already encountering some difficulties in staffing portions of the command.

The committee is also concerned about staffing in various United States embassies in Africa. AFRICOM has proposed placing liaison officers in each United States Embassy on the continent of Africa so that AFRICOM can find ways to support the ongoing bilateral activities of the country team. Of the 47 U.S. embassies on the African continent, there are 23 with a U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Mission Director and, in many cases, Foreign Service officers are being asked to serve simultaneously as political, economic, and public diplomacy officers. Given these current staffing challenges, the committee recognizes the need for USAID and the Department of State to be funded adequately. If funded adequately, other government departments and agencies will be able to leverage more fully the capacity of AFRICOM to assist our African partners to professionalize their respective militaries and assist in the delivery of humanitarian and disaster relief.

The committee is also monitoring closely the progress of the African Contingency Operation Training Assistance program, the African component of the Global Peace Operations Initiative. This program is training African peacekeepers for the five African Union-sponsored regional standby brigades. The success of the program is critical to enabling African countries to develop the security apparatus needed to respond to crises across the continent. The committee expects AFRICOM to play a more significant role in this program once it reaches full operational capability at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

Department of Defense strategic human capital plans (sec. 1101)

The committee recommends a provision that would codify the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual strategic human capital plan to shape and improve the civilian employee workforce of the Department of Defense (DOD).

Section 1122 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) required DOD to develop a strategic human capital plan by no later than March 2007. On November 6, 2007, more than 8 months after the statutory deadline, DOD submitted a plan in response to this requirement. However, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that the plan did not meet the legislative requirements. According to GAO:

> the plan does not address the majority—six of eight—of the congressional reporting requirements. For example, the plan does not include an assessment of current mission-critical competencies, future critical skills and competencies needed, gaps between the current and future needs, or specific recruiting and retention goals, even though these elements are required by the 2006 act. DOD officials acknowledged that the plan they submitted to the committees is incomplete.

DOD's civilian employee workforce is one of the cornerstones of the Department's national security mission. The Department's continued failure to conduct adequate planning for this workforce could undermine its ability to perform some aspects of this critical mission.

Conditional increase in authorized number of Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service personnel (sec. 1102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an increase in the number of Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service (DISES) personnel, provided that the rate of increase in such personnel does not exceed the rate of increase in the number of Senior Executive Service (SES) personnel in the Department of Defense (DOD) as a whole and that the increase is allocated to components of the intelligence community most in needed of additional DISES personnel.

This is the fourth consecutive year in which the Department has requested an increase in the authorized number of DISES personnel. In Senate Report 110–77, accompanying S. 1547, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee stated that it would be premature to approve this request until the Department: (1) provides a strategic plan for the entire

DOD SES workforce, as required by section 1102 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364); (2) presents a comprehensive proposal that addresses the need for SES across the entire Department, rather than addressing the needs of a single community; and (3) justifies the proposed allocation of DISES billets within the intelligence community.

These conditions remain relevant and the Department has not yet met them. Rather than deferring the increase for another year, however, the provision recommended by the committee would make the requested increase contingent upon the Department adopting a more comprehensive approach that is consistent with the conditions established in last year's committee report.

Enhancement of authorities relating to additional positions under the National Security Personnel System (sec. 1103)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the authority of the Department of Defense (DOD) to utilize streamlined hiring practices under the National Security Personnel System.

Over the last 7 years, the workload of the Department has grown dramatically as a result of the ongoing conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. During that time, the contractor workforce of the Department has more than doubled—from less than 750,000 in 2000 to more than 1.5 million in 2007—while the number of civilian employees of the Department has remained virtually unchanged at just under 700,000.

The committee concludes that the Department needs expedited hiring authority to bring the DOD civilian employee workforce back in line with the critical responsibilities for which it is responsible.

Expedited hiring authority for health care professionals of the Department of Defense (sec. 1104)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize, for purposes of sections 3304, 5333, and 5753 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense to designate any category of health care position within the Department of Defense as a shortage category position, if he determines that there is a severe shortage of candidates or a critical hiring need for such a position. This authority would terminate on September 30, 2012.

Election of insurance coverage by federal civilian employees deployed in support of a contingency operation (sec. 1105)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 8702(c) of title 5, United States Code, to authorize federal civilian employees deployed in support of a contingency operation and Department of Defense employees designated as emergency essential to elect to receive automatic life insurance coverage upon notification of deployment or designation.

This provision would also amend sections 8714a(b) and 8714b(b) of title 5, United States Code, to authorize such civilian employees to elect optional life insurance or additional optional life insurance,

respectively, within 60 days after the employee's date of notification of deployment or designation.

This provision responds to a recommendation by the Commission on Army Acquisition and Program Management in Expeditionary Operations in its October 31, 2007 report entitled, "Urgent Reform Required: Army Expeditionary Contracting." It would offer additional options for life insurance to federal civilian employees deployed in support of contingency operations, and provide them with both the benefits and peace of mind that their service deserves.

Permanent extension of Department of Defense voluntary reduction in force authority (sec. 1106)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3502(f) of title 5, United States Code, to make permanent the authority to substitute the voluntary separation of an employee for the separation of another employee who would otherwise be separated due to a reduction in force.

Four-year extension of authority to make lump sum severance payments with respect to Department of Defense employees (sec. 1107)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 5595(i)(4) of title 5, United States Code, to extend until the end of fiscal year 2014 the authority of the Secretary of Defense or the secretaries of the military departments to pay an employee the total amount of severance pay in one lump sum.

Authority to waive limitations on pay for federal civilian employees working overseas under areas of United States Central Command (sec. 1108)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the head of an executive agency to waive limitations on the aggregate of basic and premium pay, and on allowances, differentials, bonuses, awards, and similar cash payments payable during calendar year 2009 to an employee who performs work in an overseas location that is in the area of responsibility of the Commander, United States Central Command in support of a contingency operation or an operation in response to a declared emergency.

The total amount payable may not exceed the total annual compensation payable to the Vice President under section 104 of title 3, United States Code. The provision would also authorize any amount over the cap to be paid to the employee in a lump sum at the beginning of calendar year 2010.

Under current law, the head of an executive agency may waive limitations on the aggregate of basic and premium pay payable during calendar year 2008 up to $212,100, and there is no provision allowing for the rollover of any pay that exceeds this cap.

Although not limited to Army contracting personnel, the provision responds to a recommendation by the Commission on Army Acquisition and Program Management in Expeditionary Operations in its October 31, 2007 report entitled "Urgent Reform Required: Army Expeditionary Contracting," aimed at providing improved incentives for longer tours for high quality civilian contracting personnel deployed in support of contingency operations.

Technical amendment relating to definition of professional accounting position for purposes of certification and credentialing standards (sec. 1109)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1599d(e) of title 10, United States Code, to update the definition of a "professional accounting position."

Current law refers only to the General Schedule pay plan in reference to the Department of Defense's professional accounting positions. During the Department's transition to the National Security Personnel System, the definition should be updated to reflect not only the General Schedule pay plan but also this alternative personnel system with new position classification.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Subtitle A—Assistance and Training

Increase in amount available for costs of education and training of foreign military forces under Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program (sec. 1201)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2249c(b) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the amount of funds available for the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program up to $35.0 million.

The committee notes that this "parallel" program to the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program, authorized under title 22, United States Code, would now be funded at about one-third the size of the $90.5 million requested for IMET for fiscal year 2009. The committee urges the President to address the requirements met by the title 10 authority by providing additional funding to the Department of State programs, so that the agency traditionally authorized to set policy and programs for foreign military education and training is properly funded to do so.

Authority for distribution to certain foreign personnel of education and training materials and information technology to enhance military interoperability with the armed forces (sec. 1202)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide electronically-distributed education and training materials to the military and civilian personnel of friendly foreign governments to enhance interoperability between the armed forces and military forces of friendly foreign nations. This provision would make permanent the authority provided under section 1207 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), which expires on September 30, 2008.

Extension and expansion of authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism (sec. 1203)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1208(a) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), to increase the amount the Secretary of Defense may expend during any fiscal year to $35.0 million, and to extend the authority to fiscal year 2011.

This provision would also amend the original language to clarify the intent of the provision, including changing the title of section

1208 from "Support of military operations to combat terrorism" to "Support of special operations to combat terrorism."

Modification and extension of authorities relating to program to build the capacity of foreign military forces (sec. 1204)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend and modify the authority under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 1206 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), for the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to build the capacity of foreign military forces to conduct counterterrorism operations or to support military or stability operations in which U.S. armed forces are participating.

The provision would expand the types of security forces eligible to be trained and equipped under section 1206 authority to include coast guard, border protection, and other security forces whose primary mission is counterterrorism operations. The committee notes that the restrictions on the training of police or other law enforcement forces, codified in section 2420 of title 22, United States Code, would apply to activities under this authority.

The provision would increase the limitation on funding for building the capacity of foreign forces from $300.0 million to $400.0 million per fiscal year and would provide that funds available for one fiscal year may be used for programs that begin in that fiscal year but end in the next fiscal year. The provision also would extend the section 1206 authority for 3 years through September 30, 2011.

The train and equip authority under section 1206 was initiated as a pilot program to address urgent and emerging needs for building the capacity of foreign military forces, particularly those of developing or other countries that otherwise would be unable to build this capacity on their own. This authority is not intended to duplicate or substitute for other foreign assistance authorities, nor is it intended to sustain train and equip programs over multiple years. In extending this authority for an additional 3-year period, the committee emphasizes the need for train and equip programs to be executed consistent with the legislative intent of the section 1206 authority.

Specifically, the committee is concerned that funds under this authority are being used for programs, particularly in countries where the terrorist threat is currently low, that primarily serve to build counter-narcotics capabilities. While recognizing a degree of overlap between counterterrorism and counter-narcotics capabilities, the committee urges the Department of Defense to fund programs to build counter-narcotics capabilities using funds and authorities intended to support counter-narcotics activities, and, if appropriate, seek any necessary modifications to existing counter-narcotics authorities to support these activities.

The committee also recognizes that urgent U.S. national security priorities and compelling terrorist threats vary from one geographic combatant command to another. The committee therefore expects that programs and funding under section 1206 authority will not be equitably distributed among the geographic combatant com-

mands. For example, the committee notes that many countries in what will be the U.S. Africa Command area of responsibility are vulnerable to terrorist activity and have limited resources to address these threats. Therefore, the committee views the need for section 1206 assistance in that geographic command to be particularly compelling.

Extension of authority and increased funding for security and stabilization assistance (sec. 1205)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend and enhance the authority for security and stabilization assistance provided under section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 1210 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). Under that section, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide the Secretary of State services, defense articles, or funding to support Department of State programs for reconstruction, security, or stabilization assistance.

The provision recommended by the committee would extend the authority of section 1207 for 3 years until September 30, 2011, and increase the total value of all services, defense articles, and funds that may be provided or transferred under this section in a fiscal year to $200.0 million.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has inappropriately restricted the uses for which services or funds may be provided to the Department of State under section 1207 security and stabilization assistance authority. The Secretary of Defense stated in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on April 15, 2008 that section 1207 authority is primarily for bringing civilian expertise to operate alongside or in place of our armed forces. The committee is concerned that this is too narrow an interpretation of the original administration rationale for, and the legislative intent of, section 1207 authority, which is intended to enable the Secretary of Defense to support the provision by the Secretary of State of reconstruction, security, or stabilization assistance to a foreign country. This could include, for instance, providing early civilian resources to avert a crisis that could otherwise subsequently require U.S. military forces to assist or intervene. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to improve its coordination with the Department of State, and its consultation with the relevant committees of Congress, in formulating and implementing programs under the section 1207 authority.

Four-year extension of temporary authority to use acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend military equipment for personnel protection and survivability (sec. 1206)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority provided under section 1202 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), as amended by section 1252 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–181), to loan or lease certain items for personnel protection or survivability to the military forces

of foreign nations participating in combined operations with the United States in Iraq, Afghanistan, or as part of a peacekeeping operation under the United Nations Charter or other international agreement.

The committee notes that the authority of section 1202 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act allows certain significant military equipment to be treated as if it were logistical support, supplies, and services under Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreements. This authority provides a temporary solution for meeting the urgent personnel protection needs of foreign military forces operating in combination with U.S. armed forces in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and other coalition peacekeeping operations under an international mandate. The committee notes the Department of Defense's interest in making this authority permanent and to extend it to other coalition operations, including peace operations and stability operations. The committee is concerned about making the treatment of significant military equipment in this manner permanent, and about extending this temporary authority to other kinds of operations where the requirement for coalition partners to have such equipment is less exigent. The committee urges the Department to consider alternatives to using Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreements for these purposes, as such agreements are not intended for the loan or lease of significant military equipment.

Authority for use of funds for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities (sec. 1207)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the commander of a combatant command, with the concurrence of the relevant chief of mission, to expend funds in fiscal years 2009 and 2010 to establish, develop, and maintain non-conventional assisted recovery (NAR) capabilities in a foreign country if the commander determines that expenditure of such funds for that purpose is necessary in connection with support of NAR efforts in that foreign country. NAR is defined as recovery of isolated personnel in enemy-held, hostile, or uncertain areas using indigenous/surrogate personnel. NAR is used when conventional methods of personnel recovery are unavailable to, or unsuitable for, the combatant commander. The total amount of funds expended in each fiscal year may not exceed $20.0 million.

The Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing within 48 hours of the use of such authority.

Not later than 30 days after the close of each fiscal year this provision is in effect, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the support provided, including the amount of funds expended, a description of the recipient of the support, and the assistance provided by the recipient.

Subtitle B—Department of Defense Participation in Bilateral, Multilateral, and Regional Cooperation Programs

Availability across fiscal years of funds for military-to-military contacts and comparable activities (sec. 1211)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 168(e) of title 10, United States Code, by making funds available for programs or activities under this section that begin in a fiscal year and end in the following fiscal year.

Enhancement of authorities relating to Department of Defense regional centers for security studies (sec. 1212)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 184(f) of title 10, United States Code, to make funds available for programs and activities that begin in a fiscal year and end in the following fiscal year, effective October 1, 2008.

As a pilot program, the committee would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive reimbursement costs for nongovernmental and international organization personnel participating in regional center activities during fiscal years 2009 and 2010. In order to do so, the Secretary of Defense must determine that attendance of such personnel without reimbursement is in the national security interests of the United States. The amount that may be waived may not exceed $1.0 million.

The annual report submitted by the Secretary of Defense for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 would include information on the attendance of personnel of nongovernmental and international organizations who participate in activities of the regional centers during the preceding fiscal year, including information on costs incurred by the United States for the participation of personnel of nongovernmental and international organizations.

Payment of personnel expenses for multilateral cooperation programs (sec. 1213)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1051 of title 10, United States Code, by expanding authority for bilateral and regional programs to cover multilateral programs, and to permit funding to be available for programs that begin in one fiscal year and end in another.

Participation of the Department of Defense in multinational military centers of excellence (sec. 1214)

The committee recommends a provision that would give permanent authority to the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to authorize Department of Defense civilian and military personnel to participate in North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) multinational military centers of excellence. This authority was previously provided for fiscal year 2007 under section 1205 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), and extended through fiscal year 2008 under section 1204 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) remains interested in expanding this authority beyond NATO-accred-

ited multinational military centers of excellence. The committee believes that the NATO-accredited multinational military centers of excellence offer recognized expertise and experience that supports alliance transformation. Participation in these NATO centers benefits DOD military and civilian personnel, and NATO capabilities overall, by providing opportunities to enhance education and training, improve interoperability and capabilities, assist in doctrine development, and/or test and validate concepts through experimentation. The committee has yet to be convinced that expanding the authority under this section to unspecified or currently non-existent non-NATO centers of excellence would offer comparable benefits to the United States. The committee further notes that with respect to centers of excellence focused on training international peacekeepers, the Global Peace Operations Initiative provides the appropriate legal authority for U.S. participation in the training of foreign nation peacekeepers, and separate DOD authority for the same purpose is neither necessary nor desirable.

Subtitle C—Other Authorities and Limitations

Waiver of certain sanctions against North Korea (sec. 1221)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the President with limited authority to waive, with respect to North Korea, the application of sanctions under 102(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1(b)). The President would be required to notify Congress 15 days in advance of exercising such waiver authority. In addition, the provision would require the President to submit an annual report listing all the waivers granted during the preceding year and describe in detail the progress being made by North Korea in implementing of the commitments included in the Joint Statement of September 19, 2005 to abandon all nuclear weapons, existing nuclear programs, and all other programs associated with the elimination of the ability of North Korea to develop, deploy, transfer, or maintain weapons of mass destruction or their delivery systems.

The committee notes that waiver authority is necessary to enable the Departments of Energy and Defense to carry out work needed to implement the Joint Statement.

Subtitle D—Reports

Extension and modification of updates on report on claims relating to the bombing of the Labelle Discotheque (sec. 1231)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a quarterly report on the status of negotiations between the Government of Libya and United States claimants in connection with the bombing of the Labelle Discotheque in Berlin, Germany, that occurred in April 1986. The reporting requirement is an extension of section 1225 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 (Public Law 109–163) and section 1261 in the NDAA for FY 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

On April 5, 1986, Libya directed its agents to execute a terrorist attack in West Berlin for the sole purpose of killing as many Amer-

ican military personnel as possible. The Labelle Discotheque was known to be frequented by large numbers of U.S. military personnel. The bombing of the discotheque occurred at a time when 260 people, including U.S. military personnel, were present. When the bomb detonated, two U.S. soldiers were killed and over 90 U.S. soldiers were severely injured.

In 2002, the American Labelle victims and the families of deceased soldiers filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Since that time, the Government of Libya has settled the claims of the German victims of the LaBelle bombing and the claims of the victims of the Libyan bombing of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland.

Since the beginning of 2008, Libya has shown renewed interest in negotiations with a number of claimant groups, including the Labelle claimants. The committee continues to monitor closely the details surrounding the cases of Labelle claimants and the other major claims against the Government of Libya and hopes this matter will be brought to a close in short order.

Report on utilization of certain global partnership authorities (sec. 1232)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to submit by December 31, 2010, a report on the implementation of certain Building Global Partnership authorities from the date of enactment of this Act until September 30, 2010. The Building Global Partnership authorities covered by the report would consist of the authority for building the capacity of foreign military forces under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended; the authority for security and stabilization assistance under section 1207 of Public Law 109–163, as amended; and the authority to provide urgent and unanticipated civic assistance under the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund under section 166a(b)(6) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 902 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (109–364).

The committee notes that security cooperation, stabilization assistance, and humanitarian relief in response to unanticipated emergencies are critical foreign policy tools for advancing U.S. national security interests worldwide. The implementation of certain of the Building Global Partnership authorities covered by this report has benefited from close cooperation between the Department of Defense and the Department of State. The committee encourages these departments to continue to pursue an interagency approach in the formulation and execution of projects under these authorities.

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

Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301)

The committee recommends a provision that would define the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs, define the funds as authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this bill, and authorize CTR funds to be available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

Funding allocations (sec. 1302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $434.1 million, an increase of $20.0 million above the budget request, for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program. This provision would also authorize specific amounts for each CTR program element, require notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2009 funds, and require notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2009 funds in excess of the specific amount authorized for each CTR program element.

The committee recommends an additional $10.0 million for new activities in states outside of the former Soviet Union, $9.0 million for nuclear weapons storage security in Russia for additional automated inventory control management systems, and $1.0 million for additional expenses associated with the Russian chemical weapons destruction activities.

The committee continues to believe that one of the highest priorities of the CTR program is destroying Russian chemical weapons munitions at the destruction facility in Shchuch'ye, Russia. The CTR program has entered into an arrangement with the Russian Government that assigns responsibility to Russia to complete the U.S. funded destruction facility and begin operations. Timely startup and safe operation of the facility is essential and continues to be a matter of concern to the committee. As a result, the committee directs the Secretary to notify the congressional defense committees immediately if there is any delay or other problem in the startup of either the Russian funded destruction facility or the U.S. funded destruction facility.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary and explanation of tables

This title contains funding authorizations for working capital and revolving funds, the Defense Health Program, the destruction of chemical munitions, drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, the Department of Defense Inspector General, and other programs which contain elements of more than one type of traditional funding account (such as procurement or operation and maintenance) inside a single account.

This title also reflects savings from lower inflation that affect multiple accounts and titles within this Act, legislative proposals regarding the national defense stockpile, and authorizes trust fund expenditures for the Armed Forces Retirement Home, which is outside the national defense budget function.

The following table provides the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title XIV of this Act. The table also displays the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2009 budget request for these programs, and indicates those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. This table is incorporated by reference into this Act as provided in section 1002 of this Act. The Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

TITLE XIV - OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS			
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS			
Defense Working Capital Funds	198,150		198,150
Defense Commissary Agency	1,291,084		1,291,084
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND			
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,962,253	-353,700	1,608,553
MPF(F) LHA(R) advance procurement - transfer to SCN 16		[-348,300]	
MPF(F) LHA(R) R&D - transfer to RDN 112		[-5,400]	
DEFENSE COALITION SUPPORT FUND			
Defense Coalition Support Fund	22,000	-22,000	
NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE TRANSACTION FUND			
NDSTF Transfer to Defense Health Program	-1,300,000		-1,300,000
Inflation Savings (section 1407)		-1,048,000	-1,048,000
Total Revolving and Management Funds	**2,173,487**	**-1,423,700**	**749,787**
MILITARY PROGRAMS			
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM O&M	24,301,359		24,301,359
[Memo: Funds derived by transfer from National Defense Stockpile]	[1,300,000,000]		[1,300,000,000]
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL	-1,184,000	1,184,000	
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM R&D	193,938	3,000	196,938
TBI and PTSD research initiative (PE 63115HP)		[3,000]	

TITLE XIV - OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM PROCUREMENT	303,905		303,905
Total Defense Health Program	**23,615,202**	**1,187,000**	**24,802,202**
CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	1,152,668		1,152,668
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDT&E	268,881		268,881
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	64,085		64,085
Total Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction	**1,485,634**		**1,485,634**
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES			
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	1,060,463		1,060,463
Total Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities	**1,060,463**		**1,060,463**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	246,445	24,000	270,445
PROCUREMENT	1,400	2,000	3,400
Total Office of the Inspection General	**247,845**	**26,000**	**273,845**
Civil Programs (non-defense)			
Armed Forces Retirement Home	63,010		63,010
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**28,645,641**	**-210,700**	**28,434,941**

Subtitle A—Military Programs

Working capital funds (sec. 1401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize fiscal year 2009 funds for Defense Working Capital Funds.

National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize fiscal year 2009 funds for the National Defense Sealift Fund.

Defense Health Program (sec. 1403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize fiscal year 2009 funds for the Defense Health Program.

Chemical agents and munitions destruction, defense (sec. 1404)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funds for fiscal year 2009 for the destruction of chemical agents and munitions, including funds for procurement; research, development, test, and evaluation; and operation and maintenance. The provision would authorize $1.5 billion, the amount requested by the Department of Defense.

Drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, defense-wide (sec. 1405)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities of the Department of Defense.

Defense Inspector General (sec. 1406)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize fiscal year 2009 funds for the Defense Inspector General.

Reduction in certain authorizations due to savings from lower inflation (sec. 1407)

The committee recommends a provision that would reduce the amounts authorized in division A of this Act by $1.0 billion to bring the inflation assumptions applicable to purchases by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2009 in line with the economic assumptions previously adopted by the Senate.

The Office of Management and Budget assumed an inflation rate of 2.0 percent in its fiscal year 2009 budget submission. However, the Congressional Budget Office's estimate of inflation for 2009 is 1.7 percent, or 0.3 percentage points lower than the administration's estimate. The Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009 (S. Con. Res. 70) adopted by the Senate on March 13, 2008, was based on the economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office.

Subtitle B—Armed Forces Retirement Home

Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $63.0 million to be appropriated for fiscal year 2009 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Responsibilities for chemical demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commissions in Colorado and Kentucky (sec. 1431)

The committee recommends a provision that would transfer responsibility for the chemical demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commissions in Colorado and Kentucky from the Secretary of the Army to the Program Manager for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA). This would be consistent with the overall responsibility of the ACWA Program Manager for other aspects of the ACWA program and facilities.

The provision would also establish requirements to ensure that the newly transferred Citizens' Advisory Commissions would work in an effective manner.

The committee notes that each chemical demilitarization facility has a Citizens' Advisory Commission to serve as a mechanism for input and communication between the affected States, local communities, and the Federal Government. The chemical destruction facilities at Pueblo, Colorado and Blue Grass, Kentucky are the only two ACWA sites, and are managed by the ACWA Program Manager, rather than by the Secretary of the Army. Despite this separate management structure for the ACWA sites, the Citizens' Advisory Commissions for Colorado and Kentucky have been managed by the Secretary of the Army. This provision would correct this disparity.

Modification of definition of "Department of Defense Sealift Vessel" for purposes of the National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1432)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the intent of Congress on what vessels the Navy should acquire and manage within the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF).

The fiscal year 2009 budget request included $68.7 million within the NDSF for various research and development activities, including $41.8 million for the Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future) (MPF(F)). This amount included $5.4 million for research and development on amphibious assault replacement ships which are to be assigned to the MPF(F), designated MPF(F) LHA(R). The NDSF request also included $348.3 million for advance procurement for the first MPF(F) LHA(R).

The committee does not agree with funding development and procurement for amphibious assault ships within the NDSF. This ship type was specifically not included within the scope of sealift vessels

eligible for NDSF, defined within section 2218 of title 10, United States Code.

Budget Items

LHA(R) advance procurement and research and development

The fiscal year 2009 budget request included $68.7 million within the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF) for various research and development activities, including $41.8 million for the Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future) (MPF(F)). This amount included $5.4 million for research and development on amphibious assault replacement ships which are to be assigned to the MPF(F), designated MPF(F) LHA(R). The NDSF request also included $348.3 million for advance procurement for the first MPF(F) LHA(R).

The committee does not agree with funding development and procurement for amphibious assault ships within the NDSF. This ship type was specifically not included within the scope of sealift vessels eligible for NDSF, defined within section 2218 of title 10, United States Code. The committee has included a provision (described elsewhere) that would clarify the intent of Congress on what vessels should be acquired and managed within the NDSF.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $5.4 million in PE 48042N, and a corresponding increase of $5.4 million in PE 64567N for MPF(F) LHA(R) ship contract design; and a decrease of $348.3 million in PE 48042N, and an adjustment in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN), line 16, for LHA(R) advance procurement.

Traumatic brain injury and post traumatic stress disorder initiative

The budget request included $38.1 million in PE 63115HP for medical development. The committee notes that dealing with traumatic brain injury (TBI) and post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) are among the highest priority medical research challenges facing the Department of Defense. In order to support continued efforts to develop diagnoses and treatments for TBI and PTSD, the committee recommends an additional $3.0 million in PE 63115HP for TBI and PTSD research initiatives, including support of efforts to develop processes, procedures, and the application of technologies to gather baseline information on military personnel during precombat deployment and post-combat diagnosis of TBI and PTSD.

Department of Defense Inspector General

The budget request included $246.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The committee is concerned that funding levels for independent audit and investigative functions should keep pace with the demand for these services. Therefore, the committee recommends a total increase of $26.0 million in OMDW for the OIG, of which $24.0 million is for operation and maintenance and $2.0 million is for procurement.

The OIG audits, investigates, inspects, and evaluates the programs and operations of the Department of Defense (DOD), and

recommends policies and process improvements that promote economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity in DOD programs and operations. The committee notes the dramatic growth in the number and cost of Department contracts for operations, procurement, research, and construction within the United States and around the world. The committee understands that the OIG plans to conduct 83 audits related to military operations and Department of Defense contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan over the next few years. The increase recommended by the committee should enable the OIG to conduct oversight related to the global war on terror, contract management and acquisitions, and support audits to identify potential waste, fraud, and abuse.

Item of Special Interest

Completion of destruction of chemical weapons stockpile

The committee remains disappointed in the notification from the Secretary of Defense on April 10, 2006, that the United States does not expect to meet its obligation under the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) to destroy its chemical weapons stockpile by the extended deadline of April 29, 2012.

The committee notes the commitment of the Secretary in the April 10, 2006 notification to "continue working diligently to minimize the time to complete destruction without sacrificing safety and security," and "to continue requesting resources needed to complete destruction as close to April 29, 2012 as practicable."

The committee continues to urge the Department of Defense to fulfill this commitment by taking all necessary and appropriate steps to dispose of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile by the 2012 Chemical Weapons Convention deadline, or as soon thereafter as possible, and to request the funding needed in future budget requests to accelerate the chemical weapons stockpile destruction schedule to meet the United States' legal obligations under the Convention.

In order to meet the destruction deadline under the Convention at all or most of its chemical demilitarization facilities, the Department must consider options for accelerated destruction and increased funding levels for the program.

Section 922 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) included a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress semiannual reports on implementation by the United States of its chemical weapons destruction obligations under the CWC, including a description of the options for accelerating such destruction and the funding required for each option. Section 8119 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–116), included a similar reporting requirement and mandated that the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile must be destroyed no later than December 31, 2017.

The committee will continue to monitor closely the Department's compliance with the Convention's destruction deadline, as well as the destruction deadline established in section 8119 of Public Law 110–116.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OPERATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN

Overview

The President's budget requested $70.0 billion in emergency funding in the national defense budget function for operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. The request did not allocate specific funding to either operation, nor to any specific budget titles, accounts, or programs. The committee bill separates funding for these operations. This title authorizes $19.9 billion in funding for operations in Afghanistan. Title XVI authorizes funding for operations in Iraq.

Funding authorized in this title is for the incremental costs of operations in Afghanistan. As described later in this report, any such funds not designated by Congress for a specific program may not be obligated until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense transmits to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the proposed allocation of such funds at the line-item level.

Explanation of tables

The summary table that follows describes the funding authorized in this bill for operations in Afghanistan.

TITLE XV - OPERATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN
(In Thousands of Dollars)

	Senate Authorization
Military Personnel	
Military Personnel, Army	500,000
Military Personnel, Navy	25,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	62,500
Military Personnel, Air Force	25,000
Reserve Personnel, Army	25,000
Reserve Personnel, Navy	7,500
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	5,000
National Guard Personnel, Army	100,000
Total Military Personnel	**750,000**
Operation and Maintenance	
Operation & Maintenance, Army	9,000,000
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	500,000
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	1,000,000
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	500,000
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	688,750
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	12,500
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	7,500
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	10,000
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,750
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	75,000
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	12,500
Total Operation and Maintenance	**11,810,000**
Procurement	
Aircraft Procurement, Army	250,000
Missile Procurement, Army	12,500
Procurement of W&TCV, Army	375,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	87,500
Other Procurement, Army	1,100,000
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	750,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	25,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy	12,500
Procurement of Ammo, Navy & MC	75,000
Other Procurement, Navy	25,000
Procurement, Marine Corps	250,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	400,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force	12,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	12,500
Other Procurement, Air Force	150,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide	62,500
Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund	100,000
Total Procurement	**3,700,000**

TITLE XV - OPERATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN
(In Thousands of Dollars)

	Senate Authorization
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	
Research, Development, Test & Eval, Army	15,000
Research, Development, Test & Eval, Navy	15,000
Research, Development, Test & Eval, AF	15,000
Research, Development, Test & Eval, DW	15,000
Total Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**60,000**
Other	
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	3,000,000
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	150,000
Defense Health Program	155,000
Total Other	**3,305,000**
Revolving and Management Funds	
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	250,000
Total Revolving and Management Funds	**250,000**
Total Title XV - Operations in Afghanistan	**19,875,000**

Purpose (sec. 1501)

This section states the purpose of this title, which is to authorize additional appropriations for operations in Afghanistan for fiscal year 2009.

This title authorizes funding for military personnel, operation and maintenance, procurement, research and development, working capital funds, health care, and other programs normally authorized in division A of this Act. Additional war-related authorizations for military construction programs are contained in title XXIX of this Act.

Army procurement (sec. 1502)

This section would authorize an additional $1.8 billion for fiscal year 2009 procurement of war-related items for the Army.

Navy and Marine Corps procurement (sec. 1503)

This section would authorize an additional $387.5 million for fiscal year 2009 procurement of war-related items for the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Air Force procurement (sec. 1504)

This section would authorize an additional $575.0 million for fiscal year 2009 procurement of war-related items for the Air Force.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1505)

The budget request included a total of $496.3 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (JIEDDF), of which $306.3 million was for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) attack the network line of operation, $88.3 million was for the JIEDDO train the force line of operation, and $101.7 million was for the JIEDDO staff and infrastructure line of operation.

The committee recommends a transfer of $496.3 million in the JIEDDF to titles XV and XVI of this Act. The committee believes that JIEDDO's expenses are war-related and should be accounted for in the appropriate war-related accounts in titles XV and XVI of this Act. Therefore, the committee recommends increases of $750.0 million for all of JIEDDO's activities in support of operations in Afghanistan.

Defense-wide activities procurement (sec. 1506)

This section would authorize an additional $62.5 million for fiscal year 2009 procurement of war-related items for the defense agencies and the United States Special Operations Command, plus an additional $100.0 million for Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles.

Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1507)

This section would authorize an additional $60.0 million for fiscal year 2009 war-related research and development expenses.

Operation and maintenance (sec. 1508)

This section would authorize an additional $11.8 billion for fiscal year 2009 war-related operation and maintenance expenses of the

military services, the defense agencies, and the United States Special Operations Command.

Military personnel (sec. 1509)

This section would authorize an additional $750.0 million for fiscal year 2009 war-related military personnel expenses of the active and reserve components, including mobilization costs for reserve and National Guard forces.

Working capital funds (sec. 1510)

This section would authorize an additional $250.0 million for the fiscal year 2009 war-related working capital fund expenses of the Department of Defense.

Other Department of Defense programs (sec. 1511)

This section would authorize additional funding for fiscal year 2009 war-related expenses of the Defense Health Program and for counter-narcotics efforts in Afghanistan.

Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1512)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an additional $3.0 billion for the fiscal year 2009 war-related expenses of the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund. The provision would also specify the authorized use of these funds, authorize the transfer of funds from this account to other accounts of the Department of Defense, provide for prior notice to Congress before obligation of these funds, and require quarterly reports on the specific use of these funds.

Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1513)

This section would provide that the amounts authorized for war-related purposes in this title are in addition to the amounts otherwise authorized in this Act for the base budget.

Special transfer authority (sec. 1514)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer of up to $3.0 billion of war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title and title XVI. This special transfer authority is in addition to the general transfer authority contained in section 1001 of this Act, but the same reprogramming procedures applicable to transfers under section 1001 would also apply to transfers under this section. No more than $300.0 million could be transferred to the Iraq Security Forces Fund under this authority.

Limitation on use of funds (sec. 1515)

The President did not allocate any of the funding in his budget request for Iraq and Afghanistan to specific programs. This section would provide that any funding in this title not designated by Congress for a specific program could not be obligated until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense transmits to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the proposed allocation of such funds at the line-item level.

Requirement for separate display of budget for Afghanistan (sec. 1516)

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to identify separately the funding requested for operations in Afghanistan in any future annual or supplemental budget request.

The committee notes that on February 8, 2008, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates stated that, "I worry that for many Europeans the missions in Iraq and Afghanistan are confused * * * I think that they combine the two * * * Many of them, I think, have a problem with our involvement in Iraq and project that to Afghanistan, and do not understand the very different—for them—the very different kind of threat." The committee shares this concern, and believes this provision would help address this public perception problem.

TITLE XVI—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OPERATIONS IN IRAQ

Overview

The President's budget requested $70.0 billion in emergency funding in the national defense budget function for operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. The request did not allocate specific funding to either operation, nor to any specific budget titles, accounts, or programs. The committee bill separates funding for these operations. This title authorizes $49.6 billion in funding for operations in Iraq. Funding for operations in Afghanistan is authorized in title XV.

Funding authorized in this title is for the incremental costs of operations in Iraq. As described later in this report, any such funds not designated by Congress for a specific program may not be obligated until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense transmits to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the proposed allocation of such funds at the line-item level.

Explanation of tables

The summary table that follows describes the funding authorized in this bill for operations in Iraq.

TITLE XVI - OPERATIONS IN IRAQ
(In Thousands of Dollars)

	Senate Authorization
Military Personnel	
Military Personnel, Army	1,500,000
Military Personnel, Navy	75,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	187,500
Military Personnel, Air Force	75,000
Reserve Personnel, Army	75,000
Reserve Personnel, Navy	22,500
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	15,000
National Guard Personnel, Army	300,000
Total Military Personnel	**2,250,000**
Operation and Maintenance	
Operation & Maintenance, Army	27,000,000
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	1,500,000
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	3,000,000
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	1,500,000
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	1,811,250
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	37,500
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	22,500
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	30,000
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	11,250
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	225,000
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	37,500
Total Operation and Maintenance	**35,175,000**
Procurement	
Aircraft Procurement, Army	750,000
Missile Procurement, Army	37,500
Procurement of W&TCV, Army	1,125,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	262,500
Other Procurement, Army	3,300,000
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	2,250,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	75,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy	37,500
Procurement of Ammo, Navy & MC	225,000
Other Procurement, Navy	75,000
Procurement, Marine Corps	750,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	400,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force	37,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	37,500
Other Procurement, Air Force	450,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide	187,500
Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund	500,000
Total Procurement	**10,500,000**

TITLE XVI - OPERATIONS IN IRAQ
(In Thousands of Dollars)

	Senate Authorization
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	
Research, Development, Test & Eval, Army	35,000
Research, Development, Test & Eval, Navy	35,000
Research, Development, Test & Eval, AF	35,000
Research, Development, Test & Eval, DW	35,000
Total Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**140,000**
Other	
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	0
Iraq Security Forces Fund	200,000
Iraq Freedom Fund	150,000
Defense Health Program	460,000
Total Other	**810,000**
Revolving and Management Funds	
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	750,000
Total Revolving and Management Funds	**750,000**
Total Title XVI - Operations in Iraq	**49,625,000**

Purpose (sec. 1601)

This section states the purpose of this title, which is to authorize additional appropriations for operations in Iraq for fiscal year 2009.

This title authorizes funding for military personnel, operation and maintenance, procurement, research and development, working capital funds, health care, and other programs normally authorized in division A of this Act. Additional war-related authorizations for military construction programs are contained in title XXIX of this Act.

Army procurement (sec. 1602)

This section would authorize an additional $5.5 billion for fiscal year 2009 procurement of war-related items for the Army.

Navy and Marine Corps procurement (sec. 1603)

This section would authorize an additional $1.2 billion for fiscal year 2009 procurement of war-related items for the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Air Force procurement (sec. 1604)

This section would authorize an additional $925.0 million for fiscal year 2009 procurement of war-related items for the Air Force.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1605)

The budget request included a total of $496.3 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (JIEDDF), of which $306.3 million was for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) attack the network line of operation, $88.3 million was for the JIEDDO train the force line of operation, and $101.7 million was for the JIEDDO staff and infrastructure line of operation.

The committee recommends a transfer of $496.3 million in the JIEDDF to titles XV and XVI of this Act. The committee believes that JIEDDO's expenses are war-related and should be accounted for in the appropriate war-related accounts in titles XV and XVI of this Act. Therefore, the committee recommends increases of approximately $2.3 million for all of JIEDDO's activities in support of operations in Iraq.

Further, the committee directs that JIEDDO provide $5.0 million for the Marine Corps to continue research and development on the breeding and training of dogs for the Improvised Explosive Device (IED) mission and other missions in support of infantry operations, and $5.0 million for the Army's Maneuver Support Command to field an IED dog capability in cooperation with the Marine Corps.

The Marine Corps Warfighting Laboratory has developed a very innovative program to train dogs to work off-leash to detect IED and explosive caches. In contrast to other attempts to use dogs for this mission, the Marine Corps was able to find a breed that can stay on task for the length of patrols, even in extreme heat, and that can be trained to operate effectively with minimally trained handlers. These dogs have been deployed to Iraq and have performed superbly. The Marine Corps believes that these dogs have saved lives and enhanced the effectiveness of supported units.

The committee believes that the Army could benefit from a similar program and understands that the Army's Maneuver Support Command at Fort Leonard Wood is interested in working with the Marine Corps.

In addition, the committee directs that JIEDDO fund at a level of not less than $60.0 million the ongoing efforts of the Irregular Warfare Support (IWS) office under the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict. The IWS program leverages ongoing research efforts of the United States Special Operations Command, the military departments, defense agencies, and other federal agencies to analyze, modify, design, and demonstrate enduring technical and operational capabilities for irregular warfare. IWS projects include developing capabilities to attack adversaries' organizations, their infrastructure and sanctuaries, financing, support operations, the motivations of their members, and their propaganda. The IWS also utilizes multi-disciplinary approaches that combine intelligence, operations, and technology.

Defense-wide activities procurement (sec. 1606)

This section would authorize an additional $187.5 million for fiscal year 2009 procurement of war-related items for the defense agencies and the United States Special Operations Command, plus an additional $500.0 million for Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles.

Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1607)

This section would authorize an additional $140.0 million for fiscal year 2009 war-related research and development expenses.

Operation and maintenance (sec. 1608)

This section would authorize an additional $35.2 billion for fiscal year 2009 war-related operation and maintenance expenses of the military services, the defense agencies, and the United States Special Operations Command.

Military personnel (sec. 1609)

This section would authorize an additional $2.3 billion for fiscal year 2009 war-related military personnel expenses of the active and reserve components, including mobilization costs for reserve and National Guard forces.

Working capital funds (sec. 1610)

This section would authorize an additional $750.0 million for the fiscal year 2009 war-related working capital fund expenses of the Department of Defense.

Defense Health Program (sec. 1611)

This section would authorize additional funding for fiscal year 2009 war-related expenses of the Defense Health Program.

Iraq Freedom Fund (sec. 1612)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an additional $150.0 million for the fiscal year 2009 war-related ex-

penses of the Iraq Freedom Fund. The provision would also authorize the transfer of funds from this account to other accounts of the Department of Defense and require prior notice to Congress before obligation of these funds.

Iraq Security Forces Fund (sec. 1613)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an additional $200.0 million for the fiscal year 2009 war-related expenses of the Iraq Security Forces Fund. The provision would also specify the authorized use of these funds, authorize the transfer of funds from this account to other accounts of the Department of Defense, provide for prior notice to Congress before obligation of these funds, and require quarterly reports on the specific use of these funds.

The amount authorized for this program would be dramatically reduced from the fiscal year 2008 level in light of the ability of the Iraqi Government to finance its own security forces given the significant increases in Iraqi oil revenues and the large balances of unspent Iraqi funds. Funding authorized for this program is intended only for areas where the United States is in a position to make a unique contribution to Iraqi security, particularly in the area of training. No funds are authorized for expenditure on infrastructure programs for the Iraqi security forces for fiscal year 2009. The committee believes the Iraqi Government is well able to afford to finance its own infrastructure needs at this point.

Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1614)

This section would provide that the amounts authorized for war-related purposes in this title are in addition to the amounts otherwise authorized in this Act for the base budget.

Limitation on use of funds (sec. 1615)

The President did not allocate any of the funding in his budget request for Iraq and Afghanistan to specific programs. This section would provide that any funding in this title not designated by Congress for a specific program could not be obligated until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense transmits to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the proposed allocation of such funds at the line-item level.

Contributions by the Government of Iraq to large-scale infrastructure projects, combined operations, and other activities in Iraq (sec. 1616)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of funds authorized by this Act to pay for any large-scale infrastructure project commenced after the date of enactment of this Act. The provision would also require the United States Government to begin negotiating an agreement with the Government of Iraq to share the costs of combined operations between the Government of Iraq and Multinational Forces Iraq. The provision would further require that the United States Government act to ensure that Iraqi funds are used to pay the costs of training, equipping, and sustaining the Iraqi Security Forces and the costs associated with the Sons of Iraq.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary and explanation of funding tables

Division B of this Act authorizes funding for military construction projects of the Department of Defense. It includes funding authorizations for the construction and operation of military family housing as well as military construction for the reserve components, the defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program. It also provides authorization for the base closure accounts that fund military construction, environmental cleanup, and other activities required to implement the decisions in base closure rounds.

The following tables provide the project-level authorizations for the military construction funding authorized in division B of this Act, other than the war-related projects authorized in title XXIX, and summarize that funding by account. Funding for base closure projects is summarized in the table that follows, and is explained in additional detail in the table included in title XXVII of this report. These tables are incorporated by reference into this Act as provided in section 1002 of this Act.

The fiscal year 2009 budget requested $24.4 billion for military construction and housing programs. Of this amount, $11.7 billion was requested for military construction, $3.2 billion for the construction and operation of family housing, and $9.5 for base closure activities, including $9.1 billion to implement the results of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

Excluding the war-related projects in title XXIX, the committee recommends authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing programs totaling $24.8 billion. The total amount authorized for appropriations reflects the committee's continuing commitment to invest in the recapitalization of Department of Defense facilities and infrastructure. The committee recommends an increase of $596.6 million for additional construction projects, and a reduction of $191.6 million in unjustified or lower priority projects, for a net increase of $405.0 million to the amount requested for military construction and family housing.

SUMMARY OF FY 2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

	FY2009 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army	4,615,920	31,600	4,647,520
Navy	3,096,399	29,230	3,125,629
Air Force	934,892	127,172	1,062,064
Defense Agencies	1,783,998	-17,200	1,766,798
Chemical Demilitarization Construction	134,278	10,000	144,278
NATO Security Investment Program	240,867	0	240,867
Army National Guard	539,296	95,111	634,407
Army Reserve	281,687	0	281,687
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	57,045	0	57,045
Air National Guard	34,374	121,750	156,124
Air Force Reserve	19,265	7,350	26,615
Subtotal Construction	**11,738,021**	**405,013**	**12,143,034**
Army Family Housing Construction	678,580	0	678,580
Army Family Housing Operations	716,110	0	716,110
Navy Family Housing Construction	382,778	0	382,778
Navy Family Housing Operations	376,062	0	376,062
Air Force Family Housing Construction	395,879	0	395,879
Air Force Family Housing Operations	599,465	0	599,465
Defense Agencies Family Housing Operations	49,231	0	49,231
Homeowners Assistance	4,500	0	4,500
Family Housing Improvement Fund	850	0	850
Subtotal Family Housing	**3,203,455**	**0**	**3,203,455**
Base Realignment and Closure IV	393,377	0	393,377
Base Realignment and Closure 2005	9,065,386	0	9,065,386
Subtotal Base Closure (Title XXVII)	**9,458,763**	**0**	**9,458,763**
Subtotal Construction, Housing and BRAC FY2009 Authorizations (Non-War)	**24,400,239**	**405,013**	**24,805,252**
Title XXIX War-Related Construction			
Army Military Construction		450,000	450,000
Navy Military Construction		50,000	50,000
Subtotal War-Related Construction	**0**	**500,000**	**500,000**
Grand Total Division B	**24,400,239**	**905,013**	**25,305,252**

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army	ALABAMA	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	POWERTRAIN TRANSMISSION REPAIR FACILITY	27,000		27,000
Army	ALABAMA	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	SMALL ARMS REPAIR SHOP-DEPOT LEVEL	18,000		18,000
Army	ALABAMA	Redstone Arsenal	System Software Engineering Annex Phase III		16,500	16,500
Air Force	ALABAMA	MAXWELL AFB	AIR & SPACE BASIC COURSE COMBAT ARMS TNG FAC	15,556		15,556
Army Guard	ALABAMA	FORT MCCLELLAN	MULTIPURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE	3,000		3,000
Army	ALASKA	FORT RICHARDSON	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	15,000		15,000
Army	ALASKA	Fort Richardson	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range		3,100	3,100
Army	ALASKA	FORT WAINWRIGHT	BARRACKS COMPLEX	63,000		63,000
Army	ALASKA	FORT WAINWRIGHT	ORGANIZATIONAL VEHICLE PARKING	14,000		14,000
Army	ALASKA	FORT WAINWRIGHT	TACTICAL VEHICLE WASH FACILITY	21,000		21,000
Army	ALASKA	FORT WAINWRIGHT	TRAINING AIDS SUPPORT CENTER	12,400		12,400
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	C-17 RESTORE ROAD	2,000		2,000
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22 AEROSPACE GROUND EQUIP SHOP	7,200		7,200
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22 CORROSION CTRL/LO MX/COMPOSITE REPAIR FAC	22,400		22,400
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22 FLIGHT SIMULATOR	16,400		16,400
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22A 7 BAY AIRCRAFT SHELTER	20,400		20,400
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22A 8 BAY AIRCRAFT SHELTER	22,200		22,200
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22A FIELD TRAINING DETACHMENT	6,600		6,600
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22A SQUADRON OPS/AMU 6 BAY HANGAR	41,100		41,100
Defense-Wide	ALASKA	FORT RICHARDSON	DENTAL CLINIC ADDITION/ALTERATION	6,300		6,300
Army Guard	ALASKA	Bethel Armory	Bethel Readiness Center		16,000	16,000
Army	ARIZONA	FORT HUACHUCA	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	11,200		11,200
Army	ARIZONA	YUMA	RAW SEWAGE LAGOON AND OXIDATION POND	3,800		3,800
Navy	ARIZONA	YUMA	APPLIED INSTRUCTION FACILITY (MAWTS)	19,490		19,490
Air Force	ARIZONA	Davis Monthan AFB	Fire/Crash Rescue Station		15,000	15,000
Army Guard	ARIZONA	CAMP NAVAJO	READINESS CENTER	13,000		13,000
Army Guard	ARIZONA	FLORENCE	READINESS CENTER	13,800		13,800
Army Guard	ARIZONA	PAPAGO MILITARY RES	READINESS CENTER	24,000		24,000
Air Guard	ARKANSAS	Little Rock AFB	Engine Inspection and Maintenance Facility		4,000	4,000
Army	CALIFORNIA	FORT IRWIN	BARRACKS COMPLEX	17,500		17,500
Army	CALIFORNIA	FORT IRWIN	MILITARY OPERATIONS URBAN TERRAIN, PHASE 3	22,100		22,100
Army	CALIFORNIA	PRESIDIO MONTEREY	GENERAL INSTRUCTIONAL BUILDING	15,000		15,000
Army	CALIFORNIA	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	WATER TREATMENT PLANT	12,400		12,400
Navy	CALIFORNIA	BARSTOW MCLB	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	7,830		7,830
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - (41 AREA)	32,430		32,430
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - 33 AREA	30,300		30,300
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - 43 AREA	15,150		15,150
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - 62 AREA	25,920		25,920

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - AREA 13	33,320		33,320
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - AREA 14	32,350		32,350
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - CHAPPO (22 AREA)	48,640		48,640
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - DEL MAR (21 AREA)	33,190		33,190
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - DEL MAR (21 AREA)	33,440		33,440
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - HORNO (13 AREA)	33,790		33,790
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - HORNO (53 AREA)	40,660		40,660
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - LAS PULGAS AREA	34,340		34,340
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - PICO (24 AREA)	32,870		32,870
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - PICO (24 AREA)	32,260		32,260
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - SAN MATEO AREA	34,500		34,500
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS -DEL MAR (21 AREA)	34,120		34,120
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS, SAN MATEO AREA	32,550		32,550
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS-MARGARITA (33 AREA)	31,170		31,170
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BEQ - ARMORY, TRAINING FAC, SOI (52 AREA)	54,730		54,730
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	CONSOLIDATED COMM/ELEC MAINTENANCE & STORAGE	10,050		10,050
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	CORROSION CONTROL WATER TREATMENT FACILITY	52,520		52,520
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	INDOOR FITNESS CENTER	12,230		12,230
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	INFANTRY TRAINING CENTER	11,500		11,500
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	OPERATIONS ACCESS POINTS, RED BEACH	11,970		11,970
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	REGIMENTAL MAINTENANCE COMPLEX (PHASE 3)	33,620		33,620
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TRAINING BATTLE COURSE	22,250		22,250
Navy	CALIFORNIA	EL CENTRO	COMBINED CHILD CARE AND YOUTH CENTER	8,900		8,900
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	COMBAT TRAINING TANK COMPLEX	10,820		10,820
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	EMERGENCY RESPONSE STATION	6,530		6,530
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	IN-LINE FUELING STATION MODIFICATION	22,930		22,930
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	MILITARY WORKING DOG OPERATIONS CENTER	4,800		4,800
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	MV-22 WASH RACK	3,690		3,690
Navy	CALIFORNIA	NORTH ISLAND	BERTHING LIMA CONVERSION	38,992		38,992
Navy	CALIFORNIA	NORTH ISLAND	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	14,270		14,270
Navy	CALIFORNIA	SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	34,020		34,020
Navy	CALIFORNIA	SAN DIEGO	RECRUIT RECONDITIONING FACILITY	16,790		16,790
Navy	CALIFORNIA	SAN DIEGO	RECRUIT SUPPORT BARRACKS	34,430		34,430
Navy	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	36,470		36,470
Navy	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	36,280		36,280
Navy	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS	BEQ AND PARKING STRUCTURE	51,800		51,800
Navy	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS	COMBINED ARMS MOUT (PHASE 2)	21,000		21,000
Air Force	CALIFORNIA	EDWARDS AFB	F-35 RAMP & SECURITY UPGRADE	3,100		3,100

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Air Force	CALIFORNIA	Travis AFB	Large Crash Rescue Station		12,100	12,100
Defense-Wide	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	SOF COMBAT CREW TRAINING FACILITY	9,800		9,800
Defense-Wide	CALIFORNIA	DEF DISTRIB DEPOT-TRACY	REPLACE GENERAL PURPOSE WAREHOUSE	41,000		41,000
Defense-Wide	CALIFORNIA	DEF DISTRIB DEPOT-TRACY	REPLACE TRUCK ENTRANCE/CONTROL FACILITY	9,300		9,300
Army Reserve	CALIFORNIA	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	3,950		3,950
Naval Reserve	CALIFORNIA	LEMOORE	MARINE CORPS RESERVE CENTER	15,420		15,420
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	BARRACKS & DINING	154,000		154,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	BATTALION COMPLEX	45,000		45,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	BRIGADE/BATTALION HQS	46,000		46,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITIES	93,000		93,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	INFRASTRUCTURE, BCT	69,000		69,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	PHYSICAL FITNESS FACILITY	28,000		28,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	15,000		15,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOPS	84,000		84,000
Chemical Demil	COLORADO	PUEBLO DEPOT	AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PHASE 10	65,060		65,060
Air Force	COLORADO	Peterson AFB	Land Acquisition - 23 Acres		4,900	4,900
Air Force	COLORADO	U S AIR FORCE ACADEMY	UPGRADE ACADEMIC FACILITY, PHASE 5	18,000		18,000
Defense-Wide	COLORADO	BUCKLEY AIR FORCE BASE	SATELLITE PHARMACY	3,000		3,000
Army Guard	COLORADO	DENVER	READINESS CENTER	9,000		9,000
Army Guard	COLORADO	GRAND JUNCTION	READINESS CENTER	9,000		9,000
Air Guard	COLORADO	Buckley AFB	Alert Crew Headquarters		4,200	4,200
Navy	CONNECTICUT	GROTON	PIER 31 REPLACEMENT	46,060		46,060
Navy	CONNECTICUT	SUB Base New London	Indoor Small Arms Range		11,000	11,000
Army Guard	CONNECTICUT	CAMP RELL	REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE	28,000		28,000
Army Guard	CONNECTICUT	EAST HAVEN	KD RANGE ADD/ALT	13,800		13,800
Air Force	DELAWARE	DOVER AFB	ADAL PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	19,000		19,000
Defense-Wide	DELAWARE	DOVER AFB	ALTER FUEL STORAGE TANK	3,373		3,373
Army Guard	DELAWARE	NEW CASTLE	ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY ADD/ALT	28,000		28,000
Air Guard	DELAWARE	NEW CASTLE COUNTY APT	TFI - INFO OPS SQUADRON (IOS) FACILITY	3,200		3,200
Air Guard	DELAWARE	New Castle County Airport	Replace C-130 Aircraft Maintenance Shops		11,600	11,600
Naval Reserve	DELAWARE	WILMINGTON	NOSC PORTION, ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER	11,530		11,530
Navy	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	AUTONOMOUS SYSTEM RESEARCH LAB	24,220		24,220
Army	FLORIDA	MIAMI DORAL	SOUTHCOM HEADQUARTERS, INCREMENT II	81,600		81,600
Navy	FLORIDA	JACKSONVILLE	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	12,890		12,890
Navy	FLORIDA	MAYPORT	ALPHA WHARF IMPROVEMENTS	14,900		14,900
Navy	FLORIDA	TAMPA	JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SQUADRON FACILITY	29,000		29,000
Air Force	FLORIDA	Cape Canaveral Air Station	Satellite Operations Support Facility		8,000	8,000
Air Force	FLORIDA	EGLIN AFB	F-35 STUDENT DORMITORY (144 ROOM)	19,000		19,000

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Air Force	FLORIDA	MACDILL AFB	SOCCENT HDQTRS & COMMANDANT FACILITY	21,000		21,000
Defense-Wide	FLORIDA	EGLIN AFB	SOF BATTALION OPS COMPLEX	40,000		40,000
Defense-Wide	FLORIDA	HURLBURT FIELD	SOF SPECIAL TACTICS GROUP FACILITY	8,900		8,900
Defense-Wide	FLORIDA	JACKSONVILLE	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANKS	34,000		34,000
Defense-Wide	FLORIDA	MACDILL AFB	SOF ADD/ALTER 501B (HQ SOCOM)	10,500		10,500
Army Guard	FLORIDA	CAMP BLANDING	AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT	12,400		12,400
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	AUTOMATED ANTI-ARMOR RANGE	8,800		8,800
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	BASIC 10M-25M FIRING RANGE 1	2,400		2,400
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	BASIC 10M-25M FIRING RANGE 2	2,400		2,400
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	BASIC 10M-25M FIRING RANGE 3	2,350		2,350
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	BASIC 10M-25M FIRING RANGE 4	2,500		2,500
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	BASIC 10M-25M FIRING RANGE 5	2,500		2,500
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	17,500		17,500
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	FIRE AND MOVEMENT RANGE	2,450		2,450
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	MAINTENANCE SHOP	42,000		42,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE 1	4,900		4,900
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE 2	4,900		4,900
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE 3	4,500		4,500
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	RANGE ACCESS ROAD	9,100		9,100
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	RECEPTION STATION PHASE 2	39,000		39,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	STATIONARY TANK RANGE	6,900		6,900
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	TACTICAL VEHICLE WASH FACILITY	10,800		10,800
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	TRACKED VEHICLE DRIVERS COURSE	16,000		16,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	TRAINEE COMPLEX	32,000		32,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	TRAINING AREA INFRASTRUCTURE - OSUT AREA	16,000		16,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	TRAINING AREA INFRASTRUCTURE-NORTHERN AREA	13,800		13,800
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	27,000		27,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	BARRACKS & DINING	121,000		121,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	BRIGADE COMPLEX	30,000		30,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	BRIGADE/BATTALION HQS	36,000		36,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	20,000		20,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITIES	75,000		75,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	INFRASTRUCTURE	59,000		59,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	PHYSICAL FITNESS FACILITY	22,000		22,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	SHOOT HOUSE	2,300		2,300
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOPS	67,000		67,000
Navy	GEORGIA	ALBANY MCLB	BEQ REPLACEMENT	15,320		15,320
Air Force	GEORGIA	ROBINS AFB	AIRCRAFT HANGAR	24,100		24,100

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Defense-Wide	GEORGIA	AUGUSTA	REGIONAL SECURITY OPERATIONS CENTER INCR IV	100,220		100,220
Defense-Wide	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	CONSOLIDATED TROOP MEDICAL CLINIC	3,900		3,900
Defense-Wide	GEORGIA	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANK	3,500		3,500
Army Guard	GEORGIA	DOBBINS ARB	READINESS CENTER	45,000		45,000
Naval Reserve	GEORGIA	MARIETTA	MARINE CORPS RESERVE CENTER	7,560		7,560
Air Force Reserve	GEORGIA	Dobbins Air Reserve Base	Construct New Control Tower		6,450	6,450
Army	HAWAII	Pohakuloa Training Area	Saddle Road, Phase V		21,300	21,300
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BARRACKS	42,000		42,000
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BATTALION COMPLEX	69,000		69,000
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BATTALION COMPLEX	27,000		27,000
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BRIGADE COMPLEX	65,000		65,000
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	INFRASTRUCTURE EXPANSION	76,000		76,000
Army	HAWAII	WAHIAWA	WIDEBAND SATCOM OPERATIONS CENTER	40,000		40,000
Navy	HAWAII	BARKING SANDS	ADVANCED RADAR DETECTION LABORATORY	28,900		28,900
Navy	HAWAII	KANEOHE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	28,200		28,200
Navy	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	CHILD DEVELPMENT CENTER	29,300		29,300
Navy	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	FITNESS CENTER	45,000		45,000
Navy	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	JOINT FORCES DEPLOYMENT STAGING AREA FISC	5,990		5,990
Navy	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	SUB DRIVE-IN MAGNETIC SILENCING FAC (INCREMENT II)	41,088		41,088
Air Force	HAWAII	Hickam AFB	Upgrade Electrical Distribution, Phase VI		8,700	8,700
Defense-Wide	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	REPLACE FUEL PIPELINE	27,700		27,700
Army Reserve	HAWAII	FORT SHAFTER	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	19,199		19,199
Army Guard	IDAHO	ORCHARD TRAINIG AREA	LIVE FIRE SHOOT HOUSE	1,850		1,850
Army Reserve	IDAHO	HAYDEN LAKE	AR CENTER/OMS/UNHEATED STORAGE	9,580		9,580
Navy	ILLINOIS	GREAT LAKES	RTC SPECIAL PROGRAMS BARRACKS	62,940		62,940
Defense-Wide	ILLINOIS	SCOTT AFB	USTRANSCOM JOINT INTEL OPERATIONS CENTER	13,977		13,977
Army Guard	ILLINOIS	Urbana Armory	Readiness Center		16,186	16,186
Army	INDIANA	Crane Army Ammo Activity	Ready Service Magazine Complex		8,300	8,300
Army Guard	INDIANA	CAMP ATTERBURY	MULTI PURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE	5,800		5,800
Army Guard	INDIANA	LAWRENCE	READINESS CENTER	21,000		21,000
Air Guard	IOWA	Fort Dodge	Vehicle Maintenance and Communications Training		5,600	5,600
Army	KANSAS	FORT RILEY	BATTALION COMPLEX	38,000		38,000
Army	KANSAS	FORT RILEY	BRIGADE COMPLEX	79,000		79,000
Army	KANSAS	FORT RILEY	COMMISSARY	23,000	-23,000	0
Army	KANSAS	FORT RILEY	RAIL SIDING	15,000		15,000
Defense-Wide	KANSAS	FORT RILEY	HOSPITAL ADDITION/ALTERATION	52,000		52,000
Army Reserve	KANSAS	DODGE CITY	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND	8,100		8,100
Air Guard	KANSAS	Smoky Hill ANG Range	Smoky Hill Range Support Facility		7,100	7,100

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Chemical Demil	KENTUCKY	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PH IX	57,218	10,000	67,218
Chemical Demil	KENTUCKY	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	BLUE GRASS DEPOT DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD	12,000		12,000
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	BATTALION COMPLEX	37,000		37,000
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	8,600		8,600
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	TRAINING SUPPORT CENTER	15,513		15,513
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	47,000		47,000
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	School Age Services Center		10,000	10,000
Defense-Wide	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC	24,000		24,000
Defense-Wide	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21,400		21,400
Defense-Wide	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	SOF TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	15,000		15,000
Army	LOUISIANA	FORT POLK	UNIT OPERATIONS FACILITIES	29,000		29,000
Air Force	LOUISIANA	Barksdale AFB	Security Forces Complex		14,600	14,600
Navy	MAINE	Portsmouth Naval Shipyard	Dry Dock #3 Waterfront Support Facility		20,660	20,660
Army Guard	MAINE	BANGOR	REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE PHASE 1	20,000		20,000
Navy	MARYLAND	INDIAN HEAD	SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT UPGRADES	13,930		13,930
Navy	MARYLAND	NSWC, Indian Head	Energetics Systems and Technology Lab Complex		12,050	12,050
Navy	MARYLAND	SUITLAND	NATIONAL MARITIME INTEL CENTER (INCREMENT III)	12,439		12,439
Air Force	MARYLAND	ANDREWS AFB	ADMIN FACILITY ADDITION	28,000		28,000
Air Force	MARYLAND	ANDREWS AFB	NCR RELOCATION - ADMIN FACILITY	49,648		49,648
Defense-Wide	MARYLAND	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	USAMRICD REPLACEMENT, INCREMENT I	23,750		23,750
Defense-Wide	MARYLAND	FORT DETRICK	USAMRIID STAGE I, INCREMENT III	209,000		209,000
Defense-Wide	MARYLAND	FORT MEADE	SOUTH CAMPUS UTILITY PLANT PHASE 1	31,000		31,000
Army Guard	MARYLAND	EDGEWOOD	AASF ADD/ALT	28,000		28,000
Army Guard	MARYLAND	SALISBURY	READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT	9,800		9,800
Army Reserve	MARYLAND	BALTIMORE	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	11,600		11,600
Army Guard	MASSACHUSETTS	METHUEN	READINESS CENTER, ADD/ALT (ADRS)	21,000		21,000
Air Guard	MASSACHUSETTS	Otis ANG Base	Digital Ground Station Phase 1		14,300	14,300
Army Reserve	MASSACHUSETTS	FORT DEVENS	SHOOTHOUSE	1,900		1,900
Army	MICHIGAN	Detroit Arsenal	Access Control Point		6,100	6,100
Army Guard	MICHIGAN	Camp Grayling	Barracks Replacement, Phase I		16,943	16,943
Army Guard	MICHIGAN	Camp Grayling	Infantry Squad Battle Course		2,000	2,000
Army Reserve	MICHIGAN	SAGINAW	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND	11,500		11,500
Army Guard	MINNESOTA	ARDEN HILLS	READINESS CENTER	15,000		15,000
Air Guard	MINNESOTA	Duluth 148th FW Base	Fuel Cell Hangar		4,500	4,500
Navy	MISSISSIPPI	GULFPORT	25 NAVAL CONSTRUCTION REGIMENT HQ FACILITY	6,900		6,900
Navy	MISSISSIPPI	Gulfport	Battalion Maintenance Facility & Equip Yard		5,870	5,870
Navy	MISSISSIPPI	NAS Meridian	Fitness Center		6,340	6,340
Air Force	MISSISSIPPI	COLUMBUS AFB	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	8,100		8,100

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Air Force	MISSISSIPPI	Keesler AFB	Indoor Firing Range		6,600	6,600
Air Guard	MISSISSIPPI	Gulfport-Biloxi IAP	Relocate Munitions Storage Complex		3,400	3,400
Army	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	TRAINING SUPPORT CENTER	18,500		18,500
Army	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	URBAN ASSAULT COURSE	2,350		2,350
Army	MISSOURI	Fort Leonard Wood	Mine Detection Training Facility and K-9 Kennel		10,800	10,800
Defense-Wide	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	PRIMARY CARE CLINIC ADDITION/ALTERATION	22,000		22,000
Army Reserve	MISSOURI	WELDON SPRINGS	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	11,700		11,700
Air Force	MONTANA	Malmstrom AFB	Upgrade Weapons Storage Area, Phase 1		10,000	10,000
Air Force	NEBRASKA	Offutt AFB	38th Recon Squadron Facility		11,800	11,800
Air Force	NEVADA	CREECH AFB	UAS 432 WING HQ MISSION SUPT FACILITY	7,000		7,000
Air Force	NEVADA	CREECH AFB	UAS DINING HALL	9,000		9,000
Air Force	NEVADA	CREECH AFB	UAS FLIGHT SIM & ACADEMICS FACILITY	9,800		9,800
Air Force	NEVADA	CREECH AFB	UAS MAIN GATE/SEWER TRANSFER FAC/INFRASTRUCT	6,500		6,500
Air Force	NEVADA	CREECH AFB	UAS OPS FACILITY	16,200		16,200
Air Force	NEVADA	NELLIS AFB	F-16 AGGRESSOR HANGAR/AIRCRAFT MAINT UNIT	30,800		30,800
Air Force	NEVADA	NELLIS AFB	F-16 AGRESSOR SQUADRON OPS/INFRASTRUCTURE	17,500		17,500
Air Force	NEVADA	NELLIS AFB	F-35 AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS	5,000		5,000
Air Force	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	Airfield Fire Rescue Station, Nellis		9,800	9,800
Army Guard	NEVADA	Elko	Readiness Center		11,375	11,375
Army Reserve	NEVADA	LAS VEGAS	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	33,900		33,900
Navy	NEW JERSEY	NWS Earle	Main Gate Security Improvements		8,160	8,160
Navy	NEW JERSEY	LAKEHURST	ADVANCED ARRESTING GEAR TEST SITE	15,440		15,440
Army Reserve	NEW JERSEY	FORT DIX	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	3,825		3,825
Air Force	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	F-22 ALTER HANGAR FOR LO/CRF	14,500		14,500
Air Force	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	F-22A ADAL A/C MAINT UNIT	1,050		1,050
Air Force	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	F-22A ADAL FLIGHT SIMULATOR FAC	3,150		3,150
Air Force	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	F-22A ADAL JET ENGINE MAINTENANCE SHOP	2,150		2,150
Air Force	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	F-22A AEROSPACE GROUND EQUIP FAC	4,600		4,600
Defense-Wide	NEW MEXICO	CANNON AFB	SOF MAINTENANCE HANGAR	18,100		18,100
Defense-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	CV-22 Flight Simulator Facility		8,300	8,300
Defense-Wide	NEW MEXICO	KIRTLAND AFB	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANKS	14,400		14,400
Army	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM	BRIGADE COMPLEX-BARRACKS	29,000		29,000
Army	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM	BRIGADE COMPLEX-BARRACKS	24,000		24,000
Army	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	37,000		37,000
Army	NEW YORK	U S MILITARY ACADEMY	SCIENCE FACILITY, PHASE 1	67,000		67,000
Army Guard	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM	MANEUVER AREA TRAINING EQUIP SITE PH3	11,000		11,000
Army Guard	NEW YORK	QUEENSBURY	FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP	5,900		5,900
Air Guard	NEW YORK	Gabreski Airport, Westhampton	Pararescue Facility, 106th Rescue Wing, Phase 2		7,500	7,500

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Air Guard	NEW YORK	HANCOCK FIELD	TFI - REAPER IOC/FOC BEDDOWN	5,000		5,000
Army Reserve	NEW YORK	KINGSTON	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND	13,494		13,494
Army Reserve	NEW YORK	SHOREHAM	ADD/ALT ARMY RESERVE CENTER	15,031		15,031
Army Reserve	NEW YORK	STATEN ISLAND	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	18,550		18,550
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	ACCESS ROADS PHASE 1	13,200		13,200
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	TRAINING SUPPORT CENTER	20,500		20,500
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	UTILITY UPGRADE (CAMP MACKALL)	3,200		3,200
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - CAMP JOHNSON	38,230		38,230
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - CAMP JOHNSON	23,760		23,760
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - FRENCH CREEK	33,960		33,960
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - HADNOT POINT	39,890		39,890
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - HADNOT POINT	39,320		39,320
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS- COURTHOUSE BAY	35,890		35,890
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS- HADNOT POINT	42,950		42,950
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	13,960		13,960
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	CONSOLIDATED MESSHALL-HADNOT POINT (200 AREA)	25,000		25,000
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	INFANTRY PLATOON BATTLE COURSE - SR1	18,250		18,250
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	MESSHALL - HADNOT POINT (400 AREA)	21,660		21,660
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	MOD K-RANGES (PHASE 2)	20,220		20,220
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CHERRY POINT MCAS	2ND MAW COMMAND OPERATIONS FACILITY	30,480		30,480
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CHERRY POINT MCAS	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	30,100		30,100
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CHERRY POINT MCAS	ENGINEERING PRODUCT SUPPORT FACILITY	16,840		16,840
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	NEW RIVER	AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON ADDITION	6,830		6,830
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	NEW RIVER	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	36,740		36,740
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	NEW RIVER	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - MCAS	25,620		25,620
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	NEW RIVER	ENLISTED DINING FACILITY	17,090		17,090
Air Force	NORTH CAROLINA	Seymour Johnson AFB	Consolidated Support Center		12,200	12,200
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	28,170		28,170
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	NEW INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL (IRWIN)	27,945		27,945
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	NEW MIDDLE SCHOOL	22,356		22,356
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF EXPAND TRAINING COMPOUND	14,200		14,200
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF HEADQUARTERS FACILITY	14,600		14,600
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF SECURITY/FORCE PROTECTION	4,150		4,150
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF TRAINING FACILITY	5,300		5,300
Army Reserve	NORTH CAROLINA	RALEIGH	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND	25,581		25,581
Air Force	NORTH DAKOTA	Grand Forks AFB	Fire Station		13,000	13,000
Army	OKLAHOMA	FORT SILL	TRAINING COMPLEX UPGRADE	63,000		63,000
Air Force	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	Consol Digital Airport Surveill Radar (DASR)/RAPCON Facil		10,200	10,200

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Air Force	OKLAHOMA	TINKER AFB	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	48,600		48,600
Defense-Wide	OKLAHOMA	ALTUS AFB	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE DIKES	2,850		2,850
Defense-Wide	OKLAHOMA	TINKER AFB	MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	65,000		65,000
Air Force Reserve	OKLAHOMA	TINKER AFB	AFR SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE HANGAR	9,900		9,900
Army	PENNSYLVANIA	CARLISLE BARRACKS	MUSEUM SUPPORT FACILITY	13,400		13,400
Army	PENNSYLVANIA	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	ELECTRONICS MAINTENANCE SHOP	15,000		15,000
Army	PENNSYLVANIA	Letterkenny Army Depot	Upgrade Munition Igloos Phase 2		7,500	7,500
Navy	PENNSYLVANIA	PHILADELPHIA	FULL SCALE ELECTRIC DRIVE TEST FACILITY	22,020		22,020
Defense-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	PHILADELPHIA	CONVERT WAREHOUSE TO ADMIN SPACE	1,200		1,200
Army Reserve	PENNSYLVANIA	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	14,914		14,914
Navy	RHODE ISLAND	NEWPORT	FITNESS FACILITY	29,900		29,900
Army Guard	RHODE ISLAND	North Kingstown	Army Aviation Support Facility (addition to FY2008)		5,000	5,000
Air Guard	RHODE ISLAND	Quonset State Airport	Construct Air Traffic Control Tower		7,700	7,700
Army	SOUTH CAROLINA	FORT JACKSON	TRAINING COMPLEX UPGRADE	30,000		30,000
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	EOD/ORDNANCE OPERATIONS FACILITY	5,940		5,940
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	PARRIS ISLAND	THIRD RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION (PHASE 2)	36,400		36,400
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	PARRIS ISLAND	THIRD RECRUIT TRAINING BN COMPLEX (PHASE 3)	28,350		28,350
Air Force	SOUTH CAROLINA	Shaw AFB	Physical Fitness Center		9,900	9,900
Air Force	SOUTH CAROLINA	CHARLESTON AFB	C-17 FLIGHT SIMULATOR ADDITION	4,500		4,500
Army Guard	SOUTH CAROLINA	ANDERSON	READINESS CENTER	12,000		12,000
Army Guard	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT	3,400		3,400
Army Guard	SOUTH CAROLINA	EASTOVER	JOINT FORCES HEADQUARTERS	28,000		28,000
Air Force	SOUTH DAKOTA	Ellsworth AFB	Base Entry and Perimeter Gates		11,000	11,000
Army Guard	SOUTH DAKOTA	RAPID CITY	ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER	29,000		29,000
Army Guard	SOUTH DAKOTA	Camp Rapid	Barracks/Dining/Admin and Parking Complex Phase I		14,463	14,463
Air Guard	TENNESSEE	Knoxville	Replace Squadron Operations		8,000	8,000
Army Reserve	TENNESSEE	CHATTANOOGA	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	10,600		10,600
Army	TEXAS	CORPUS CHRISTI	DYNAMIC COMPONENT REBUILD FACILITY	39,000		39,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	BARRACKS & DINING	148,000		148,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	BARRACKS & DINING	148,000		148,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	BATTALION COMPLEX	34,000		34,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	BRIGADE/BATTALION HQS	44,000		44,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	BRIGADE/BATTALION HQS	44,000		44,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	CHAPEL	9,000		9,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITIES, BCT	90,000		90,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITIES, BCT 1	90,000		90,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX	42,000		42,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	INFRASTRUCTURE, IBCT1	98,000		98,000

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	INFRASTRUCTURE, IBCT2	100,000		100,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	TRAINING SUPPORT CENTER	12,600		12,600
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	10,200		10,200
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOPS	81,000		81,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOPS	81,000		81,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT HOOD	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	32,000		32,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT SAM HOUSTON	TRAINEE BARRACKS COMPLEX	96,000		96,000
Army	TEXAS	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	MANEUVER SYSTEMS SUSTAINMENT CTR, PHASE 1	6,900		6,900
Air Force	TEXAS	Dyess AFB	Multipurpose C-130 Maintenance Hangar		21,000	21,000
Air Force	TEXAS	FORT HOOD	TACP JOINT AIR GROUND CTR	10,800		10,800
Air Force	TEXAS	LACKLAND AFB	BMT RECRUIT DORMITORY	75,515		75,515
Defense-Wide	TEXAS	FORT SAM HOUSTON	MEDICAL INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITY	13,000		13,000
Army Reserve	TEXAS	SINTON	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	9,700		9,700
Air Force	UTAH	HILL AFB	F-22A HEAVY MAINT FAC & COMPOSITE BACK SHOP	36,000		36,000
Air Force	UTAH	Hill AFB	Three-bay Fire Station		5,400	5,400
Defense-Wide	UTAH	HILL AFB	HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	20,400		20,400
Army Guard	UTAH	CAMP WILLIAMS	AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT	17,500		17,500
Army Guard	VERMONT	Ethan Allen Firing Range Jericho	Readiness Center		10,200	10,200
Air Guard	VERMONT	BURLINGTON IAP	SECURITY FORCES AND COMM FACILITY	6,600		6,600
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT BELVOIR	EMERGENCY SERVICES CENTER	7,200		7,200
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT EUSTIS	UNIT OPERATIONS FACILITIES	14,400		14,400
Army	VIRGINIA	Fort Eustis	Training Support Center, Phase 1		13,600	13,600
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT LEE	DINING FACILITY	10,600		10,600
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT LEE	TRAINEE BARRACKS COMPLEX	90,000		90,000
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT MYER	BARRACKS	14,000		14,000
Navy	VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	10,500		10,500
Navy	VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	NORFOLK HARBOR CHANNEL DREDGING	42,830		42,830
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR, TYPE II	27,750		27,750
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON (GREEN SIDE)	36,280		36,280
Navy	VIRGINIA	Marine Corps Base Quantico	Marine Corps Officer Candidate School HQ Facility		5,980	5,980
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	INFRASTRUCTURE - RUSSELL ROAD (PHASE 1)	7,450		7,450
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	INSTRUCTION FACILITY ADDITION - TBS	6,350		6,350
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	INSTRUCTION FACILITY TBS (PHASE I)	25,200		25,200
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	MESS HALL - OCS	13,750		13,750
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	STUDENT QUARTERS - TBS (PHASE 3)	27,530		27,530
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	CRANEY ISLAND	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANKS	39,900		39,900
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	DAM NECK	SOF OPERATIONAL FACILITY INCREMENT II	31,000		31,000
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	FORT STORY	SOF SMALL ARMS RANGE	11,600		11,600

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	PENTAGON	PENTAGON ATHLETIC CENTER PHASE 2	6,967		6,967
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	PENTAGON	PFPA HAZMAT FACILITY	16,401		16,401
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	PENTAGON	RAVEN ROCK WEST POWER PLANT	15,572		15,572
Army Guard	VIRGINIA	ARLINGTON	ARLINGTON HALL READINESS CENTER PHASE 2	15,500		15,500
Army Guard	VIRGINIA	FORT PICKETT	MULTIPURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE	2,950		2,950
Naval Reserve	VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	EODMU 10 OPERATIONS FACILITY	8,170		8,170
Naval Reserve	VIRGINIA	WILLIAMSBURG	ORDNANCE HANDLING CARGO OPS TRAINING SUPPORT	12,320		12,320
Army	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	BATTALION COMPLEX	54,000		54,000
Army	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	BATTALION COMPLEX	47,000		47,000
Army	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	BRIGADE COMPLEX	30,000		30,000
Army	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	BRIGADE COMPLEX, INCREMENT III	102,000		102,000
Army	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	27,000		27,000
Navy	WASHINGTON	BANGOR	LIMITED AREA PROD & STORAGE COMPLEX (INCR V)	50,700		50,700
Navy	WASHINGTON	WHIDBEY ISLAND	HANGAR 5 RECAPITALIZATION (INCREMENT II)	34,000		34,000
Air Force	WASHINGTON	MCCHORD AFB	C-17 ADAL FLIGHT SIMULATOR	5,500		5,500
Defense-Wide	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	SOF RANGER BATTALION COMPLEX	38,000		38,000
Army Guard	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	AVIATION READINESS CENTER	32,000		32,000
Air Guard	WASHINGTON	McChord AFB	262 Information Warfare Aggressor SQ (IWAS) Facility		8,600	8,600
Army Reserve	WASHINGTON	SEATTLE	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	37,500		37,500
Air Guard	WEST VIRGINIA	Yeager Airport, Charleston	Fuel System/Corrosion Control Hangar		27,000	27,000
Army Reserve	WISCONSIN	FORT MCCOY	AUTO QUALIFICATION TRAINING RANGE	4,000		4,000
Air Guard	WISCONSIN	Truax Field	Communications and Audio Visual Training Facility		6,300	6,300
Air Force	WYOMING	F E WARREN AFB	RENOVATE HISTORIC DORMITORY	8,600		8,600
Air Guard	WYOMING	CHEYENNE MAP	TFI - C-130 SQDN OPERATIONS FACILITY	7,000		7,000
Army	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	BULK FUEL STORAGE & SUPPLY, PHASE 8	26,000		26,000
Army	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	BULK FUEL STORAGE & SUPPLY, PHASE 5	22,000		22,000
Army	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	SOF HQ COMPLEX	19,000		19,000
Air Force	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	C-130 MAINTENANCE HANGAR	27,400		27,400
Air Force	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	CARGO HANDLING AREA EXPANSION	8,800		8,800
Air Force	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	REFUELER RAMP	21,000		21,000
Navy	CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY NS	CONSOLIDATED FITNESS COMPLEX	20,600		20,600
Defense-Wide	CZECH REPUBLIC	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	BMDS-EUROPEAN MIDCOURSE RADAR SITE	108,560		108,560
Navy	DIEGO GARCIA	DIEGO GARCIA	WHARF UPGRADE AND WAREHOUSE	35,060		35,060
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	12,830	-12,830	0
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER	AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	15,250		15,250
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER	TELECOM FACILITY	3,330		3,330
Army	GERMANY	KATTERBACH	AIRCRAFT/VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	19,000		19,000

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army	GERMANY	WIESBADEN MIL CMTY	COMMAND & BATTLE CENTER	119,000	-42,600	76,400
Defense-Wide	GERMANY	GERMERSHEIM	LOGISTICS DISTRIBUTION CENTER EUROPE	48,000		48,000
Defense-Wide	GREECE	SOUDA BAY	FUEL STORAGE TANKS AND PIPELINE REPL	27,761		27,761
Navy	GUAM	GUAM	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS, MAIN BASE	62,360		62,360
Navy	GUAM	GUAM	KILO WHARF EXTENSION (INCREMENT II)	50,912		50,912
Navy	GUAM	GUAM	WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM & UPGRADE	26,070		26,070
Air Force	GUAM	ANDERSEN AFB	COMBAT COMM MAINTENANCE FACILITY	5,200		5,200
Defense-Wide	GUAM	GUAM	CENTRAL UTILITY PLANT	30,000		30,000
Army	ITALY	VICENZA	BRIGADE COMPLEX-BARRACKS/COMMUNITY, INCR II	15,000		15,000
Army	ITALY	VICENZA	BRIGADE COMPLEX-OPERATIONS SPT FAC, INCR II	15,000		15,000
Army	JAPAN	CAMP ZAMA	SENSITIVE COMPARTMENTED INFORMATION FACILITY	2,350		2,350
Army	JAPAN	SAGAMIHARA	BATTLE COMMAND TRAINING CENTER	17,500		17,500
Army	KOREA	CAMP HUMPHREYS	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	20,000		20,000
Air Force	KYRGYZSTAN	MANAS AIR BASE	HOT CARGO PAD	6,000		6,000
Defense-Wide	POLAND	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	BMDS-EUROPEAN INTERCEPTOR SITE	132,600		132,600
Air Force	QATAR	AL UDEID	CAS PARKING APRON	59,638	-59,638	0
Defense-Wide	QATAR	AL UDEID	SOF TRAINING RANGE	9,200		9,200
Air Force	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF LAKENHEATH	LARGE VEHICLE INSPECTION STATION	7,400		7,400
Air Force	CLASSIFIED	CLASSIFIED LOCATION	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROJECT	891		891
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	DATA CENTER	28,000	-28,000	0
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	JOINT OPERATIONS & SUPPORT COMPLEX, PHASE 1	17,800		17,800
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	P-8A INTEGRATED TRAINING CENTER	48,220		48,220
Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	COMMON BATTLEFIELD AIRMAN TRAINING COMPLEX	15,000		15,000
Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UAS FIELD TRAINING UNIT MAINT COMPLEX	22,000		22,000
Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UAS FIELD TRAINING UNIT OPS COMPLEX	15,500		15,500
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	ARMY-NAVY/TRANSPORT RADAR SURVEILLANCE-2 #3	25,500	-25,500	0
NSIP	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	NATO	NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM	240,867		240,867
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	HOST NATION SUPPORT	24,000		24,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	23,000		23,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	176,807		176,807
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	239,128		239,128
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	13,670		13,670
Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	70,494	2,610	73,104
Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	15,000		15,000
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION	10,000		10,000
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	ENERGY CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	80,000		80,000
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (TMA)	3,990		3,990

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (NSA)	20,221		20,221
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (MDA)	14,889		14,889
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (SOCOM)	16,833		16,833
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (OSD)	43,768		43,768
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (DODEA)	1,830		1,830
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (SOCOM)	7,697		7,697
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (MDA)	3,457		3,457
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (OSD)	3,000		3,000
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (DODEA)	382		382
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (JCS)	9,228		9,228
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (TMA)	58,252		58,252
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (DLA)	4,099		4,099
Army Guard	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	48,796	2,944	51,740
Army Guard	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	11,800		11,800
Air Guard	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,200		7,200
Air Guard	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	5,374	1,950	7,324
Army Reserve	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	13,963		13,963
Army Reserve	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,100		3,100
Naval Reserve	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,045		2,045
Air Force Reserve	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,922	900	4,822
Air Force Reserve	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,443		5,443

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
FamHouse Con Navy	CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY NS	REPLACE BARGO HOUSING (48)	22,385		22,385
FamHouse Con Navy	CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY NS	REPLACE GRANADILLO CIRCLE HOUSING (38)	16,547		16,547
FamHouse Con Navy	CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY NS	REPLACE GRANADILLO POINT HOUSING (60)	23,666		23,666
FamHouse Con Army	GERMANY	WEISBADEN	FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION	32,000		32,000
FamHouse Con Army	GERMANY	WIESBADEN AB	FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION	20,000		20,000
FamHouse Con Army	GERMANY	WIESBADEN AB	FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION	43,000		43,000
FamHouse Con Army	GERMANY	WIESBADEN AB	FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION	38,000		38,000
FamHouse Con Army	KOREA	CAMP HUMPHREYS	FAMILY HOUSING NEW CONSTRUCTION	125,000		125,000
FamHouse Con AF	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF LAKENHEATH	REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING (182 UNITS)	71,828		71,828
FamHouse Con Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS (1608 UNITS)	420,001		420,001
FamHouse Con Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FAMILY HOUSING PLANNING AND DESIGN	579		579
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	113,017		113,017
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	OPERATIONS	124,780		124,780
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,241		1,241
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING	192,849		192,849
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	252,189		252,189
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS	32,034		32,034
FamHouse Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	318,011		318,011
FamHouse Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FAMILY HOUSING PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,169		2,169
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	44,068		44,068
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	15,036		15,036
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	60,063		60,063
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	655		655
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	SERVICES ACCOUNT	13,347		13,347
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING	130,261		130,261
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	87,074		87,074
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS	25,558		25,558
FamHouse Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	316,343		316,343
FamHouse Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FAMILY HOUSING PLANNING AND DESIGN	7,708		7,708
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	100,997		100,997
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	1,559		1,559
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	56,837		56,837
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	SERVICES ACCOUNT	20,166		20,166
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	42,189		42,189
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,999		1,999
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING ACCOUNT	565		565
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING ACCOUNT	93,681		93,681

FY2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account Title	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT	2,142		2,142
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE (RMPA & RMPC)	225,770		225,770
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	DEBT ACCOUNT	1		1
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	HOUSING PRIVATIZATION	53,559		53,559
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	OPERATIONS	35		35
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING (NSA)	10,407		10,407
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	70		70
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT (DIA)	4,359		4,359
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING (DIA)	33,066		33,066
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	346		346
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT (DLA)	38		38
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	SERVICES ACCOUNT	33		33
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	382		382
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	495		495
FHIF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND	850		850
HOAP	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	4,500		4,500
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	ARMY VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, ARMY	72,855		72,855
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	NAVY VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, NAVY	178,700		178,700
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	AIR FORCE VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, AIR FORCE	139,155		139,155
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	DEF-WIDE VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, DEFENSE-WIDE	2,667		2,667
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	ARMY VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE 2005, ARMY	4,486,178		4,486,178
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	NAVY VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE 2005, NAVY	871,492		871,492
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	AIR FORCE VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE 2005, AIR FORCE	1,072,925		1,072,925
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	DEF-WIDE VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE 2005, DEFENSE-WIDE	2,634,791		2,634,791
			GRAND TOTAL	**24,400,239**	**405,013**	**24,805,252**

Short title (sec. 2001)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate division B of this Act as the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009.

Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2002)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the expiration date for authorizations in this Act for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, as October 1, 2011, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2012, whichever is later.

Effective date (sec. 2003)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, and XXIX of this Act take effect on October 1, 2008 or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXI—ARMY

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $4.6 billion for military construction and $1.4 billion for family housing for the Army for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $4.6 billion for military construction and $1.4 billion for family housing for fiscal year 2009.

The committee has eliminated the military construction funding proposed for a commissary at Fort Riley, Kansas, which is inconsistent with the longstanding practice of not using military construction funding for revenue-generating non-appropriated fund projects.

The committee has fully authorized the construction of a command and battle center at Weisbaden, Germany, but has reduced the fiscal year 2009 funding for this project by $42.6 million. This reduction is made without prejudice. The committee expects the Army to request the balance of the funding needed to complete this project in the fiscal year 2010 budget request.

The committee has fully funded the Army's request for $125.0 million to begin construction of a family housing complex at Camp Humphreys in the Republic of Korea. The committee understands the Army is pursuing leasing options with the private sector as an alternative way to meet this requirement.

Should this alternative approach show sufficient promise and maturity before the conference report on this legislation is enacted, the committee is open to alternative uses of these construction funds, if such alternative uses would more quickly and effectively fulfill the requirement for accompanied housing in Korea.

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the active component of the Army for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2009. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2009 to improve existing Army family housing units.

Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Army authorized for construction for fiscal year 2009 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Army. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2105)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain Army fiscal year 2005 military construction projects until October 1, 2009, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2106)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization for an Army fiscal year 2006 military construction project at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, until October 1, 2009, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later. This extension was requested by the Department of Defense.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $3.1 billion for military construction and $758.9 million for family housing for the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $3.1 billion for military construction and $758.9 million for family housing for fiscal year 2009.

The committee has deleted funding for a classified project for which adequate justification was not provided.

The committee has also deleted the funding requested for an aircraft maintenance hangar in Djibouti. The committee values the relationship between the United States and the Government of Djibouti, and supports the defensive and offensive operational objectives of Combined Joint Task Force—Horn of Africa (CJTF–HOA) currently operating at Camp Lemonier, Djibouti. However, the committee reiterates two concerns expressed by the conferees in the statement of managers to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). First, the United States still lacks a long-term lease for our facilities in Djibouti, thus calling into question the wisdom of making long-term investments at this time. The committee believes such improved lease terms can be achieved.

Second, a coherent strategy of basing and operations for the new U.S. Africa Command remains a work in progress. The committee believes such a strategy should be in place to provide a strategic context for investment plans in Djibouti or other nations in Africa. While the commander of U.S. Africa Command has stated that CJTF–HOA will have an "enduring" presence in Djibouti, the President has stated that it is not our intent to have military bases in Africa. The committee believes plans for the U.S. Africa Command require clarification before Congress funds construction of enduring facilities in Africa.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Navy and Marine Corps military construction projects for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2202)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2009. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2009 to improve existing Navy family housing units.

Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Department of the Navy authorized for construction for fiscal year 2009 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty components of the Navy and the Marine Corps. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2005 project inside the United States (sec. 2205)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108–375) to increase the project authorization for a strategic weapons facility at Bangor, Washington, by $16.7 million. This increase was requested by the Department of Defense.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2007 projects inside the United States (sec. 2206)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–364) to increase the authorization for a project at Suitland, Maryland by $8.3 million and the authorization for a project at Whidbey Island, Washington by $2.8 million. These increases were requested by the Department of Defense.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $934.9 million for military construction and $995.3 million for family housing for the Air Force in fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1.1 billion for military construction and $995.3 million for family housing for fiscal year 2009.

The committee has deleted funding for a close air support parking apron project in Qatar. The committee notes that the Department of Defense is now requesting that this project be funded using fiscal year 2008 supplemental funds.

The committee is concerned that the very low levels of funding contained in the fiscal year 2009 future years defense program for the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard do not represent adequate investment levels in the facilities of the reserve components of the Air Force. The committee urges the Air Force to allocate more funding to modernizing its reserve component facilities than the levels projected in this year's plan.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Air Force military construction projects for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2009. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2009 to improve existing Air Force family housing units.

Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Air Force authorized for construction for fiscal year 2009 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Air Force. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2006 projects (sec. 2305)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain Air Force fiscal year 2006 military construction projects until October 1, 2009, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2306)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain Air Force fiscal year 2005 military construction projects until October 1, 2009, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense.

Budget Item

Planning and design, Air Force

The committee directs that the amount of $1.8 million, added to the authorization of appropriations for planning and design for the Air Force be used to complete the design of a logistics readiness center at Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, and that $810,000 added to this same account be used to complete the design of a missile service complex at F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $1.8 billion for military construction for the defense agencies, $134.3 million for chemical demilitarization construction, and $54.6 million for family housing for the defense agencies, the Family Housing Improvement Fund, and the Homeowners Assistance Program for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1.8 billion for military construction, $144.3 million for chemical demilitarization construction, and $54.6 million for the three family housing programs for fiscal year 2009.

The committee bill would authorize the construction of a European-based missile defense system, including an interceptor site in Poland and a radar site in the Czech Republic, subject to the conditions of section 232 of this Act that would restrict the obligation of funds for this system until agreements are ratified by the host nations. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense may be relying too heavily on the prime contractor to carry out all the major phases of this system, from requirements definition to construction to operation of the system. The committee urges the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to carefully review the acquisition process being used for this program, and to ensure the Department of Defense complies with the requirements of section 2851 of title 10, United States Code.

Finally, the committee has eliminated the funding requested for a transportable missile defense radar. The committee found the justification for this request inadequate.

Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations

Authorized defense agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Authorization of appropriations, defense agencies (sec. 2403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the military construction and family housing

projects of the defense agencies authorized for construction for fiscal year 2009 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the defense agencies. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2007 project (sec. 2404)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–364) to increase the construction authorization for a project at Fort Detrick, Maryland by $133.0 million. This increase was requested by the Department of Defense.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2405)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization for a fiscal year 2006 military construction project for the Defense Logistics Agency until October 1, 2009, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later. This extension was requested by the Department of Defense.

Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations

Authorized chemical demilitarization program construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the chemical demilitarization program for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorization of appropriations, chemical demilitarization construction, defense-wide (sec. 2412)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the chemical demilitarization projects authorized for construction for fiscal year 2009 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for chemical demilitarization military construction projects. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 1997 project (sec. 2413)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (division B of Public Law 104–201) to increase the construction authorization for the chemical demilitarization program at the Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado, by $223.0 million. This increase was requested by the Department of Defense.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2000 project (sec. 2414)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–65) to increase the construction authorization for the chemical demilitarization program at the Bluegrass Army Depot, Kentucky, by $201.7 million. This increase was requested by the Department of Defense.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriation of $240.9 million for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends an authorization of appropriation of $240.9 million for this program. The committee notes that a significant portion of the NATO Security Investment Program is currently devoted to support of the NATO mission in Afghanistan, and expects that a significant portion of the funding for fiscal year 2009 would be used to continue those efforts.

Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this title and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations of $240.9 million for the United States' contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2009.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $931.7 million for military construction in fiscal year 2009 for National Guard and reserve facilities. The committee recommends a total of $1.2 billion for military construction for the reserve components. The detailed funding recommendations are contained in the State list table included in this report.

Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army National Guard for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army Reserve for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air National Guard for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air Force Reserve for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorization of appropriations, Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the reserve component military construction projects authorized for construction for fiscal year 2009 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction projects for each of the reserve components of the military departments. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2006 projects (sec. 2607)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain Guard and reserve fiscal year 2006 military construction projects until October 1, 2009, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2005 project (sec. 2608)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for an Army National Guard fiscal year 2005 military construction project in California until October 1, 2009, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later. This extension was requested by the Department of Defense.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2008 project (sec. 2609)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2601 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–181) to increase the authorization for a project for the Army National Guard at North Kingstown, Rhode Island, by $5.0 million. This increase is necessary because of unforeseen increases in the cost of this project subsequent to the initial project authorization. The authorization of additional appropriations for this fiscal year 2008 project is included in the amount in section 2606(1) of this Act, and this additional funding is reflected in the table of fiscal year 2009 military construction authorizations in division B of the report accompanying this Act.

Budget Items

Planning and design, Army National Guard

The committee directs that the amount of $2.0 million, added to the authorization of appropriations for planning and design for the Army National Guard, be used to complete the design of a field maintenance shop in Las Vegas, Nevada; that $204,000 added to this account be used to complete the design of an infantry platoon battle course at Fort Chaffee, Arkansas; and that $682,000 added

to this account be used to complete the design of a readiness center at The Dalles, Oregon.

Planning and design, Air National Guard

The committee directs that the amount of $1.1 million, added to the authorization of appropriations for planning and design for the Air National Guard, be used to complete the design of a combat communications training complex at Springfield-Beckley Air National Guard Base, Ohio, and that $850,000 added to this account be used to complete the design of an apron and taxiway for the C–5 aircraft at Eastern West Virginia Regional Airport/Shepherd Field in Martinsburg, West Virginia.

Planning and design, Air Force Reserve

The committee directs that the amount of $900,000 added to the authorization of appropriations for planning and design for the Air Force Reserve be used to complete the design of phase 2 of the joint services lodging facility at the Youngstown Air Reserve Station, Ohio.

TITLE XXVII—BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACTIVITIES

Summary and explanation of tables

The budget request included $393.4 million for the ongoing cost of environmental remediation and other activities necessary to continue implementation of the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) rounds. The committee has authorized the amount requested for these activities in section 2701 of this Act.

In addition, the budget requested an authorization of appropriations of $9.1 billion for implementation of the 2005 BRAC round. Section 2703 of this Act would authorize the full $9.1 billion requested for BRAC activities in fiscal year 2009. Included in the $9.1 billion requested for BRAC is an authorization of appropriations for $7.2 billion in military construction projects that would be initiated in fiscal year 2009. The total of new full project authorizations, and increases in the total authorized cost of three previously authorized medical center projects, is $7.0 billion. Section 2702 of this Act provides the authorization for these projects.

The following table provides the specific amount authorized for each BRAC military construction project as well as the amount authorized for appropriations for all BRAC activities, including military construction, environmental costs, relocation and other operation and maintenance costs, permanent change of station costs for military personnel, and other BRAC costs. This table is incorporated by reference into this Act as provided in section 1002 of this Act.

TITLE XXVII - 2005 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ROUND
Fiscal Year 2009 Project Listing
(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Commission Recommendation	Location	State	Project Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Air Force	80,110	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Aircraft Support Equip Shop	3,000	3,000
Air Force	80,110	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Add to Aerial Port	1,900	1,900
Air Force	80,110	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Add to and Alter for Squad Ops and AMU	8,200	8,200
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Add to Combat Arms Maint. and Training Simulator	1,000	1,000
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Alter Bldg 8515 for Supply and Security Forces	5,600	5,600
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Base Engineer Complex	500	500
Air Force	80,110	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Fuel Cell/Corrosion Control Facility	22,000	22,000
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Medical Training Facility	5,400	5,400
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Operations and Training Facility	8,900	8,900
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Training Fire Station	2,500	2,500
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	1,500	1,500
Army	189	Redstone Arsenal	AL	Rotary Wing Center	46,000	46,000
Army	148	Redstone Arsenal	AL	AMC & USASAC Headquarters, Increment II	0	98,000
MDA	134	Redstone Arsenal	AL	Von Braun Complex Phase 3 Increment II	0	127,000
Army	13	Jonesboro	AR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	23,000	23,000
Army	13	NW Arkansas (Fayetteville)	AR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	25,000	25,000
Navy	137B	MCAS Miramar	CA	HRSC Consolidation	20,940	20,940
Navy	138	MCAS Miramar	CA	Construct & Alter Regional Confinement Facility	31,950	31,950
Navy	184	NAWS China Lake	CA	Weapons and Armament Facility #1	32,870	32,870
Navy	184	NAWS China Lake	CA	Renovate Facilities, Ordnance Area	9,270	9,270
Navy	184	NAWS China Lake	CA	Lab Renovation, Building 5	25,520	25,520
Navy	184	NAWS China Lake	CA	Ordnance Storage Facilities	12,110	12,110
Air Force	91	Buckley AFB	CO	BRAC AFR Training Facility	7,200	7,200
Air Force	143B	Buckley AFB	CO	BRAC ARPC Administrative	25,000	25,000
Army	15	AFRC Middletown	CT	Armed Forces Reserve Center	68,000	68,000
Army	15	Newtown Armory	CT	Armed Forces Reserve Center	66,800	66,800
Air Force	85	Bradley IAP AGS	CT	Upgrade A-10 Engine CIRF	1,100	1,100
Navy	149	Washington	DC	Navy Systems Management Activity Relocation	14,963	14,963
Navy	149	Washington	DC	Navy Systems Management Activity Warehouse	7,610	7,610

TITLE XXVII - 2005 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ROUND
Fiscal Year 2009 Project Listing
(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Commission Recommendation	Location	State	Project Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Army	169	Dover AFB	DE	Joint Medical Examiner Facility	52,000	52,000
Army	16	AFRC Newark	DE	Armed Forces Reserve Center	26,000	26,000
Army	4	Eglin AFB	FL	Special Forces Complex	148,000	148,000
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	BRAC F-35 Construction Haul Road	810	810
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	BRAC F-35 Duke Field Barriers	1,550	1,550
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	F-35 (JSF) Renovate Maintenance Dock B1318	3,810	3,810
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	F-35 (JSF) Renovate Maintenance Dock B1344	2,006	2,006
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	F-35 (JSF) Renovate Warehouse B1404	1,050	1,050
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	F-35 (JSF) Utility Infrastructure Upgrades	10,400	10,400
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	JSF IFT Dining Facility	5,000	5,000
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	JSF Marine Corps/Navy Hangar (Increment II)	0	21,800
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	JSF Munition Maintenance	8,900	8,900
Air Force	128	NAS Pensacola	FL	BRAC-CSO Bachelor Quarters	39,600	39,600
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Medical Facility, Increment I	157,000	80,000
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Heaquarters Bldg, Armor Officer Basic Crs	7,700	7,700
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	General Instruction Complex 2, Increment I	77,000	39,000
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Vehicle Maintenance Instruction Facility	63,000	63,000
Army	2	Fort Benning	GA	CIDC Field Operations Bldg	3,050	3,050
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Infrastructure Support, Increment II	0	74,000
Army	2	Fort Gillem	GA	Armed Forces Reserve Center, Add/Alt	12,000	12,000
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	BRAC Add/Alter Dental Clinic	1,000	1,000
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	BRAC Child Development Center	4,000	4,000
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	BRAC Community Activity Center	4,400	4,400
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	BRAC Transient Lodging Facility	1,800	1,800
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	BRAC Visiting Quarters	2,600	2,600
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	LOLA/Ramp/Gun Berm	2,550	2,550
Air Force	104	Hickam AFB	HI	Flight Simulator Training Facility	5,000	5,000
Air Force	116	Sioux Gateway APT	IA	KC-135 Test Apron and Taxiway	3,000	3,000
Army	19	Carbondale	IL	Armed Forces Reserve Center	11,800	11,800

TITLE XXVII - 2005 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ROUND
Fiscal Year 2009 Project Listing
(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Commission Recommendation	Location	State	Project Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Air Force	90	Capital APT AGS	IL	F-16 CIRF Sound Suppressor Foundation	1,600	1,600
Air Force	90	Capital APT AGS	IL	Upgrade F-16 Engine CIRF	6,200	6,200
Army	20	Greenwood (Indianapolis)	IN	Armed Forces Reserve Center	39,000	39,000
Air Force	112	McConnell AFB	KS	Munitions Delivery Road	1,450	1,450
Air Force	112	McConnell AFB	KS	STAMP Relocation	4,900	4,900
Air Force	112	McConnell AFB	KS	STRAPP Relocation	1,800	1,800
Army	143	Fort Knox	KY	Human Resources Command Complex, Increment III	0	55,400
Army	9	Fort Knox	KY	Army Reserve Center, Phase 2	28,000	28,000
Army	23	Shreveport	LA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	16,500	16,500
Air Force	119	New Orleans ARS	LA	Establish F-15 CIRF	5,100	5,100
Air Force	119	New Orleans ARS	LA	F-15 CIRF Sound Suppressor Foundation	1,500	1,500
Air Force	94	Barnes MPT AGS	MA	EOD Facility	1,750	1,750
Army	169	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	Medical Research Lab, Chem Bio Defense	27,000	27,000
Army	174	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	Non-Medical Chem Bio Fac	27,000	27,000
Army	136	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	Headquarters Bldg, Army Test and Eval Cmd	43,000	43,000
Army	5	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	C4ISR, Phase 2, Increment I	251,000	99,000
Army	5	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	C4ISR, Phase 1, Increment III	0	142,000
Army	187	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	Army Research Lab Vehicle Technology	35,000	35,000
Army	169	Bethesda	MD	Community Support Facilities	11,200	11,200
Army	130	Fort Meade	MD	MILDEP Adjudication Activities	51,000	51,000
Army	141	Fort Meade	MD	Defense Media Activity, Increment I	61,000	44,000
Air Force	129	Andrews AFB	MD	BRAC Construct Administrative Facility	53,000	53,000
Air Force	129	Andrews AFB	MD	BRAC Construct POV Lane, Pearl Harbor Gate	1,350	1,350
DISA	140	Fort Meade	MD	Construct DISA Building	130,128	130,128
TMA	169	Bethesda (WRNMMC)	MD	Medical Center Addition - Increment II	200,500	201,350
Navy	65	Inspector-Instructor Bath	ME	Facility Renovation Project	540	540
Navy	65	Portsmouth	ME	Special Purpose BN Ops Facility	2,900	2,900
Army	176	Detroit Arsenal	MI	Administrative Office Buildings, Increment I	99,000	56,000
Army	176	Detroit Arsenal	MI	Weapons Maintenance and Operations Fac	6,400	6,400

TITLE XXVII - 2005 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ROUND
Fiscal Year 2009 Project Listing
(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Commission Recommendation	Location	State	Project Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Air Force	95	Selfridge ANGB	MI	Add To Alert Complex	870	870
Army	127	Leonard Wood	MO	Prime Power School Complex	29,000	29,000
Air Force	94	Lambert - St Louis IAP AGS	MO	Relocate 157 AOG	4,000	4,000
TMA	173G	Keesler AFB	MS	Community Hospital	67,700	67,700
Army	3	Fort Bragg	NC	Headquarters Bldg, FORSCOM/USARC, Increment II	0	150,000
Army	30	Beatrice Readiness Center	NE	Armed Forces Reserve Center	13,290	13,290
Army	31	Pease AFRC	NH	Armed Forces Reserve Center	34,000	34,000
Army	53	Lakehurst AFRC	NJ	Equipment Concentration Site	27,000	27,000
Army	186	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	Packaging, Handling, Shipping & Trans Ctr	26,000	26,000
Army	186	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	Fuze Eng Cmplx/Explosive Magazines	25,000	25,000
Army	186	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	Guns & Weapons Systems Lab (Turret)	12,000	12,000
Army	186	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	Guns & Weapons Systems Tech Data	13,000	13,000
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	Aviation Supply Dept & AIMD Ops Facility	37,010	37,010
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	Munitions Maintenance Facility	1,800	1,800
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	NAVY VR Fleet Logistics Ops Facility (INCR II of II)	0	28,882
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	Aviation Support Facility Hangar Renovation	12,000	12,000
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	C-130 Flight Simulator Facility	4,260	4,260
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	Helicopters Hangars & MAG HQ (INCR II of II)	0	41,941
Air Force	89,100	Nellis AFB	NV	Construct Airfield Pavements	7,800	7,800
Army	34	AFRC Farmingdale	NY	Armed Forces Reserve Center, Increment II	0	27,000
Army	5	West Point	NY	US Military Academy Prep School, Increment I	198,000	100,000
Army	37	Columbus	OH	Armed Forces Reserve Center	65,218	65,218
Army	37	Mansfield	OH	Armed Forces Reserve Center	30,714	30,714
Air Force	187	Wright-Patterson AFB	OH	Add to and Alter Sensors Laboratory (AFRL/SN)	40,000	40,000
Air Force	170	Wright-Patterson AFB	OH	Pipeline Dormitory	12,600	12,600
Air Force	170	Wright-Patterson AFB	OH	USAFSAM (Increment II)	0	30,000
Army	73	Broken Arrow	OK	Armed Forces Reserve Center	12,100	12,100
Army	38	Broken Arrow	OK	Armed Forces Reserve Center	54,900	54,900
Army	38	Muskogee	OK	Armed Forces Reserve Center	23,000	23,000

TITLE XXVII - 2005 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ROUND
Fiscal Year 2009 Project Listing
(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Commission Recommendation	Location	State	Project Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Army	10	Fort Sill	OK	ADA Brigade Complex, Increment II	0	47,000
Army	39	Camp Wythcombe	OR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	45,500	45,500
Army	40	AFRC Lewisburg	PA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	24,000	24,000
Army	40	AFRC Williamsport	PA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	18,500	18,500
Army	40	AFRC Willow Grove	PA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	30,000	30,000
Navy	137B	Philadelphia	PA	Renovate Building 9	20,570	20,570
Navy	57	Tobyhanna Army Depot	PA	Radar Maintenance Facility	2,450	2,450
Navy	73	NMCRC Pittsburgh	PA	NMCRC Moundsville to NMCRC Pittsburgh, PA	4,920	4,920
Army	41	AFRC Fort Allen	PR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	19,500	19,500
Army	41	AFRC Fort Buchanan	PR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	28,000	28,000
Army	41	Ceiba	PR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	36,000	36,000
Army	41	Mayaguez	PR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	37,000	37,000
Navy	181	NS Newport	RI	Maritime Subsurface Sensor Operations Facility	15,320	15,320
Army	3	Shaw AFB	SC	Headquarters Building, Third US Army	102,000	102,000
Air Force	3A	Shaw AFB	SC	Dormitory Renovation for HQ 3rd Army	2,350	2,350
Army	43	Kingsport	TN	Armed Forces Reserve Center	19,300	19,300
Air Force	92	McGhee Tyson APT AGS	TN	Expand Parking Apron & Hydrant Sys	5,200	5,200
Army	44	AFRC Amarillo	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	24,000	24,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Division Headquarters Building	25,000	25,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Combat Aviation Brigade Complex, Increment III	0	103,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Brigade Combat Team Complex #3, Increment II	0	145,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility 1	79,000	79,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Community Infrastructure	32,000	32,000
Army	44	AFRC Dyess AFB	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	40,000	40,000
Army	44	AFRC Lewisville	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	22,000	22,000
Army	44	AFRC Round Rock	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	41,000	41,000
Army	44	AFRC San Marcos	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	29,000	29,000
Army	44	AFRC Tyler	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	29,000	29,000
Air Force	113	NAS-JRB Fort Worth	TX	BRAC AFR Add Avionics Shop	1,050	1,050

TITLE XXVII - 2005 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ROUND
Fiscal Year 2009 Project Listing
(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Commission Recommendation	Location	State	Project Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Air Force	113	NAS-JRB Fort Worth	TX	BRAC AFR ECM Shop	1,150	1,150
Air Force	111	Ellington Field	TX	Relocate 272 EIS HQ	2,650	2,650
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	Medical Field Training Complex	18,000	18,000
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	METC Medical Instructional Facility (Increment II)	0	96,400
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	METC Student Dorm #1 (Increment II)	0	41,200
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	METC Student Dorm #2 (Increment II	0	33,700
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	METC Student Dorm #3 (Increment I)	48,000	48,000
Air Force	170	Fort Sam Houston	TX	Tri-Service Research Facility	79,500	79,500
Air Force	170	Randolph AFB	TX	AF Audit Agency Relocation	1,336	1,336
TMA	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	San Antonio Military Medical Center (North) Incr II	162,700	294,074
TMA	172	Lackland AFB	TX	WHMC Rennovation of Ambulatory Care Center	51,000	51,000
Air Force	113	Hill AFB	UT	Renovate LANTIRN CIRF Bldgs 584 & 578	2,500	2,500
Army	129	Arlington Hall	VA	Armed Forces Reserve Center, Add/Alt	80,100	80,100
Army	5	Fort Belvoir	VA	Network Operations Center	8,300	8,300
Army	132	Fort Belvoir	VA	Infrastructure Support, Increment II	0	23,000
Army	168	Fort Belvoir	VA	Infrastructure Support, Increment II	0	48,000
Army	169	Fort Belvoir	VA	Infrastructure Support, Increment II	0	20,000
Army	168	Fort Belvoir	VA	Defense Access Roads, EPG	36,000	36,000
Army	8	Fort Eustis	VA	Headquarters Building, TRADOC	113,000	113,000
Army	122	Fort Lee	VA	USAF Transportation Management School	16,500	16,500
Army	121	Fort Lee	VA	Warrior Training Facilities	12,000	12,000
Army	121	Fort Lee	VA	Combat Service Support School, Ph 1, Increment III	0	6,348
Army	133	Fort Lee	VA	Administrative Building (DCMA)	23,000	23,000
Army	121	Fort Lee	VA	Combat Service Support School, Ph 2, Increment II	0	143,000
Army	123	Fort Lee	VA	JCOE for Culinary Training	17,000	17,000
NGA	168	Fort Belvoir	VA	NGA Headquarters Facility	324,900	743,868
TMA	169	Fort Belvoir	VA	Hospital Replacement - Increment III	249,000	197,750
WHS	133	Fort Belvoir	VA	Office Complex	0	274,330
Navy	131	MCB Quantico	VA	Collocate MILDEP Invest Agencies (INCR II of II)	0	213,109

TITLE XXVII - 2005 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ROUND
Fiscal Year 2009 Project Listing
(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Commission Recommendation	Location	State	Project Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Navy	138	Chesapeake	VA	Joint Regional Correctional Facility (INCR I of II)	33,000	33,000
Navy	138	MCB Quantico	VA	Pre-trial Detainee Facility	5,570	5,570
Navy	8	NS Norfolk	VA	Renovate V47 for Combat Craft Facility	7,140	7,140
DIA	167	Rivanna Sta (Charlottesville)	VA	Joint Use Intelligence Analysis Facility - Phase 2	3,000	21,000
Army	45	AFRC White River Junction	VT	Armed Forces Reserve Center	28,000	28,000
Army	46	AFRC Everett	WA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	28,000	28,000
Air Force	116	Fairchild AFB	WA	Relocate Combat Communications	12,800	12,800
Army	48	Madison	WI	Armed Forces Reserve Center	25,375	25,375
Army	73	Madison	WI	Armed Forces Reserve Center	6,600	6,600
Air Force	97	Gen Mitchell IAP AGS	WI	Add Hydrant Refueling Outlet	1,150	1,150
Air Force	-	Various	Worldwide	Planning and Design	4,173	4,173
Army	-	Various	Worldwide	Planning and Design	12,000	12,000
Army	-	Various	Worldwide	Planning and Design (GDPR)	3,700	3,700
				Total Military Construction and P&D	**5,141,743**	**7,224,795**
Army	-	Various	Various	Environmental	54,831	54,831
Navy	-	Various	Various	Environmental	8,627	8,627
Air Force	-	Various	Various	Environmental	11,486	11,486
Defense Wide	-	Various	Various	Environmental	0	0
				Total Environmental	**74,944**	**74,944**
Army	-	Various	Various	Operation and Maintenance	481,561	481,561
Navy	-	Various	Various	Operation and Maintenance	254,336	254,336
Air Force	-	Various	Various	Operation and Maintenance	253,272	253,272
Defense Wide	-	Various	Various	Operation and Maintenance	340,152	340,152
				Total Operation and Maintenance	**1,329,321**	**1,329,321**
Army	-	Various	Various	MilPers PCS	0	0
Navy	-	Various	Various	MilPers PCS	9,785	9,785

TITLE XXVII - 2005 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ROUND
Fiscal Year 2009 Project Listing
(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Commission Recommendation	Location	State	Project Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Air Force	-	Various	Various	MilPers PCS	6,786	6,786
Defense Wide	-	Various	Various	MilPers PCS	0	0
				Total MilPers PCS	**16,571**	**16,571**
Army	-	Various	Various	Other	157,991	157,991
Navy	-	Various	Various	Other	12,099	12,099
Air Force	-	Various	Various	Other	63,226	63,226
Defense Wide	-	Various	Various	Other	186,439	186,439
				Total Other	**419,755**	**419,755**
				TOTAL FY 2009 FUNDING FOR BRAC 2005	**6,982,334**	**9,065,386**

Authorization of appropriations for base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account 1990 (sec. 2701)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decisions of the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) rounds.

Authorized base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account 2005 (sec. 2702)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for fiscal year 2009 that are required to implement the decisions of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. The table included in this title of the report lists the specific amounts authorized at each location.

Authorization of appropriations for base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account 2005 (sec. 2703)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for military construction projects for fiscal year 2009 that are required to implement the decisions of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for BRAC military construction projects. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Modification of annual base closure and realignment reporting requirements (sec. 2704)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the reporting requirements for ongoing base closure actions to implement the decisions of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round by terminating the reporting requirements for actions regarding realigned bases with the report submitted with the budget request for fiscal year 2014, and for closing bases with the report submitted with the budget request for fiscal year 2016. The base closure round implementation period ends in September 2011. The committee believes the sunset dates proposed in this provision will provide adequate time to document the closure and realignment actions of the 2005 BRAC round.

Technical corrections regarding authorized cost and scope of work variations for military construction and military family housing projects related to base closures and realignments (sec. 2705)

The committee recommends a provision that would make two technical corrections to section 2705 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–181). These technical corrections reflect the original intent of the conferees.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

Increase in threshold for unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2801)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2805(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, by raising the cost ceiling of a construction project authorized by this section from $2.0 million to $3.0 million. This provision would also eliminate the separate threshold for projects intended solely to correct deficiencies that are life-threatening, health-threatening, or safety-threatening. The committee believes this unified threshold for unspecified minor construction projects will provide both greater flexibility and greater efficiency for the Department of Defense.

Authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects outside the United States (sec. 2802)

The committee recommends a provision that would further amend section 2808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), as amended, to extend for 1 additional year, through the end of fiscal year 2009, the temporary authority provided to the Secretary of Defense to use funds appropriated for operation and maintenance to carry out construction projects intended to satisfy certain operational requirements in support of a declaration of war, national emergency, or other contingency.

The provision would also modify current law to allow the Department of Defense to use this authority to construct temporary facilities in support of contingency operations at locations in Afghanistan where the United States expects to have an enduring presence. The provision would also extend from 30 to 45 days the time for the Department of Defense to transmit the quarterly reports on the use of this authority.

Improved oversight and accountability for military housing privatization initiative projects (sec. 2803)

The committee recommends a provision that would require enhanced oversight of, and reporting on, housing privatization projects. The provision would require greater interaction among the government and private entities involved in these projects, establish minimum bonding levels, specify procedures to be used in the case of significant schedule or performance deficiencies, ensure that the Department of Defense maintains a database of entities that achieve unsatisfactory performance ratings on such projects, and require the Department to identify and establish regulations to im-

plement best practices for monitoring the progress and performance of housing privatization projects.

The committee has long supported, and continues to support, the military housing privatization program. The committee is disappointed that privatization projects at Air Force installations in Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, and Massachusetts failed to meet schedule and other performance standards. However, the committee notes that the problems with these projects, all of which involved a single developer, do not and should not overshadow the enormous successes achieved by the military housing privatization initiative across the United States and across all the military departments over the past decade.

Intrinsic to the very idea of privatization is a more "hands off" approach by Congress and, to a lesser degree, by the Department of Defense, than is normally the case with acquisition or construction programs. The committee seeks to find an appropriate balance that will enhance oversight of this program and reduce the chance of the damaging failure of these projects being repeated, while still preserving the essential structure and benefits of the existing privatization program.

Leasing of military family housing to Secretary of Defense (sec. 2804)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to live in, and lease, a military family housing unit in the National Capital Region, and would prescribe the rental rate for such quarters.

The Department of Defense requested this provision in the belief that housing the Secretary of Defense in established quarters on a secure military installation is far more cost-effective than installing, maintaining, and protecting sensitive Department of Defense equipment, along with secure information facilities and security and detection systems, in private residences. The Department also believes that housing the Secretary on a military installation would substantially reduce the logistics burden, disruptions to the public, and costs associated with protecting the Secretary, and would provide the Secretary with quarters that are properly equipped for executive security and communications. The committee agrees with the Department's rationale.

Cost-benefit analysis of dissolution of Patrick Family Housing LLC (sec. 2805)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees a cost-benefit analysis regarding the dissolution of the Patrick Family Housing LLC created in connection with the privatization of military family housing at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, and would prohibit the Secretary from dissolving that entity until this analysis has been submitted.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

Participation in conservation banking programs (sec. 2811)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Department of Defense to participate in conservation mitigation bank programs. This authority would generally operate under the same terms and conditions as the existing wetlands mitigation bank authority contained in section 2694b of title 10, United States Code.

The committee believes this additional authority has the potential to enhance training and testing both for forces as they are currently stationed as well as for installations, such as those on Guam, where additional forces may be stationed, which will in turn increase the need for local training to accommodate the increased population at such installations.

Clarification of congressional reporting requirements for certain real property transactions (sec. 2812)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the requirement for the Secretaries of the military departments to notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives and to wait a specified period before entering into real property transactions listed in section 2662 of title 10, United States Code.

The notice and wait requirement applies to six listed real property transactions, and provides for limited exceptions. Subsection (c) states that section 2662 does not apply to "river and harbor projects or flood control projects, or to leases of Government-owned real property for agricultural or grazing purposes or to any real property acquisition specifically authorized in a Military Construction Authorization Act."

This section would clarify and expand the current exception for "river and harbor projects or flood control projects" to cover "Army civil works water resource development projects." This is consistent with an informal understanding that section 2662 applies only to military real property transactions. The Army civil works mission, however, now includes more than just river and harbor or flood control projects. This amendment would recognize the intended scope of section 2662 and specifically exclude all Army civil works water resource development projects from the notice and wait requirements.

Modification of land management restrictions applicable to Utah national defense lands (sec. 2813)

The committee recommends a provision that would sunset a reporting requirement and associated restriction contained in section 2815 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). This provision of current law restricts the actions of the Department of the Interior until the Secretary of Defense submitted a report. The Department of Defense has failed, in over 7 years, to submit this report, and has not given the committee any indication that the report will ever be submitted. The committee does not believe it is sound public policy for one

government agency to restrict the actions of another agency indefinitely simply through inaction. The committee believes these restrictions should be terminated not later than the end of fiscal year 2013, which is the date contained in the legislation on this matter adopted by the Senate in 2007.

Subtitle C—Land Conveyances

Transfer of proceeds from property conveyance, Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, Georgia (sec. 2821)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense to transfer the proceeds from the sale of the Boyett Village Housing Complex at the Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, Georgia, into the Family Housing Improvement Fund (FHIF) for carrying out military family housing privatization activities. This housing is surplus to long-term Marine Corps family housing requirements.

Absent special authority, the proceeds from the disposal of family housing property must be transferred to the Defense Military Family Housing Management Account under section 2831 of title 10, United States Code. Those proceeds would then be used to carry out operations and maintenance activities associated with government-owned military family housing. Because of the extensive privatization of military family housing property already achieved, these funds are not needed in the operations and maintenance account.

The committee urges the Department of Defense to give first priority for the use of these proceeds to remedying the problems at the Air Force housing privatization projects in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, and Massachusetts.

Subtitle D—Energy Security

Expansion of authority of the military departments to develop energy on military lands (sec. 2831)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand the authority of the military departments to develop energy resources on military lands. Section 2917 of title 10, United States Code currently authorizes such development in the case of geothermal energy resources. The provision recommended by the committee would expand this authority to include other renewable energy resources, such as solar energy.

The committee notes that this provision would have the effect of expanding the authority of the Department of Defense to enter into long-term contracts for geothermal energy under section 2922a of title 10, United States Code, to other renewable energy resources developed on military lands.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Report on application of force protection and anti-terrorism standards to gates and entry points on military installations (sec. 2841)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense com-

mittees a report, not later than February 1, 2009, on the implementation of Department of Defense anti-terrorism/force protection (AT/FP) standards for main gates or entry points of military installations.

The committee recognizes the importance of anti-terrorism and force protection (AT/FP) measures for Department of Defense installations and facilities. The continued need for attention to this issue is emphasized by the recent bombing of an Army recruiting station located in New York City, New York. The committee is concerned that adequate funding has not been requested to construct permanent facilities and equipment to ensure compliance with AT/FP standards. Timely execution of these requirements is necessary to protect the safety and welfare of service members and their families. The committee expects the Department of Defense to include, in conjunction with this report, funding in the fiscal year 2010 budget and future-years defense program to ensure that main gates and entry points at military installations comply with AT/FP standards.

Items of Special Interest

Defense Access Roads criteria

The Department of Defense (DOD) has the responsibility to determine whether proposed improvements to roads serving military installations may be eligible for financing through the Defense Access Roads (DAR) program. Section 210 of title 23, United States Code, authorizes DOD to pay a fair share of the cost of public road improvements necessary to mitigate an unusual impact of a defense activity if the Secretary of Defense determines the requirement to be important to national defense. An unusual impact includes the establishment of a new military installation, a significant increase in assigned personnel at an existing military installation, the relocation of an access gate, compensation for a closure of a public road caused by military activities, transport of heavy equipment over a public road, or a temporary surge of military activity creating intolerable congestion.

The committee is concerned that the current DAR eligibility criteria contained in the Federal-aid Policy Guide of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) do not consider the full range of transportation impacts or requirements. The committee is aware that the criteria currently do not account for safety and security concerns for local roads, even though certain DAR projects have been carried out in the past 5 years in order to correct significant deficiencies threatening the safety of military personnel.

In addition, the decisions of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment process, relocations of forces from overseas, and growth in the size of the Army and Marine Corps have led to a substantial increase in the number of personnel on certain military installations over a period of just a few years. Yet the staggered nature of these basing decisions make it difficult to show that any one decision meets the strict criterion of at least doubling local traffic, or easily determine the appropriate scope of cumulative impacts. As a result, valid transportation requirements may not be considered eligible due to a strict interpretation of the Adoubling@ cri-

terion, despite a significant expansion of the installation's population.

The committee notes that the Transportation Research Board, which serves as an independent adviser to the President, Congress, and federal agencies on scientific and technical questions, has published a Highway Capacity Manual, which contains state-of-the-art techniques for estimating road capacity and determining levels of service for transportation facilities and modes. These techniques have been adopted by the Federal Highway Administration as a basis for assessment of road requirements based on current congestion and saturation levels for traffic flows on public roads.

The DAR criteria were developed to assess the relative impact of military activities on public roads. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, working with the Secretary of Transportation, to review the current DAR eligibility requirements and to submit a report to Congress, not later than September 30, 2008, that includes the following:

(1) a description of the current DAR criteria, including the statutory, regulatory, or policy basis for each of them;

(2) the procedures in place to assist installation commanders in understanding the DAR criteria and submitting requests for DAR projects;

(3) an assessment of whether each DAR project carried out in the past 10 years has specifically met the current criteria;

(4) an analysis of whether a separate military construction account for DAR projects is in the best interest of the Department;

(5) a review of the best practices and techniques used by the FHWA to assess road capacity requirements, and whether these techniques and measurement tools would be appropriate for assessing eligibility for DAR projects; and

(6) any recommendations for changes in the criteria.

Military construction reprogrammings

Military construction projects are authorized on an installation-by-installation basis in statute in annual military construction authorization acts. The statement of managers in the conference reports that accompany those acts provides a binding "State list" that describes each specific project at each installation. Annual military construction appropriations conference reports provide similar binding lists of the construction projects for which appropriations are being made available. These projects are not specified individually in the statutory language of annual appropriations acts.

Section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, allows for variation in the cost or scope of such projects above certain limits. With respect to the authorization for such projects, changes to the authorized amounts are made on a notice-and-wait basis following the notices provided pursuant to section 2853. With respect to the appropriations for such projects, the transfers are made not on a notice-and-wait basis, but on a prior approval basis, as directed in the statement of managers of annual military construction appropriations acts.

Since military construction projects require both an authorization and an appropriation, the committee believes the procedures for

changing the congressionally approved funding for such projects should be consistent among the committees, and consistent with established practices for the reprogramming of other defense funds.

Beginning with fiscal year 2009 projects, the committee directs the Department of Defense to submit proposed transfers of funds between military construction projects to the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate on the same prior approval basis as these reprogrammings are submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

TITLE XXIX—WAR-RELATED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary

In March 2008, the Department of Defense made an informal request to the congressional defense committees to add new projects for fiscal year 2008, both inside the United States as well as in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility, and to cancel some projects which were authorized in title XXIX of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–181).

The provisions in subtitle A of this Act relating to fiscal year 2008 authorize $355.2 million in additional construction projects requested by the Department of Defense, and cancel the authorizations for $105.7 million of previously authorized projects in Iraq.

The President's budget request for fiscal year 2009 included $70.0 billion for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The administration has not yet provided any detailed allocation of how those funds will be used. However, the committee understands that there are fiscal year 2009 military construction requirements related to these operations, specifically, for additional warrior transition unit facilities for wounded warriors. The committee recommends an additional $500.0 million in fiscal year 2009 war-related construction funding, within the overall total of $70.0 billion for war-related activities in this Act, for such purposes.

The following table describes the specific project adjustments for fiscal year 2008. No specific projects have been identified at this time for fiscal year 2009. These tables are incorporated by reference into this Act as provided in section 1002 of this Act.

TITLE XXIX
SUBTITLE A - FY2008 AUTHORIZATIONS

State / Country	Service	Installation	Project Title	Previous FY2008 Authorized	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
			Projects Inside the United States			
ALASKA	ARMY	FORT WAINWRIGHT	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	17,000	17,000
CALIFORNIA	ARMY	FORT IRWIN	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	11,800	11,800
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	SAN DIEGO	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	12,299	12,299
CALIFORNIA	AIR FORCE	BEALE AFB	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	17,600	17,600
COLORADO	ARMY	FORT CARSON	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	8,400	8,400
FLORIDA	AIR FORCE	EGLIN AFB	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	11,000	11,000
GEORGIA	ARMY	FORT GORDON	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	7,800	7,800
HAWAII	ARMY	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	12,500	12,500
KENTUCKY	ARMY	FORT CAMPBELL	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	9,900	9,900
KENTUCKY	ARMY	FORT KNOX	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	7,400	7,400
NEW MEXICO	AIR FORCE	CANNON AFB	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	8,000	8,000
NORTH CAROLINA	ARMY	FORT BRAGG	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	8,500	8,500
NORTH CAROLINA	NAVY	CAMP LEJEUNE	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	16,000	16,000
OKLAHOMA	ARMY	FORT SILL	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	9,000	9,000
TEXAS	ARMY	FORT BLISS	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	5,700	5,700
TEXAS	ARMY	FORT BLISS	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	5,900	5,900
TEXAS	ARMY	FORT BLISS	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	5,700	5,700
TEXAS	ARMY	FORT HOOD	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	7,200	7,200
TEXAS	ARMY	FORT SAM HOUSTON	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	7,000	7,000
VIRGINIA	ARMY	FORT LEE	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	7,400	7,400
WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	ARMY	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN - CDCs	0	6,000	6,000
WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	NAVY	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN - CDCs	0	1,052	1,052
WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	AIR FORCE	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN - CDCs	0	1,427	1,427
			Subtotal Child Development Centers	**0**	**204,578**	**204,578**
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	CAMP PENDLETON	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	0	9,270	9,270
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	CHINA LAKE	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	0	7,210	7,210
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	POINT MUGU	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	0	7,250	7,250
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	TWENTYNINE PALMS	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	0	11,250	11,250
FLORIDA	NAVY	EGLIN AFB	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSE ADDITIONS	0	780	780
MISSISSIPPI	NAVY	GULFPORT	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	0	6,570	6,570

TITLE XXIX
SUBTITLE A - FY2008 AUTHORIZATIONS

State / Country	Service	Installation	Project Title	Previous FY2008 Authorized	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
NORTH CAROLINA	NAVY	CAMP LEJEUNE	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	0	11,980	11,980
VIRGINIA	NAVY	YORKTOWN	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	0	8,070	8,070
WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	NAVY	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN - JIEDDO	0	3,000	3,000
			Subtotal JIEDDO Battle Courses	**0**	**65,380**	**65,380**
			United States Total	**0**	**269,958**	**269,958**
			Projects Outside the United States			
IRAQ	ARMY	CAMP ADDER	CORPS SUPPORT CENTER PHASE 3	0	13,200	13,200
IRAQ	ARMY	CAMP RAMADI	INCINERATOR	0	6,200	6,200
IRAQ	ARMY	FALLUJAH	INCINERATORS	0	5,500	5,500
QATAR	AIR FORCE	AL UDEID	CLOSE AIR SUPPORT PARKING APRON	0	60,400	60,400
			Overseas Total	**0**	**85,300**	**85,300**
			Subtotal New FY 2008 Authorizations	**0**	**355,258**	**355,258**
			Repeal of Previous Authorizations			
IRAQ	ARMY	CAMP ADDER	ENTRY CONTROL POINT	4,850	-4,850	0
IRAQ	ARMY	CAMP ANACONDA	URBAN BYPASS ROAD	43,000	-43,000	0
IRAQ	ARMY	CAMP SPEICHER	WASTE WATER TREATMENT & COLLECTION SYS	9,800	-9,800	0
IRAQ	ARMY	CAMP VICTORY	ENTRY CONTROL POINT	5,000	-5,000	0
IRAQ	ARMY	TIKRIT	URBAN BYPASS ROAD	43,000	-43,000	0
			Subtotal Repeal of Previous Authorizations	**105,650**	**-105,650**	**0**
			Grand Total FY2008 Authorization Changes	**105,650**	**249,608**	**355,258**

Subtitle A—Fiscal Year 2008 Projects

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2901)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $162.1 million in additional war-related military construction projects for the Army for fiscal year 2008. These authorizations are in addition to the projects and amounts authorized in title XXIX of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–181).

The additional funding would construct 15 additional child development centers at installations in the United States.

These projects were requested by the Department of Defense.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2902)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $94.7 million in additional war-related military construction projects for the Navy for fiscal year 2008. These authorizations are in addition to the projects and amounts authorized in title XXIX of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–181).

The majority of this additional funding is for counter-improvised explosive device (IED) battle courses at various Navy and Marine Corps locations in the United States. The balance of the funding, $28.3 million, would construct child development centers at Camp Lejeuene, North Carolina and in San Diego, California.

These projects were requested by the Department of Defense.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2903)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $98.4 million in additional war-related military construction projects for the Air Force for fiscal year 2008. These authorizations are in addition to the projects and amounts authorized in title XXIX of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–181).

Of this additional funding, $60.4 million would accelerate a close air support project at Al Udeid Air Base in Qatar that was originally requested in the fiscal year 2009 budget into the fiscal year 2008 budget. There is also an additional $36.6 million to construct child development centers at three Air Force installations in the United States.

These projects were requested by the Department of Defense.

Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2008 Army projects (sec. 2904)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the project authorizations for $105.7 million of Army construction projects in Iraq that were authorized in title XXIX of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–181).

The Department of Defense has accomplished one of these projects using another authority, and has advised the committee that the remainder of these projects are no longer required.

Subtitle B—Fiscal Year 2009 Projects

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2911)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $450.0 million in war-related military construction projects for the Army for fiscal year 2009. The committee understands the Army has identified a substantial requirement for additional warrior transition unit facilities, primarily barracks, for fiscal year 2009. This provision would provide additional funding for such facilities. The funding would be available 14 days after the Secretary of Defense submits a report to Congress with a description and justification of the specific projects to be funded.

The committee is disappointed that the Army has not included these projects in the fiscal year 2009 budget request, nor did the Chief of Staff of the Army highlight them as one of his unfunded Army priorities. The committee believes facilities to care for wounded warriors should be a top priority of the Army and the Department of Defense and funding for such facilities should have been included in the budget request. The committee intends to build on the progress made in last year's Wounded Warrior Act, and has included these funds in anticipation of the Army identifying such requirements as a fiscal year 2009 supplemental request.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2912)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $50.0 million in war-related military construction projects for the Navy for fiscal year 2009. This provision would provide additional funding for warrior transition unit facilities, primarily barracks. The funding would be available 14 days after the Secretary of Defense submits a report to Congress with a description and justification of the specific projects to be funded.

The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that the Department of the Navy is providing all the facilities needed for the care and recovery of wounded marines or sailors. The committee believes facilities to care for wounded warriors should be a top priority of the Department of Defense, and expects the Secretary of the Navy to promptly identify any facility requirements pursuant to this authorization.

Limitation on availability of funds for certain purposes relating to Iraq (sec. 2913)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the prohibition enacted in section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to fiscal year 2009. This provision would prohibit the use of funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations in this Act to establish any installation or base intended to provide for the permanent stationing of United

States forces in Iraq, or to exercise control over the oil resources of Iraq.

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

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Overview

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2009, including: the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; research and development; nuclear weapons; naval nuclear propulsion; environmental restoration and waste management; operating expenses; and other expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). This title authorizes appropriations in four categories: (1) National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA); (2) defense environmental cleanup; (3) other defense activities; and (4) defense nuclear waste disposal. The budget request for atomic energy defense activities at the Department totaled $16.0 billion, a 5.6 percent increase above the fiscal year 2008 appropriated level.

Of the total amount suggested:

(1) $9.1 billion is for NNSA, of which

(a) $6.6 is for weapons activities;

(b) $1.2 is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities;

(c) $828.1 million is for naval reactors; and

(d) $404.1 million is for the Office of the Administrator;

(2) $5.3 billion is for defense environmental cleanup;

(3) $1.3 billion is for other defense activities; and

(4) $247.4 million is for defense nuclear waste disposal.

The budget request also included $7.6 million within energy supply.

The committee recommends $16.0 billion for atomic energy defense activities, the amount of the budget request.

Of the amounts authorized, the committee recommends:

(1) $9.6 billion for NNSA, of which

(a) $6.6 billion is for weapons activities, a decrease of $7.4 million below the budget request;

(b) $1.8 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, an increase of $552.0 million above the budget request;

(c) $828.1 million is for naval reactors, the amount of the budget request; and

(c) $404.1 million is for the Office of the Administrator, the amount of the budget request;

(2) $5.3 billion for defense environmental cleanup activities, the amount of the budget request;

(3) $826.5 million for other defense activities, a decrease of $487.0 million below the budget request; and

(4) $197.4 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, a decrease of $50.0 million below the budget request.

The committee recommends no funds for energy supply, a reduction of $7.6 million.

The following table summarizes the budget request and the authorizations:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation			
Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies Appropriation Summary:			
Energy Programs (270)			
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	7,622	-7,622	----
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	**7,622**	**-7,622**	**----**
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (050)			
National Nuclear Security Administration:			
Weapons activities			
Operation and maintenance	6,126,057	42,622	6,168,679
Construction	492,022	-50,000	442,022
Total, Weapons activities	**6,618,079**	**-7,378**	**6,610,701**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Operation and maintenance	1,233,901	552,008	1,785,909
Construction	13,147	----	13,147
Total, Defense nuclear nonproliferation	**1,247,048**	**552,008**	**1,799,056**
Naval Reactors			
Operation and maintenance	806,054	----	806,054
Construction	22,000	----	22,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Total, Naval reactors	**828,054**	**----**	**828,054**
Office of the administrator	**404,081**	**----**	**404,081**
Total, National nuclear security administration	**9,097,262**	**544,630**	**9,641,892**
Environmental and other defense activities:			
Defense environmental cleanup			
Operation and maintenance	4,391,000	----	4,391,000
Construction	906,256	----	906,256
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,297,256**	**----**	**5,297,256**
Other Defense Activities			
Health, safety and security	446,868	----	446,868
Legacy Management	185,981	----	185,981
Nuclear energy	565,819	-487,008	78,811
Defense related administrative support	108,190	----	108,190
Office of hearings and appeals	6,603	----	6,603
Subtotal, Other defense activities	**1,313,461**	**-487,008**	**826,453**
Total, Other Defense Activities	**1,313,461**	**-487,008**	**826,453**
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	**247,371**	**-50,000**	**197,371**
Total, Environmental & Other Defense Activities	**6,858,088**	**-537,008**	**6,321,080**
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**15,955,350**	**7,622**	**15,962,972**
Total, Discretionary Funding	**15,962,972**	**----**	**15,962,972**

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability			
Operations and analysis			
Infrastructure security & energy restoration	7,622	-7,622	0
Subtotal, Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability	**7,622**	**-7,622**	**----**
Weapons Activities			
Directed stockpile work			
Life extension programs			
B61 Life extension program	2,189		2,189
W76 Life extension program	209,196	-18,000	191,196
Total, Life extension programs	**211,385**	**-18,000**	**193,385**
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	80,434		80,434
W62 Stockpile systems	1,645		1,645
W76 Stockpile systems	68,418		68,418
W78 Stockpile systems	43,349		43,349
W80 Stockpile systems	32,034		32,034
B83 Stockpile systems	25,759		25,759
W87 Stockpile systems	37,189		37,189
W88 Stockpile systems	49,854		49,854
Total, Stockpile systems	**338,682**	**----**	**338,682**

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Reliable replacement warhead	**10,000**		**10,000**
Weapons dismantlement and disposition			
Operations and maintenance	116,822	12,000	128,822
Construction:			
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversionfacility, SRS	66,890		66,890
Total, Weapons dismantlement and disposition	**183,712**	**12,000**	**195,712**
Stockpile services			
Production support	302,126		302,126
Research and development support	36,231		36,231
R&D certification and safety	193,375		193,375
Management, technology, and production	201,375		201,375
Pit manufacturing	145,269	-20,000	125,269
Pit manufacturing capability	53,560		53,560
Total, Stockpile services	**931,936**	**-20,000**	**911,936**
Total, Directed stockpile work	**1,675,715**	**-26,000**	**1,649,715**
Campaigns:			
Science campaign			
Advanced certification	20,000		20,000
Primary assessment technologies	74,413		74,413
Dynamic plutonium experiments	23,734		23,734
Dynamic materials properties	85,805		85,805

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Advanced radiography	29,418		29,418
Secondary assessment technologies	79,292		79,292
Test readiness	10,408		10,408
Total, Science campaign	**323,070**	**----**	**323,070**
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	35,641		35,641
technology	17,105		17,105
Nuclear survivability	21,753		21,753
Enhanced surveillance	68,243		68,243
Total, Engineering campaign	**142,742**	**----**	**142,742**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign			
Ignition	103,644		103,644
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	68,248		68,248
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	8,920		8,920
laboratory plasmas	3,147		3,147
Facility operations and target production	180,384		180,384
NIF assembly and installation	56,899		56,899
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**421,242**	**----**	**421,242**
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**421,242**	**----**	**421,242**

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Advanced simulation and computing campaign			
Operations and maintenance	**561,742**		**561,742**
Readiness Campaign			
Stockpile readiness	28,731		28,731
High explosives and weapon operations	8,927		8,927
Nonnuclear readiness	40,165		40,165
Tritium readiness			
Operations and maintenance	82,265	-27,600	54,665
Advanced design and production technologies	22,949		22,949
Total, Readiness campaign	**183,037**	**-27,600**	**155,437**
Total, Campaigns	**1,631,833**	**-27,600**	**1,604,233**
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)			
Operations of facilities			
Operations of facilities			
Operations of facilities			
Kansas City Plant	122,389		122,389
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	85,160		85,160
Los Alamos National Laboratory	298,112		298,112
Nevada Test Site	92,203		92,203
Pantex	104,361		104,361
Sandia National Laboratory	127,827		127,827

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Savannah River Site	108,114		108,114
Y-12 National security complex	216,904		216,904
Institutional site support	57,837		57,837
Total, Operations of facilities	1,212,907	----	1,212,907
Total, Operations of facilities	**1,212,907**	**----**	**1,212,907**
Program readiness	73,841		73,841
Material recycle and recovery	72,509		72,509
Containers	23,398		23,398
Storage	29,846		29,846
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,412,501**	**----**	**1,412,501**
Construction:			
09-D-404, Test capabilities revitalization II, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM	3,200		3,200
08-D-801 High pressure fire loop (HPFL) Pantex, TX	2,000		2,000
08-D-802 High explosive pressing facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	28,233		28,233
08-D-804 TA-55 Reinvestment project Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)	7,900		7,900

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
08-D-806 Ion beam laboratory refurbishment SNL, Albuquerque, NM	10,014		10,014
07-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	7,446		7,446
07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	19,660		19,660
06-D-140 Project engineering design (PED) various locations	104,661		104,661
06-D-402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV.	9,340		9,340
05-D-402 Beryllium capability (BEC) project Y-12 National Security Complex, Oakridge, TN	5,015		5,015
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	100,200	-50,000	50,200
04-D-128 TA-18 Criticality experiments facility (CEF), Los Alamos National Laboratory Nevada Test Site, NV.	10,353		10,353

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Total, Construction	**308,022**	**-50,000**	**258,022**
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,720,523**	**-50,000**	**1,670,523**
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	131,651		131,651
Program direction	89,421		89,421
Total, Secure transportation asset	**221,072**	**----**	**221,072**
Nuclear weapons incident response	**221,936**	**0**	**221,936**
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program			
Operations and maintenance	99,550	64,222	163,772
Construction			
08-D-601 Mercury highway Nevada Test Site, NV	11,700		11,700
08-D-602 Portable water system upgrades Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN.	27,666		27,666
07-D-253 TA 1 heating systems modernization (HSM) Sandia National Laboratory	15,755		15,755
06-D-601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX.	4,000		4,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
06-D-603 Steam plant life extension project (SLEP), Y-12, National Security Complex, Oakridge, TN	10,878		10,878
Total, Construction	**69,999**	**----**	**69,999**
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	**169,549**	**64,222**	**233,771**
Environmental projects and operations			
Long term stewardship	40,587		40,587
Transformation disposition	77,391		77,391
Safeguards and security			
Defense nuclear security			
Operations and maintenance	690,217	40,000	730,217
Construction:			
08-D-701 Nuclear materials S&S upgrade project Los Alamos National Laboratory	46,000		46,000
05-D-170 Project engineering and design, various locations	1,111		1,111
Total, Construction	**47,111**	**----**	**47,111**
Total, Defense nuclear security	**737,328**	**40,000**	**777,328**

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Cyber security	122,511		122,511
Total, Safeguards and security	**859,839**	**40,000**	**899,839**
Subtotal, Weapons Activities	**6,618,445**	**622**	**6,619,067**
Adjustments			
Use of prior year balances	-366	-8,000	-8,366
Total, Adjustments	**-366**	**-8,000**	**-8,366**
Total, Weapons Activities	**6,618,079**	**-7,378**	**6,610,701**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operations and maintenance	261,944	25,000	286,944
Construction:			
07-SC-05 Physical Science Facility Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Richland, WA	13,147		13,147
Total, Construction	**13,147**	**----**	**13,147**
Total, Nonproliferation & verification R&D	**275,091**	**25,000**	**300,091**
Nonproliferation and international security			
Nonproliferation and international security	140,467	-20,000	120,467
GIPP		[-5000]	

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
GNEP support		[-15000]	
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	429,694	50,000	479,694
North Korea denuclearization		[50,000]	
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	141,299		141,299
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition			
Operations and maintenance			
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition	40,774	19,200	59,974
Total, Operations and maintenance	**40,774**	**19,200**	**59,974**
Construction:			
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC.	----	467,808	467,808
Total, Construction	**----**	**467,808**	**467,808**
Total, U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition	**40,774**	**487,008**	**527,782**
Russian surplus materials disposition	1,000	10,000	11,000
Total, Fissile materials disposition	**41,774**	**497,008**	**538,782**
Global threat reduction initiative	219,641		219,641

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,247,966**	**552,008**	**1,799,974**
Use of prior year balances (NN)	-918		-918
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,247,048**	**552,008**	**1,799,056**
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,247,048**	**552,008**	**1,799,056**
Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance			
Operation and maintenance	771,600		771,600
Total, Operation and maintenance	**771,600**	**----**	**771,600**
Construction:			
09-D-190, PED, Infrastructure upgrades, KAPL	1,000		1,000
09-D-902, NRF Production Support Complex Idaho Falls	8,300		8,300
08-D-190 Project engineering and design Expended Core Facility M-290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID	300		300
07-D-190 Materials research technology complex (MRTC)	12,400		12,400

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Total, Construction	**22,000**	**----**	**22,000**
Total, Naval reactors development	**793,600**	**----**	**793,600**
Program direction	34,454		34,454
Total, Naval Reactors	**828,054**	**----**	**828,054**
Office Of The Administrator			
Office of the administrator	404,081		404,081
Congressionally directed projects	----		0
Total, Office Of The Administrator	**404,081**	**----**	**404,081**
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			
Closure sites administration	13,209		13,209
Fernald	2,100	13,500	15,600
Miamisburg	30,574		30,574
Total, Closure sites	**45,883**	**13,500**	**59,383**
Hanford site:			
2012 completion projects			
Nuclear facility D&D river corridor closure project	165,248	80,577	245,825
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition PFP	113,483	8,972	122,455

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
SNF stabilization and disposition	122,171		122,171
Total, 2012 completion projects	**400,902**	**89,549**	**490,451**
2035 completion projects			
Nuclear facility D&D - remainder of Hanford	85,653		85,653
Richland community and regulatory support	19,620		19,620
Soil and water remediation - groundwater vadose zone	169,682		169,682
Solid waste stabilization and disposition 200 area	175,930	45,000	220,930
Total, 2035 completion projects	**450,885**	**45,000**	**495,885**
Total, Hanford site	**851,787**	**134,549**	**986,336**
Idaho National Laboratory:			
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	2,030		2,030
SNF stabilization and disposition - 2012	20,334	7,000	27,334
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	178,767		178,767
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	46,025		46,025
Construction			
06-D-401 Sodium bearing waste treatment project, Idaho	86,700		86,700
Total, Construction	**86,700**	**----**	**86,700**
Soil and water remediation - 2012	70,268	32,000	102,268

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Nuclear facility D & D	24,133	8,000	32,133
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,867		3,867
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**432,124**	**47,000**	**479,124**
NNSA sites			
NNSA Service Center/SPRU	16,943	17,256	34,199
Nevada	65,674	10,000	75,674
Sandia National Laboratories		3,000	3,000
Pantex		5,000	5,000
Los Alamos National Laboratory	162,467	67,101	229,568
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**245,084**	**102,357**	**347,441**
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
Building 3019	58,000		58,000
Nuclear facility D & D ORNL	58,160	7,000	65,160
Nuclear facility D & D Y-12	32,392	20,000	52,392
technology park	105		105
OR reservation community and regulatory support	6,100		6,100
Soil and water remediation - offsites	4,730		4,730
Solid waste stabilization and disposition - 2012	78,183	4,000	82,183
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**237,670**	**31,000**	**268,670**
Office of River Protection:			
Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
Construction:			

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
01-D-416 Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
01-D-16A Low activity waste facility	160,000		160,000
01-D-16B Analytical laboratory	65,000		65,000
01-D-16C Balance of facilities	75,000		75,000
01-D-16D High level waste facility	125,000		125,000
01-D-16E Pretreatment facility	265,000		265,000
Total, Construction	**690,000**	**----**	**690,000**
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	**690,000**	**----**	**690,000**
Tank farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	288,443	53,443	341,886
Total, Tank farm activities	**288,443**	**53,443**	**341,886**
Total, Office of River protection	**978,443**	**53,443**	**1,031,886**
Savannah River sites:			
2012 completion projects			
04-D-414 Container surveillance capability in 235F Project engineering and design	2,032		2,032
Total, construction	**2,032**	**----**	**2,032**
Total, 2012 completion projects	**2,032**	**----**	**2,032**
2035 completion projects			
SR community and regulatory support	12,500		12,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	339,311	8,000	347,311
Spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition	24,108	3,500	27,608
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	53,559		53,559
Soil and water remediation	67,121	16,000	83,121
Nuclear facility D & D	2,052	46,500	48,552
Total, 2035 completion projects	**498,651**	**74,000**	**572,651**
Tank farm activities			
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	578,218		578,218
Construction:			
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	127,524		127,524
Total, Construction	**127,524**	**----**	**127,524**
Total, Tank farm activities	**705,742**	**----**	**705,742**
Total, Savannah River site	**1,206,425**	**74,000**	**1,280,425**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Waste isolation pilot plant	126,425	10,000	136,425
Central characterization project	29,069	8,694	37,763
Transportation	28,170		28,170
Community and regulatory support	27,860		27,860
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	**211,524**	**18,694**	**230,218**

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Program direction	308,765	10,000	318,765
Program support	33,930	8,500	42,430
Safeguards and Security:			
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	5,124		5,124
Oak Ridge Reservation	27,020		27,020
West Valley	1,400		1,400
Paducah	8,196		8,196
Richland/Hanford Site	75,265	8,170	83,435
Savannah River Site	134,336		134,336
Total, Safeguards and Security	**251,341**	**8,170**	**259,511**
Technology development	32,389		32,389
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	463,000		463,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	**5,298,365**	**501,213**	**5,799,578**
Use of prior year balances	-1,109	-501,213	-502,322
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,297,256**	**----**	**5,297,256**
Other Defense Activities			
Health, safety and security			
Health, safety and security	347,271		347,271
Program direction	99,597		99,597
Total, Health, safety and security	**446,868**	**----**	**446,868**

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Office of Legacy Management			0
Legacy management	174,397		174,397
Program direction	11,584		11,584
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**185,981**	**----**	**185,981**
Nuclear energy			
Infrastructure			
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	78,811		78,811
Total, Infrastructure	78,811	----	78,811
Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility			
Operations and maintenance	19,200	-19,200	0
Construction and other project costs:			
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	467,808	-467,808	0
Total, Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility	487,008	-487,008	----
Total, Nuclear energy	565,819	-487,008	78,811
Defense related administrative support	108,190		108,190
Office of hearings and appeals	6,603		6,603
Subtotal, Other defense activities	1,313,461	-487,008	826,453
Total, Other Defense Activities	**1,313,461**	**-487,008**	**826,453**

Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Defense nuclear waste disposal	247,371	-50,000	197,371
Total, Department of Energy.....	**15,962,972**	**----**	**15,962,972**

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $9.6 billion for the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2009 for the National Nuclear Security Administration to carry out programs necessary to national security, an increase of $544.6 million above the budget request.

Weapons activities

The committee recommends $6.6 billion for weapons activities, a decrease of $7.4 million below the budget request. The committee authorizes the following activities: $1.6 billion for directed stockpile work; $1.6 billion for campaigns; $1.7 billion for readiness in the technical base and facilities; $221.1 million for the secure transportation asset; $221.9 million for nuclear weapons incident response; $40.6 million for environmental projects and operations; $77.4 million for transformation disposition; $899.8 million for safeguards and security; and $233.8 million for facilities and infrastructure recapitalization.

Directed stockpile work

The committee recommends $1.6 billion for directed stockpile work, a decrease of $26.0 million below the amount of the budget request. The directed stockpile account supports work directly related to weapons in the stockpile, including day-to-day maintenance as well as research, development, engineering, and certification activities to support planned life extension programs and the reliable replacement warhead. This account also includes fabrication and assembly of weapons components, feasibility studies, weapons dismantlement and disposal, training, and support equipment.

The committee recommends a decrease of $18.0 million in the W76 life extension program as a result of schedule delays. In addition, the committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million in weapons dismantlement and disposition for additional studies for the device assembly facility (DAF) and a decrease of $20.0 million in pit manufacturing. The committee believes that the DAF is under-utilized and that the efforts begun last year to expand the current missions at the DAF should be continued. The committee notes that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has restructured funding for pit manufacturing into two new project lines for fiscal year 2009. There appears to be substantial overlap in the activities in the two new project lines.

Campaigns

The committee recommends $1.6 billion for campaigns, a decrease of $27.6 million below the amount of the budget request. The campaigns focus on science and engineering efforts involving the three nuclear weapons laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, and the weapons production plants. Each campaign is focused on a specific activity to support and maintain the nuclear stockpile without underground nuclear weapons testing. These efforts from the scientific underpinning of the Department of Energy's annual certifi-

cation that the stockpile remains safe, secure, and reliable with nuclear weapons testing. The reduction in the tritium readiness campaign takes into account a large carryover balance resulting in contracting delays.

Readiness in the technical base

The committee recommends $1.7 million for readiness in the technical base, a decrease of $50.0 million below the budget request. This account funds facilities and infrastructure in the nuclear weapons complex and includes construction funding for new facilities.

The committee recommends a decrease of $50.0 million in the Chemistry and Metallurgy Facility Replacement project (CMRR), Project 04–D–125, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory as a result of uncertainty in the design of the CMRR. As the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB) noted, replacing the existing facility is essential but the CMRR has significant unresolved issues for which there is no clear resolution. The CMRR is one of two projects with which the DNFSB have the most significant unresolved safety issues. These issues are associated with the project's safety-related systems. Until such time as the safety basis documents are completed, the outstanding issues cannot be resolved. CMRR will be a category I facility supporting pit operations in building PF–4 and has a preliminary cost estimate of $2.6 billion. The committee continues to support reconstitution of the pit manufacturing capability in PF–4 but urges that all safety issues with CMRR be resolved as soon as possible. If there is any change in the planned mission at CMRR, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy to notify the congressional defense committees.

The committee has included an offset of $8.0 million for prior year balances in weapons activities and directs that this offset be applied to the Ion Beam Laboratory Refurbishment at Sandia National Laboratory, Project 08–D–806. These funds are available as result of the completion of the Microelectronics Facility at Sandia National Laboratory.

Secure transportation asset

The committee recommends $221.1 million for the secure transportation asset (STA), the amount of the budget request. The secure transportation asset is responsible for the transportation of nuclear weapons, weapons materials, and components, and other materials requiring safe and secure transport. The committee directs the STA to include in its budget submittal for fiscal year 2010 a break out of the lease expenses for each leased facility and the expenses for each minor construction project. In addition, the committee reminds STA of its obligation to fully notify Congress of all third-party financing arrangements in advance of executing any leases.

Nuclear weapons incident response

The committee recommends $221.9 million for nuclear weapons incident response, the amount of the budget request.

Safeguards and security

The committee recommends $899.8 million for safeguards and security, an increase of $40.0 million above the budget request. The committee recommends additional funds to continue to address training and equipment issues and to meet the 2005 design basis threat.

Facilities and Infrastructure

The committee recommends $223.8 million for the facilities and infrastructure program (FIRP), an increase of $64.2 million above the amount of the budget request, to meet urgent maintenance requirements across the NNSA complex. FIRP was established to address the backlog of deferred maintenance at NNSA facilities. While the FIRP has been successful, the committee is concerned that as the FIRP comes to a close, routine maintenance of facilities, and utilities and infrastructure upgrades, such as electrical system and road improvement, will once again be deferred to address programmatic demands. As a result, the committee recommends that the NNSA establish a separate facilities management function reporting to the Administrator or the Principal Administrator. This function should be devoted exclusively to managing and maintaining facilities so that both new and existing facilities, including those that have been built recently, and that are planned, do not fall into disrepair.

Environmental projects and operations and transformation disposition

The committee recommends $40.6 million for environmental projects and $77.4 million for transformation, the amount of the budget request. Transformation is a new account in fiscal year 2009 dedicated to disposition of excess facilities through demolition, sale, or transfer. Some facilities will be stabilized and transferred to the Office of Environmental Management. The committee directs the NNSA to work closely with the Office of Environmental Management (EM) to ensure that the work funded in both budget lines is fully coordinated with EM. The committee notes that the increase in environmental projects and the new transformation disposition activity represents a substantial increase in funding for these activities in NNSA.

Stockpile surveillance testing

In 2001 the Department of Energy (DOE) Inspector General (IG) reported that the DOE was behind schedule in conducting stockpile surveillance tests. These surveillance tests are supposed to be conducted on a routine basis to support the annual requirement to certify that the nuclear weapons stockpile remains safe, secure, and reliable. In response to the 2001 report, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) committed to take steps to return the stockpile surveillance tests to the planned schedule. In October 2006, the DOE IG office conducted a follow-up review of the commitments made in 2001 and whether NNSA had resolved the surveillance testing backlog. Again, the IG found that although NNSA had made progress, significant backlogs existed in the surveillance tests. In response, NNSA committed to fully resolve the backlog in

surveillance testing by the end of 2007. The committee directs the DOE IG to review the status of stockpile surveillance tests to determine whether the backlog in surveillance continues, and if it still exists, the extent of the backlog.

Construction projects

The committee is increasingly concerned that the Department of Energy (DOE) is moving away from funding construction projects with funds authorized and appropriated for line item construction projects and seeking non-traditional approaches to construction funding. These non-traditional projects may, in the long-term, be more expensive than traditional line item construction projects, and may introduce new security risks and other management complications at DOE sites. In addition, the committee is concerned that efforts to secure non-traditional funding may be because the projects in question do not meet programmatic requirements or fill programmatic needs. If the Secretary of Energy determines that there is a need for a new facility or building to meet programmatic requirements and activities, the committee urges the Secretary to include requests for traditional line item construction projects to meet such programmatic requirements.

The committee is aware of anecdotal complaints about the construction planning and decision process, and urges the DOE to address issues that arise from management of the process or to bring to the committee's attention any issues that are founded in statutory requirements.

The committee recognizes that the many multiple disciplinary activities at the DOE laboratories and facilities support both direct DOE activities as well as activities that assist broader United States Government activities, and encourage DOE to take these responsibilities into consideration in determining requirements for new buildings and facilities.

As the DOE moves forward to recapitalize manufacturing and continues to improve science, engineering, research, and other capabilities, while downsizing the overall footprint of the complex, it must ensure sound, transparent financial planning and execution.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs

The committee recommends $1.8 billion for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program, an increase of $552.0 million above the budget request for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has management and oversight responsibility for the nuclear nonproliferation programs at the Department of Energy (DOE).

The committee recommends funding for these programs as follows: $286.9 million for nonproliferation and verification research and development, an increase of $25.0 million; $120.5 million for nonproliferation and international security, a decrease of $20.0 million; $479.7 million for international nuclear materials production and cooperation, an increase of $50.0 million; $141.3 million for elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production, the amount of the budget request; $538.8 million for fissile materials disposition which includes a transfer of $487.0 million from another program office in the DOE and an increase of $10.0 million; and $219.6 mil-

lion for the global threat reduction initiative, the amount of the budget request.

Nonproliferation and verification research and development

The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million for nonproliferation and verification research and development, for increased forensics capabilities, international safeguards technologies, nuclear detonation systems, seismic monitoring, and proliferation detection technologies. The committee continues to be concerned about the continued ability of the United States to effectively monitor and detect clandestine nuclear weapons development activity and to attribute nuclear weapons, improvised nuclear devices, and radiological dispersal devices. Recent collaborative interagency efforts are encouraging but the committee urges the many federal agencies to exercise this developing interagency process for detection and attribution, including the role that the DOE and its laboratories play in the nuclear forensics portion of this process.

The committee notes that elsewhere in this Act, it has included a provision that would establish a scholarship and fellowship program for nuclear nonproliferation activities. A recently released study by the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Physical Society, which discusses nuclear forensics, highlights the work that needs to be done to develop the global, technical, and operational cooperation needed in the event that a terrorist successfully detonates a nuclear weapon or device or uses a radiological dispersal device.

Nonproliferation and international security

The committee recommends a decrease of $20.0 million, including a reduction of $5.0 million for Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (GIPP), and a reduction of $15.0 million for support to the Global Nuclear Energy program (GNEP). The committee believes that the GIPP has helped to ensure that former nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons scientists in the former Soviet Union (FSU) were gainfully employed during a period of transition. Today, Russia and some of the other FSU countries are enjoying economic growth and, as the Government Accountability Office has noted, may no longer need the assistance provided under the GIPP program. On the other hand, some of the FSU countries have not been as fortunate. For these and for additional countries, such as Iraq and possibly North Korea, new partnership opportunities might be useful. Elsewhere in this Act the committee recommends a provision calling for a review of the GIPP program. This review will afford NNSA the opportunity to re-baseline the GIPP program, reviewing the need for and goals of the program.

The committee also notes that some of the work in nonproliferation and international security is in direct support of the GNEP. The committee takes no view on the GNEP as it is not a program funded as part of the Atomic Energy Defense activities, but believes that the nonproliferation programs should not directly support specific future energy technologies. As a result the committee recommends a decrease of $15.0 million.

International nuclear materials and cooperation

The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million in international nuclear materials and cooperation to verifiably disable and dismantle the North Korean nuclear program. Elsewhere in this Act the committee recommends a provision that would enable the NNSA to support the Department of State in North Korean denuclearization activities.

Fissile materials disposition

The committee recommends a transfer of $487.0 million from nuclear energy, other defense activities to the NNSA for the mixed oxide fuel (MOX) facility. The NNSA is mandated to carry out nonproliferation activities. The Unites States and Russia have made considerable progress in formulating a new plan for each country to disposition 34 metric tons of excess weapons grade plutonium. As a result the committee continues to support the fissile materials disposition program as an important part of the overall nuclear nonproliferation program. The committee recognizes that the NNSA will have additional amounts of excess plutonium to disposition and expects the NNSA to continue to use this approximately $12.0 billion complex of facilities to disposition plutonium well into the future.

The committee recommends an additional $10.0 million for the Russian fissile materials disposition program to continue the joint gas reactor technology demonstration program. The gas reactor is a more efficient burner of excess plutonium than conventional reactors. The committee notes that the Russian Government and the United States jointly fund this effort and that Russian Government support for the program will exceed the U.S. contribution.

Naval reactors

The committee recommends $793.6 million for naval reactors, the amount of the budget request. The committee directs the Office of Naval Reactors to review carefully options for using low enriched uranium fuel in new or modified reactor plants for surface ships and submarines.

Office of the Administrator

The committee recommends $404.1 million for program direction for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), the amount of the budget request. This account provides program direction funding for all elements of the NNSA, except for the naval reactors program and the secure transportation asset.

Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.3 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE) in fiscal year 2009 for defense environmental cleanup, the amount of the budget request. The provision would authorize $501.2 million in additional environmental projects offset by $501.2 million in prior year balances. The committee recommends the additional authorization authority in the event funds become available to address a variety of projects at DOE defense sites to address budget shortfalls. Without additional funds, much of the ongoing cleanup would be disrupted,

causing the DOE to miss many enforceable milestones, require significant layoffs, and increase the overall cost of the cleanup. The specific projects are listed in the DOE budget tables for the defense cleanup program in this committee report.

Other defense activities (sec. 3103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $826.5 million for other defense activities, a decrease of $487.0 million from the amount of the budget request. The committee recommends: $446.9 million for health, safety, and security, the amount of the budget request; $186.0 million for legacy management, the amount of the request; $6.6 million for the office of hearings and appeals; and $78.8 million for nuclear energy, a decrease of $487.0 million. The committee recommends that the $487.0 million included in the budget request for other defense activities for the mixed oxide fuel fabrication be transferred to the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3104)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $197.4 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, a decrease of $50.0 million below the budget request due to uncertainties in the program. The committee remains supportive of the effort to establish a geologic repository as delays in the repository delay the ability of the Defense Environmental Management program to complete its work with respect to high level waste and spent nuclear fuel, and increase the overall cost of cleanup.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

Modifications of functions of Administrator for Nuclear Security to include elimination of surplus fissile materials usable for nuclear weapons (sec. 3111)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2402(b)(1) of title 50, United States Code, by adding a new paragraph assigning responsibility for elimination of surplus fissile materials usable for nuclear weapons to the Administrator for Nuclear Security. This provision would restate that the responsibility for this activity is assigned to the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.

Report on compliance with Design Basis Threat issued by the Department of Energy in 2005 (sec. 3112)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Energy to submit a report on the progress made by the Department of Energy (DOE) to achieve compliance with the requirements of the 2005 design basis threat (DBT) for each DOE site with Category I nuclear materials. The DBT establishes the physical security requirements for each DOE site. This report would be a follow-on report to the 2006 DBT report, which laid out a plan for each site to either be compliant by 2008 or obtain a waiver. The provision would also direct the Secretary to conduct an assessment of the 2005 DBT and to identify any necessary modi-

fications, updates, or revisions to the 2005 DBT. The committee is concerned that several sites may not be in compliance with the 2005 DBT by the end of 2008.

Modification of submittal of reports on inadvertent releases of restricted data (sec. 3113)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2672 of title 50, United States Code, to make the annual report on inadvertent releases of restricted data due every other year rather than annually. This report deals with inadvertent releases of restricted data that might occur during the process of declassifying historical documents. When the current process for declassification was established approximately 10 years ago, there were a series of inadvertent releases. Since that time the process has become much more rigorous and an annual report is no longer needed.

The provision would further amend section 2672 to change the frequency of the report that the Secretary of Energy submits to Congress to identify the plans of various federal agencies to prevent the inadvertent release of restricted data. Each agency that has or may have restricted data in its historical documents slated for release must prepare a plan to ensure that such data is not inadvertently released. The Department of Energy (DOE) must review the plans, determine that they are sufficient, and determine if the agency is in compliance with its plan. This amendment would modify the frequency of the DOE review of the agencies' plans from periodic, which has been treated by the Secretary as an annual requirement, to once every 2 years. The agencies have made considerable progress in establishing effective plans.

Nonproliferation scholarship and fellowship program (sec. 3114)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to establish a nonproliferation scholarship program. The committee is concerned that certain technical areas of expertise critical to nonproliferation programs, such as radio-chemistry, are increasingly difficult for the NNSA and the Department of Energy laboratories to attract and retain. The scholarship program would be available to both undergraduate and graduate students in disciplines to be determined by the Administrator. A student would be required to work as a Federal Government employee or as a laboratory employee for 1 year for each year that the student received support under the program.

Review of and reports on Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention program (sec. 3115)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to conduct a review of the Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (GIPP) program and submit a report on the review to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2009.

The report would include a description of the goals for the GIPP program and the criteria for partnership projects together with rec-

ommendations regarding the future of projects in Russia and the other countries of the former Soviet Union as well as plans for projects in countries other than the former Soviet Union. In addition, the report would include a plan for completing all projects in the countries of the former Soviet Union by 2012.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Authorization (sec. 3201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $29.0 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB). This is an increase of $3.0 million above the budget request. The DNFSB has the responsibility to ensure that the health and safety of the public surrounding, and workers at Department of Energy (DOE) defense nuclear facilities are adequately protected. The DNFSB is responsible not only for operational nuclear safety of existing facilities and activities, but also ensures that the design and construction of new defense nuclear projects and decommissioning of old facilities meets applicable DOE orders.

The DOE is in the process of designing and constructing many new facilities, including major new nuclear facilities, and decommissioning the older facilities that are no longer needed. The committee believes that additional funds are needed to enable the DNFSB to hire additional technical staff to ensure that the DNFSB fully reviews and provides the results of those reviews to DOE. Timely interaction with DOE is particularly important in the design and construction process. The work of the DNFSB is growing substantially as DOE is undertaking 26 new nuclear construction projects. The budget request funds only two thirds of the DNFSB statutory staffing levels.

The committee continues to find the quarterly reports useful by highlighting issues as they emerge, and commends the DNFSB for submitting reports that are succinct, clearly written, and timely.

The committee is concerned that if the DOE pursues third party financing of facilities in which nuclear operations are conducted, the DNFSB will either not be able to carry out its statutory responsibilities or that it will be more difficult or costly to do so. The committee reminds the DOE that if it is conducting nuclear operations at a defense nuclear facility, the DNFSB has jurisdiction over the facility and the operations.

Recently the DOE National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) asked the DNFSB to provide technical assistance for the Mixed Oxide Fuel facility, a facility not within the jurisdiction of the DNFSB. The committee supports the use of the DNFSB in this capacity, but notes that the DNFSB does not have funds authorized and appropriated for this purpose. The committee directs the DNFSB and the NNSA to enter into an agreement that provides for full cost recovery by the DNFSB for work for others.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
TITLE: 1						
Aircraft procurement, Army						
20		Additional forward looking infrared (FLIR) systems	3,000	Schumer	New York State Division of Military and Naval Affairs	Various
22		Additional avionics navigation equipment – Army UFR	11,300	CI	N/A	N/A
28		Avionic support equipment – Army UFR	249	CI	N/A	N/A
30		Aircrew integrated systems – Army UFR	2,440	CI	N/A	N/A
31		Air traffic control equipment- Army UFR	5,493	CI	N/A	N/A
32		Additional avionics and airborne instrumentation equipment – Army UFR	116	CI	N/A	N/A
34		Additional high frequency radio equipment – Army UFR	2	CI	N/A	N/A
Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army						
49		Additional small arms - Army UFR	2,200	CI	N/A	N/A
Procurement of ammunition, Army						
26		Grenades, all types	7,000	Lincoln	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Pine Bluff, AR
26		Grenades, all types	7,000	Pryor	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Pine Bluff, AR
36		Radford AAP Upgrades	20,000	Warner	Army	Radford Army Ammunition Plant, VA
36		Radford AAP Upgrades	20,000	Webb	Army	Radford Army Ammunition Plant, VA
41		Bomb line modernization	1,000	Inhofe	TSM Corporation	McAlester, OK
Other procurement, Army						
5		Additional palletized loading systems – Army UFR	80,700	CI	N/A	N/A
7		Additional heavy equipment transporter system (HETS) – Army UFR	43,100	CI	N/A	N/A
25		Super high frequency terminals – Army UFR	15,000	CI	N/A	N/A

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Other procurement, Army						
27		Additional defense advanced GP5 receivers – Army UFR	15,500	CI	N/A	N/A
27		Additional defense advanced GPS receivers – Army UFR	1,000	Dole	North Carolina National Guard, 30th Brigade Combat Team	Clinton, NC
31		Tactical satellite equipment upgrades – Army UFR	4,000	CI	N/A	N/A
43		Commercial-off-the-shelf tactical radios equipment – Army UFR	22,800	CI	N/A	N/A
44		Medical communication and combat casualty care equipment – Army UFR	1,400	CI	N/A	N/A
54		Information technology upgrades	3,000	Levin	Detroit Arsenal	Warren, MI
74		Triton III	25,000	CI	N/A	N/A
77		Additional night vision devices – Army UFR	27,150	CI	N/A	N/A
77		Night vision devices	1,650	Reid	Nevada Military Department	Carson City, NV
79		Additional driver vision enhancement systems – Army UFR	52,500	CI	N/A	N/A
100		Life cycle software support – Army UFR	5,900	CI	N/A	N/A
101		Additional automatic identification equipment – Army UFR	5,900	CI	N/A	N/A
102		Additional transportation coordinator's automated information for movement system equipment (TC AIMS) equipment – Army UFR	5,900	CI	N/A	N/A
107		Additional logistics automation systems – Army UFR	300	CI	N/A	N/A
112		Combat service support communications equipment – Army UFR	5,900	CI	N/A	N/A
127		Fido explosives detector	6,000	Inhofe	ICx Nomadics	Stillwater, OK, Norman, OK
137		Additional field feeding systems – Army UFR	5,400	CI	N/A	N/A
144		Additional water purification systems – Army UFR	1,200	CI	N/A	N/A

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Other procurement, Army						
145		Additional combat medical support equipment – Army UFR	4,300	CI	N/A	N/A
148		Additional graders – Army UFR	1,000	CI	N/A	N/A
149		Additional skid steer loaders – Army UFR	3,000	CI	N/A	N/A
150		Additional scrapers – Army UFR	1,000	CI	N/A	N/A
151		Additional water distributors – Army UFR	1,000	CI	N/A	N/A
152		Additional engineer mission module water distributors – Army UFR	1,000	CI	N/A	N/A
153		Additional loaders – Army UFR	2,000	CI	N/A	N/A
155		Additional tractors – Army UFR	2,000	CI	N/A	N/A
156		Additional cranes – Army UFR	1,000	CI	N/A	N/A
158		Additional high mobility engineer excavators - Army UFR	8,000	CI	N/A	N/A
159		Construction equipment - Army UFR	1,000	CI	N/A	N/A
160		Additional equipment – Army UFR	4,000	CI	N/A	N/A
165		Additional tactical electric generators cranes – Army UFR	44,600	CI	N/A	N/A
169		Combat Arms Training System	6,000	Chambliss	Meggitt Training Systems	Suwanee, GA
169		Combat Arms Training System	6,000	Isakson	GA Army National Guard, Meggitt Training Systems	Suwanee, GA
169		Immersive group simulation	6,000	Akaka	Atlantis Cyberspace	Honolulu, HI
169		Joint fires and effects trainer	5,000	Inhofe	Stanley Associates	Ft Sill, OK
169		Laser collective combat training	8,000	Reed	MPRI/L-3	Middletown, RI
169		Operator driving simulators	5,000	Levin	FAAC Inc	Ann Arbor, MI
169		Operator driving simulators	5,000	Stabenow	FAAC, Inc	Ann Arbor, MI

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Other procurement, Army						
169		Urban training center instrumentation	2,900	Bayh	General Dynamics Information Technology (GDIT)	Butlerville, IN
169		Urban training center instrumentation	2,900	Lugar	Indiana Army National Guard & General Dynamics Information Technology	Butlerville, IN
182		Additional spares – Army UFR	2,400	CI	N/A	N/A
Aircraft procurement, Navy						
32		Integrated mechanical diagnostics health & usage management system (IMDS)	8,000	Thune	Goodrich Corporation	Vergennes, VT
36		Critical P-3 life sustainment improvements	160,000	CI	N/A	N/A
51		AN/AAR-47 hostile fire improvements	10,000	Collins	University of Maine	Orono, ME
51		AN/AAR-47 hostile fire improvements	10,000	Nelson, Bill	ATK Mission Systems, Integrated Systems Division	Clearwater, FL
Weapons procurement, Navy						
16		Accelerate facility restoration program	30,000	Byrd	NAVSEA	ABL, Rocket Ctr,WV
Procurement of ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps						
28		Grenades, all types	9,000	Lincoln	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Pine Bluff, AR
28		Grenades, all types	9,000	Pryor	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Pine Bluff, AR
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy						
4		Additional funds to smooth ramp up to 2 boats per year	79,000	Dodd	Electric Boat	Groton, CT
4		Additional funds to smooth ramp up to 2 boats per year	79,000	Dole	Northrop Grumman	Newport News, VA
4		Additional funds to smooth ramp up to 2 boats per year	79,000	Lieberman	Electric Boat	Groton, CT
4		Additional funds to smooth ramp up to 2 boats per year	79,000	Reed	Electric Boat	North Kingstown, RI
15		LPD -17	273,216	Landrieu	Boeing	Wichita, KS

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy						
15		LPD -17	273,216	Wicker	Northrop Grumman Corporation	Pascagoula, MS
Other procurement, Navy						
7		DDG MOD	25,000	Collins	General Dynamics - Bath Iron Works	Bath, ME
7		DDG MOD	25,000	Snowe	General Dynamics - Bath Iron Works	Bath, ME
119		Standardize metrics assessment of readiness & training	3,800	Reed	MIKEL, Inc	Middletown, RI
134		Man overboard indicators (MOBI)	4,850	Akaka	Briar Tek	Alexandria, VA
134		Man overboard indicators (MOBI)	4,850	Bayh	BriarTek, Inc	Indianapolis, IN
134		Man overboard indicators (MOBI)	4,850	Warner	BriarTek, Inc	Arlington, VA
134		Man overboard indicators (MOBI)	4,850	Webb	BriarTek, Inc	Arlington, VA
Procurement, Marine Corps						
50		Combat casualty care equipment upgrades	7,900	Graham	North American Rescue Products	Greenville, SC
Aircraft procurement, Air Force						
2		F136 engine advance procurement	35,000	Bayh	Rolls-Royce	Cincinnati, OH
2		F136 engine advance procurement	35,000	Kennedy	General Electric and Rolls Royce Naval Marine	Lynn and Walpole, MA
2		F136 engine advance procurement	35,000	McConnell	General Electric	Evendale, Ohio and Lynn, MA
4		Advance procurement or line close down costs	497,000	Chambliss	United Technologies / Lockheed Martin	Marietta, GA, various
4		Advance procurement or line close down costs	497,000	Collins	UTC - Pratt & Whitney	North Berwick, ME
4		Advance procurement or line close down costs	497,000	Dodd	Pratt & Whitney	Middletown, CT

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Aircraft procurement, Air Force						
4		Advance procurement or line close down costs	497,000	Isakson	U.S. Air Force, Lockheed Martin and United Technologies Corporation	Marietta, GA
4		Advance procurement or line close down costs	497,000	Snowe	Pratt and Whitney	North Berwick, ME
20		UAV NAS radar	31,000	CI	N/A	N/A
22		UAV NAS radar	31,000	CI	N/A	N/A
26		Advanced Weapons Integration (AWI)	16,700	CI	N/A	N/A
26		Combat Network Communications Technology (CONECT)	22,800	CI	N/A	N/A
26		Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM)	18,100	CI	N/A	N/A
48		Accelerate LAIRCM upgrades for AFSOC C-130 aircraft	2,200	Nelson, Bill	L-3 Crestview Aerospace	Crestview, FL
48		Accelerate LAIRCM upgrades for C-130 aircraft	15,000	Chambliss	Georgia National Guard	Savannah, GA
48		Accelerate LAIRCM upgrades for C-130 aircraft	15,000	Isakson	GA Air National Guard, Northrop Grumman Corporation	Savannah, GA
48		Acelerate LAIRCM upgrades for C-130 aircraft	15,000	Martinez	L-3 Crestview Aerospace	Crestview, FL
80		Litening targeting pod upgrades	27,900	Craig	Northrop Grumman Corporation	Arlington, VA
80		Litening targeting pod upgrades	27,900	Lieberman	Rafael USA	Rolling Meadows, IL
80		Litening targeting pod upgrades	27,900	Lincoln	USAF Targeting Pod Programs Office	WPAFB, OH
80		Litening targeting pod upgrades	27,900	Nelson, Bill	Northrop Grumman Corporation	Homestead, FL
80		Litening targeting pod upgrades	27,900	Pryor	USAF Targeting Pod Programs Office	WPAFB, OH
80		Litening targeting pod upgrades	27,900	Thune	Northrop Grumman	Rolling Meadows, IL

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Procurement of ammunition, Air Force						
2		Improved stores ejection cartridges	1,000	Thune	Tekord Corporation	Clear Lake, SD
Missile procurement, Air Force						
16		AEHF	212,000	CI	N/A	N/A
Other procurement, Air Force						
16		Eagle Vision one meter SAR upgrades	3,500	Akaka	Hawaii Air National Guard	State of HI
24		Next generation OTHR risk reduction	1,900	CI	N/A	N/A
28		Unmanned threat emitter (UMTE) modernization	10,700	Reid	98 Range Wing	Nellis AFB, NV
28		Unmanned threat emitter (UMTE) modernization	10,700	Schumer	DRS-Electronic Warfare and Network	Buffalo, NY
Procurement, Defense-wide						
1		SM-3 long lead	20,000	Lincoln	Raytheon Company	East Camden, AR
1		SM-3 long lead	20,000	Pryor	Raytheon Company	East Camden, AR
1		THAAD long lead	75,000	Sessions	United Technologies Corp	Huntsville, AL
1		THAAD radar long lead	40,000	CI	N/A	N/A
64		ISR mission equipment package	13,300	CI	N/A	N/A
65		MK 17 rifle	4,400	Graham	FN	Columbia, SC
82		Hand-held imager / long range	5,000	Kennedy	FLIR Systems, Inc	North Billerica, MA
82		Hand-held imager / long range	5,000	Kerry	FLIR Systems, Inc	North Billerica, MA
87		M53 joint chemical biological protective mask	5,000	Levin	Avon Protection Systems	Cadillac, MI
94		Joint bio standoff detection system (JBSDS)	8,000	Sessions	Science & Engineering Services, Inc	Huntsville, AL
94		Joint chemical agent detector (JCAD)	10,000	Bayh	Smiths Detection	Edgewood, MD
94		Joint chemical agent detector (JCAD)	10,000	Lincoln	Smith's Detection	Edgewood, MD
94		Joint chemical agent detector (JCAD)	10,000	Pryor	Smith's Detection	Edgewood, MD

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
TITLE: 2						
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army						
2	0601102A	Advanced energy storage research	3,000	Levin	Michigan State University	East Lansing, MI
2	0601102A	Advanced energy storage research	3,000	Stabenow	Michigan State University	East Lansing, MI
2	0601102A	Drug resistant infections research	1,500	Nelson, Ben	University of Nebraska Medial Center	Omaha, NE
2	0601102A	Military operating environments research	1,500	Ensign	Defense Research Institute	Las Vegas, NV
2	0601102A	Military operating environments research	1,500	Reid	Desert Research Institute (DRI)	Reno, NV
2	0601102A	Organic semiconductor modeling and simulation	1,500	Cornyn	University of Texas at Tyler	Tyler, TX
3	0601103A	Low temperature vehicle performance research	2,000	Levin	Wayne State University	Detroit, MI
3	0601103A	Nanocomposite materials research	2,000	Martinez	Florida State University	Tallahassee, FL
3	0601103A	Nanocomposite materials research	2,000	Nelson, Bill	Florida State University	Tallahassee, FL
3	0601103A	Nanocomposite wireless power systems research	1,500	Schumer	SUNY Stony Brook/SUNY Farmingdale	Stony Brook, NY
3	0601103A	Nanoscale biosensor research	2,500	Lincoln	University of Arkansas at Fayetteville	Fayetteville, AR
3	0601103A	Nanoscale biosensor research	2,500	Pryor	University of Arkansas at Fayetteville	Fayetteville, AR
3	0601103A	Urban simulation and training research	1,200	McConnell	University of Kentucky Research Foundation	Lexington, KY and Fort Knox, KY
5	0602105A	Cold spray technology development	2,000	Thune	H F Webster Inc	Rapid City, SD
5	0602105A	Composite materials applied research and technology	2,000	Carper	University of Delaware	Newark, DE
5	0602105A	Improvised explosive device blast simulations	475	Thune	South Dakota School of Mines and Technology	Rapid City, SD

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army						
5	0602105A	Magnetic nanosensor development	2,000	Nelson, Ben	University of Nebraska - Lincoln	Lincoln, NE
5	0602105A	Nanosensor manufacturing research	1,500	Kennedy	University of Massachusetts Lowell	Lowell, MA
5	0602105A	Nanosensor manufacturing research	1,500	Kerry	University of Massachusetts Lowell	Lowell, MA
5	0602105A	Ultrasonic consolidation research	1,700	Levin	Solidica Inc	Ann Arbor, MI
5	0602105A	Ultrasonic consolidation research	1,700	Stabenow	Solidica, Inc	Ann Arbor, MI
6	0602120A	Hydrogen battery research	2,000	Graham	Gecko Energy Technologies	Columbia, SC
8	0602211A	Slowed-rotor technologies	2,500	Lieberman	Carter Aviation Technologies	Wichita Fall, TX
12	0602308A	Photonics research for sniper detection	3,000	Kennedy	Boston University Photonics Center	Boston, MA
12	0602308A	Photonics research for sniper detection	3,000	Kerry	Boston University Photonics Center	Boston, MA
13	0602601A	Advanced vehicle technology and fuel development	1,500	Levin	Central Michigan University	Mt Pleasant, MI
13	0602601A	Condition based maintenance simulation tools	4,500	Isakson	Ricardo US	Georgia Tech and other various universities
13	0602601A	Condition based maintenance simulation tools	4,500	Levin	Ricardo Inc	Van Buren Township, MI
13	0602601A	Condition based maintenance simulation tools	4,500	Stabenow	Ricardo US	Belleville, MI
13	0602601A	Fuel cell development for medium and heavy-duty vehicles	4,000	Lieberman	UTC Power	South Windsor, CT
13	0602601A	Ground vehicle reliability modeling	2,000	Levin	Western Michigan University	Kalamazoo, MI
13	0602601A	Hybrid electric vehicle batteries for FCS	2,000	Bayh	EnerDel, Inc	Indianapolis, IN
13	0602601A	Hybrid electric vehicle batteries for FCS	2,000	Lugar	EnerDel	Indianapolis, IN
13	0602601A	Lightweight electric drive technologies	2,000	Thune	Dakota Power	Rapid City, SD

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army						
13	0602601A	Military fuels research program	2,000	McConnell	University of Kentucky Research Foundation	Lexington, KY
17	0602624A	UGV weaponization	3,500	Collins	Howe and Howe Technologies, Inc	North Berwick, ME
17	0602624A	UGV weaponization	3,500	Snowe	Howe and Howe Technologies	North Berwick, ME
18	0602705A	Soldier portable power pack technologies	2,000	Dodd	Ensign Bickford	Simsbury, CT
18	0602705A	Soldier portable power pack technologies	2,000	Dole	INI Power Systems	Morrisville, NC
18	0602705A	Soldier portable power pack technologies	2,000	Lieberman	Ensign Bickford Aerospace and Defense	Simsbury, CT
20	0602712A	Standoff IED detection technologies	3,000	Akaka	University of Hawaii, Arkansas State University, Florida A&M	Honolulu, HI, Jonesboro, AR; Tallahassee, FL
20	0602712A	Standoff IED detection technologies	3,000	Lincoln	Arkansas State University	Jonesboro, AR
20	0602712A	Standoff IED detection technologies	3,000	Pryor	Arkansas State University	Jonesboro, AR
23	0602782A	Portable compass/positioning/timing device development	2,000	Collins	CrossRate Technologies, LLC	Standish, ME
23	0602782A	Portable compass/positioning/timing device development	2,000	Snowe	Cross Rate Technologies	Standish, ME
25	0602784A	Geosciences and atmospheric research	2,500	Allard	Colorado State University	Fort Collins, CO
25	0602784A	Geosciences and atmospheric research	2,500	Salazar	Colorado State University	Fort Collins, CO
25	0602784A	Nanocomposite panels for blast and ballistic protection	1,500	Collins	University of Maine	Orono, ME
25	0602784A	Nanocomposite panels for blast and ballistic protection	1,500	Snowe	University of Maine	Orono, ME
27	0602786A	Ballistic materials for force protection	1,500	Collins	University of Maine	Orono, ME
27	0602786A	Ballistic materials for force protection	1,500	Snowe	University of Maine	Orono, ME
27	0602786A	Mobile feeding unit development	1,500	Kennedy	Acumentrics Corporation	Natick and Westwood, MA

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army						
28	0602787A	Bioengineering research	2,500	Chambliss	Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, GA
28	0602787A	Bioengineering research	2,500	Isakson	Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, GA
28	0602787A	Biomechanics research	1,000	Warner	Virginia Tech, Wake Forest	Blacksburg, VA
28	0602787A	Biomechanics research	1,000	Webb	Virginia Tech, Wake Forest	Blacksburg, VA
28	0602787A	Blast wave effect modeling	5,000	Nelson, Ben	University of Nebraska - Lincoln	Lincoln, NE
28	0602787A	Dengue fever treatment research	2,000	Dodd	NanoViricides, Inc	West Haven, CT
28	0602787A	Dengue fever treatment research	2,000	Lieberman	NanoViricides Inc	West Haven, CT
28	0602787A	Dried blood technology clinical research	2,000	Cardin	Core Dynamics, Inc	Ft Detrick, MD
28	0602787A	Dried blood technology clinical research	2,000	Inhofe	Core Dynamics	Rockville, MD
28	0602787A	Extremity war Injuries research program	5,000	Cornyn	Medical Research and Materiel Command, US Army Institute of Surgical Research, Ft Sam Houston	San Antonio, TX
28	0602787A	Genetics research for soldier survivability	2,000	Nelson, Ben	University of Nebraska Medical Center	Omaha, NE
28	0602787A	Military photomedicine program	8,000	Dole	Military Photomedicine Program (Fort Detrick, MD)	Peer reviewed competitive process to university research centers.
28	0602787A	Military photomedicine program	8,000	Kennedy	Administered by Air Force Office of Scientific Research	Competitive
28	0602787A	Nanomaterials research for biological processes	2,000	Lincoln	University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Little Rock, AR

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army						
28	0602787A	Nanomaterials research for biological processes	2,000	Pryor	University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Little Rock, AR
28	0602787A	PTSD research	2,500	Chambliss	Phoebe Putney Health System	Albany, GA
28	0602787A	PTSD research	2,500	Isakson	Phoebe Putney Health System	Albany, GA
28	0602787A	Traumatic brain injury research	3,500	Bayh	Purdue University	West Lafayette, IN
28	0602787A	Traumatic brain injury research	3,500	Lugar	Purdue University	West Lafayette, IN
29	0603001A	Biosensor controller systems development	3,500	Reid	Eye-Com Corporation	Reno, NV
30	0603002A	Advanced fibrin dressings	5,000	Cardin	STB Lifesaving Technologies	Rockville, MD
30	0603002A	Advanced fibrin dressings	5,000	Dole	STB Lifesaving Technologies	Rockville, MD
30	0603002A	Battlefield tracheal intubation technologies	2,000	Nelson, Ben	University of Nebraska Medial Center UNMC	Omaha, NE
30	0603002A	Bioelectrics research	2,000	Warner	Old Dominion University	Norfolk, VA
30	0603002A	Bioelectrics research	2,000	Webb	Old Dominion University	Norfolk, VA
30	0603002A	Combat wound initiative	5,500	Reed	TRT	Walter Reed, Washington DC
30	0603002A	Electronic vital signs monitoring	3,000	Reed	Northeast Knitting	Pawtucket, RI
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Akaka	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Baucus	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Bayh	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Bond	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Boxer	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Brown	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Dodd	Competitive	N/A

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army						
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Durbin	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Feinstein	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Kerry	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Lautenberg	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Rockefeller	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Sanders	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Schumer	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Snowe	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Gulf War veterans' illnesses research	13,000	Tester	Competitive	N/A
30	0603002A	Joint medical logistics modernization program	4,000	Dole	Intermec Technologies Corp	Everett, WA
30	0603002A	Joint medical logistics modernization program	4,000	Voinovich	Intermec Technologies Corporation	Fairfield, OH
30	0603002A	Lower limb prosthetics research	2,500	Kennedy	Foster-Miller	Waltham, MA
30	0603002A	Lower limb prosthetics research	2,500	Kerry	Foster-Miller, Inc	Waltham, MA
30	0603002A	Mild traumatic brain injury assessment sensor research	2,000	Levin	Beaumont Hospital	Royal Oak, MI
30	0603002A	Mild traumatic brain injury assessment sensor research	2,000	Stabenow	William Beaumont Hospital	Royal Oak, MI
30	0603002A	Online military medical training program	2,000	McConnell	Accella Learning and the University of Louisville	Louisville, KY
30	0603002A	Regenerative medicine research	5,000	Dole	Wake Forest University Institute for Regenerative Medicine	Winston-Salem, NC
31	0603003A	Helicopter vulnerability reduction technologies	1,500	Dodd	UTC Research Center	East Hartford, CT
31	0603003A	Helicopter vulnerability reduction technologies	1,500	Lieberman	UTC Research Center	East Hartford, CT
31	0603003A	Tactical integration systems development	3,500	Sessions	People Tec	Huntsville, AL

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army						
31	0603003A	UAV payload delivery systems	2,000	Sessions	Dynetics Inc	Huntsville, AL
33	0603005A	Advanced battery development program	10,000	Levin	U S Army Tank-Automotive Research Development and Engineering Center	Warren, MI
33	0603005A	Advanced digital hydraulic hybrid drive systems	3,500	Coleman	Eaton Corporation	Eden Prairie, MN
33	0603005A	Advanced digital hydraulic hybrid drive systems	3,500	Levin	Eaton	Southfield, MI
33	0603005A	Advanced digital hydraulic hybrid drive systems	3,500	Stabenow	Eaton Corporation	Southfield, MI
33	0603005A	Advanced lithium vehicle battery systems	3,000	Levin	T/J Technologies	Ann Arbor, MI
33	0603005A	Advanced lithium vehicle battery systems	3,000	Stabenow	T/J Technologies, Advanced Research & Government Solutions Division, A123Systems, Inc	Ann Arbor, MI
33	0603005A	Advanced tactical wheeled vehicle electric drive systems	5,000	Levin	Advanced Defense Vehicle Systems	Shelby Township, MI
33	0603005A	Advanced thermal and oil management controls research	5,000	Levin	Engineered Machined Products	Escanaba, MI
33	0603005A	Antiballistic windshield armor	4,000	Bayh	DefenseCS	Mishawaka, IN
33	0603005A	Antiballistic windshield armor	4,000	Graham	Defense CS	Mishawaka, IN
33	0603005A	Antiballistic windshield armor	4,000	Lugar	Defense CS, Inc	Mishawaka, IN
33	0603005A	Composite armor cab development	2,000	Reed	TPI Composites	Warren, RI
33	0603005A	Development of logistical fuel processors	3,500	Sessions	Auburn University	Auburn, AL
33	0603005A	Diverse threat sensor development	1,000	Levin	Michigan Technological University	Houghton, MI
33	0603005A	Diverse threat sensor development	1,000	Stabenow	Michigan Technological University	Houghton, MI

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army						
33	0603005A	Dynamometer facility upgrade	4,250	Levin	AVL North America	Plymouth, MI
33	0603005A	Dynamometer facility upgrade	4,250	Stabenow	AVL North America	Plymouth, MI
33	0603005A	Fastening & joining research	2,000	Levin	Oakland University	Rochester, MI
33	0603005A	Ground vehicle integration technologies	4,000	Levin	U 5 Army Tank-Automotive Research Development and Engineering Center	Warren, MI
33	0603005A	Hostile fire detection systems	2,500	Cornyn	Mustang Technology	Allen, TX
33	0603005A	Hybrid electric blast protected vehicle technologies	4,000	Graham	Force Protection	Ladson, SC
33	0603005A	Hybrid engine development program	6,000	Levin	U 5 Army Tank-Automotive Research Development and Engineering Center	Warren, MI
33	0603005A	Hydraulic hybrid vehicle systems	3,000	Levin	Bosch Rexroth	Rochester Hills, MI
33	0603005A	Hydraulic hybrid vehicle systems	3,000	Stabenow	Bosch Rexroth Corporation	Rochester Hills, MI
33	0603005A	Next generation non-tactical vehicle propulsion technologies	5,000	Cardin	General Motors	Michigan
33	0603005A	Next generation non-tactical vehicle propulsion technologies	5,000	Levin	General Motors	Warren, MI
33	0603005A	Next generation non-tactical vehicle propulsion technologies	5,000	Schumer	General Motors	Honeoye Falls, NY
33	0603005A	Next generation non-tactical vehicle propulsion technologies	5,000	Stabenow	General Motors	Detroit, MI
33	0603005A	Nickel metal hydride battery development	2,000	Levin	Energy Conversion Devices	Auburn Hills, MI
33	0603005A	Power and energy research equipment upgrades	12,000	Levin	U.S Army Tank-Automotive Research Development and Engineering Center	Warren, MI

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army						
33	0603005A	Power management control and integration systems	2,000	Levin	Global Embedded Technologies	Farmington Hills, MI
33	0603005A	Power management control and integration systems	2,000	Stabenow	Global Embedded Technologies, Inc	Farmington Hills, MI
33	0603005A	Solid hydrogen storage systems development	1,000	Levin	Energy Conversion Devices	Auburn Hills, MI
33	0603005A	Unmanned ground vehicle initiative	12,000	Levin	U S Army Tank-Automotive Research Development and Engineering Center	Warren, MI
33	0603005A	Vehicle prognostics technologies	3,500	Levin	nCode International	Southfield, MI
33	0603005A	Vehicle prognostics technologies	3,500	Wicker	nCode International, Inc	Starkville, MS
38	0603015A	Joint fires training systems	3,500	Inhofe	Institute for Creative Technologies	Marina Del Ray, CA
38	0603015A	Modeling architectures for battle command experimentation	2,000	Warner	Dynamic Animation Systems	Burke, VA
38	0603015A	Modeling architectures for battle command experimentation	2,000	Webb	Dynamic Animation Systems	Burke, VA
41	0603103A	Deactivation of military explosives research	S00	Inhofe	Oklahoma State University	Stillwater, OK
45	0603270A	Laser development for light aircraft missile defense	2,000	Levin	Omni Sciences	Ann Arbor, MI
45	0603270A	Laser development for light aircraft missile defense	2,000	Stabenow	Omni Sciences, Inc	Ann Arbor, MI
46	0603313A	Hypersonic interceptor studies	1,000	Brownback	Iron Tree Research	Lansing, KS
50	0603710A	Short range electro-optic sensors	3,S00	Nelson, Bill	DRS Technologies, Inc	Melbourne, FL
52	0603734A	Direct methanol fuel cell development	2,000	Martinez	University of North Florida	Jacksonville, FL
52	0603734A	Direct methanol fuel cell development	2,000	Nelson, Bill	University of North Florda	Jacksonville, FL
53	0603734A	Fuel cell technologies for continuity of operations	1,000	Levin	Ballard	Dearborn, MI
53	0603734A	Fuel cell technologies for continuity of operations	1,000	Schumer	Plug Power Inc	Latham, NY

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army						
53	0603734A	Fuel cell technologies for continuity of operations	1,000	Stabenow	Ballard Power Systems Corp	Dearborn, MI
54	0603024A	Unique item ID data management research	2,000	Reed	A2B Tracking Solutions	RI
54	0603024A	Unique item ID data management research	2,000	Wicker	Applied Enterprise Solutions	Oxford, MS
55	0603305A	Advanced electronics integration	4,000	Thune	Rosebud Sioux Tribe	Mission, SD
55	0603305A	Advanced environmental control systems	5,000	Reid	Rocky Research	Boulder City, NV
55	060330SA	Advanced fuel cell research	3,500	Cornyn	Lamar University	Beaumont, TX
55	0603305A	Radiation hardening initiative	3,000	Sessions	Analytical Services, Inc	Huntsville, AL
56	0603308A	High-altitude integration testbed	3,000	Sessions	COLSA Corporation	Huntsville, AL
57	0603327A	IAMD architecture analysis program	5,000	Sessions	Westar	Huntsville, AL
62	0603653A	Stryker active protection system	4,500	Cornyn	Raytheon Network Centric Systems	McKinney, TX
76	0604201A	Vibration management enhancement research	3,000	Graham	Intelligent Automation Corportation	Columbia, SC
82	0604601A	Next generation helmet	3,000	Dole	DSM Dyneema	Stanley, NC
87	0604642A	HMMWV modernization research	5,000	Bayh	AM General	Mishawaka, IN
87	0604642A	HMMWV modernization research	5,000	Levin	AM General	Livonia, MI
87	0604642A	HMMWV modernization research	5,000	Lugar	AM General	South Bend, IN
89	0604646A	NLOS-LS anti-tamper research	2,000	Bayh	Arxan Defense Systems, Inc	West Lafayette, IN
89	0604646A	NLOS-LS anti-tamper research	2,000	Lugar	Arxan Defense Systems, Inc	West Lafayette, IN
100	0604715A	Urban training development	6,000	Nelson, Bill	National Center For Simulation	Camp Blanding, FL
107	0604802A	Extended range sniper rifle research	3,000	Inhofe	Surgeon Rifles, Inc	Prague, OK, Charlottesville, VA
127	060425SA	Fixed-Wing aerial target development	3,000	Sessions	Applied Geo Technlogies	Huntsville, AL

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army						
135	0605602A	LIDAR and modeling improvements	3,000	Hatch	Dugway Proving Ground, Utah; Utah State University's Space Dynamics Laboratory, and ITT, UT	Dugway Proving Ground, UT, Utah State University's Space Dynamics Laboratory, and ITT, UT
137	0605605A	HELSTF	15,000	Bingaman	Northrop Grumman	White Sands NM
137	0605605A	HELSTF	15,000	Domenici	Northrop Grumman	White Sands Missile Range, NM
163	0203802A	Javelin modernization	10,000	CI	N/A	N/A
179	0708045A	Castings research for weapons systems	3,500	Brownback	Atchison Steel Castings	Atchison, KS
179	0708045A	Castings research for weapons systems	3,500	Lincoln	Benet Labs at Watervliet Arsenal	Watervliet, NY
179	0708045A	Castings research for weapons systems	3,500	Pryor	Benet Labs at Watervliet Arsenal	Watervliet, NY
179	0708045A	Manufacturing metrology research	3,000	Reed	Independent Quality Labs	Rockville, RI
179	0708045A	Nanotechnology manufacturing research	2,500	Chambliss	GA NanoFAB	Swainsboro, GA
179	0708045A	Near-net shaped body armor plate development	2,000	Lincoln	CoorsTek	Benton, AR
179	0708045A	Near-net shaped body armor plate development	2,000	Pryor	CoorsTek	Benton, AR
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy						
1	0601103N	Automated technology for landmine detection	1,500	Nelson, Ben	University of Nebraska - Omaha	Omaha, NE
1	0601103N	Radiation hardened electronic systems	1,000	Bayh	University of Notre Dame	South Bend, IN
1	0601103N	Radiation hardened electronic systems	1,000	Lugar	University of Notre Dame	Notre Dame, IN
3	0601153N	Energetics research	1,500	Cardin	Energetics Technology Center	La Plata, MD
3	0601153N	Manufacturing engineering educational outreach program	2,000	Levin	Focus.HOPE	Detroit, MI
3	0601153N	Quantum studies research	1,500	Warner	George Mason University	Fairfax, VA

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy						
3	0601153N	Quantum studies research	1,500	Webb	George Mason University	Fairfax, VA
3	0601153N	S&T educational outreach programs	1,500	Reed	N-STAR	Newport, RI
3	0601153N	S&T educational outreach programs	1,500	Warner	College of William and Mary	Virginia Public Schools - (Stafford, Spotsylvania, King George, Portsmouth, Accomack Counties, Fredericksburg City) Dahlgren DoD School; College of William and Mary
3	0601153N	S&T educational outreach programs	1,500	Webb	College of William and Mary	Virginia Public Schools - (Stafford, Spotsylvania, King George, Portsmouth, Accomack Counties, Fredericksburg City) Dahlgren DoD School, College of William and Mary
4	0602114N	Free electron laser development	3,500	Warner	Jefferson Science Associates / Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility	Newport News, VA
4	0602114N	Free electron laser development	3,500	Webb	Jefferson Science Associates / Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility	Newport News, VA
4	0602114N	High brightness electron source development	1,500	Warner	College of William and Mary	Williamsburg, VA
4	0602114N	High brightness electron source development	1,500	Webb	College of William and Mary	Williamsburg, VA
4	0602114N	UAV fuel cell technologies	2,500	Schumer	NanoDynamics Energy, Inc	Buffalo, NY
5	0602123N	Composite materials for high speed craft	3,000	Wicker	Seemann Composites, Inc	Gulfport, MS
5	0602123N	Energy systems integration research	3,000	Martinez	Florida State University	Tallahassee, FL

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy						
5	0602123N	Energy systems integration research	3,000	Nelson, Bill	Florida State University	Tallahassee, FL
5	0602123N	Infrared materials research	3,000	Inhofe	Ardmore Development Authority	Ardmore, OK
5	0602123N	Novel coating technologies for military equipment	3,500	Nelson, Ben	University of Nebraska - Lincoln	Lincoln, NE
5	0602123N	Port security technologies	3,500	Reed	Battelle	Newport, RI
5	0602123N	Port security technologies	3,500	Voinovich	Battelle	Columbus, OH
5	0602123N	SOF combatant signature and weight performance research	2,000	Collins	Maine Marine Manufacturing	Portland, ME
5	0602123N	SOF combatant signature and weight performance research	2,000	Snowe	Maine Marine Manufacturing	East Boothbay, ME
5	0602123N	Towed array systems M&S	2,500	Reed	Alion Science and Technology	Middletown, RI
6	0602131M	Rapid awareness systems	4,500	Akaka	Archinoetics	Honolulu, HI
9	0602236N	Acoustic Research Detachment test support upgrades	1,500	Craig	BAE Systems, Naval Surface Warfare Center	Bayview, ID
9	0602236N	Acoustic Research Detachment test support upgrades	1,500	Crapo	BAE Systems, Naval Warfare Center	Bayview, ID
10	0602271N	RF power technologies	1,500	Dole	RF Micro Devices	Charlotte, NC
15	0603114N	Mobile target tracking technologies	3,500	Akaka	Pukoa Scientific	Honolulu, HI
15	0603114N	Watercraft APS	2,500	Hatch	Chang Industries	California and possible testing in Utah
16	0603123N	Combined mishap reduction system	2,000	Kennedy	International Compliance Systems, Inc	Bedford, MA

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy						
16	0603123N	Integrated vehicle health monitoring	3,500	Kennedy	Curtiss-Wright Controls Embedded Computing	Littleton, MA
16	0603123N	Navy / USMC fuel cell non-tactical vehicle initiative	5,000	Cardin	General Motors	Detroit, MI
16	0603123N	Navy / USMC fuel cell non-tactical vehicle initiative	5,000	Levin	General Motors	Warren, MI
16	0603123N	Navy / USMC fuel cell non-tactical vehicle initiative	5,000	Schumer	General Motors	Honeoye Falls, NY
16	0603123N	Navy / USMC fuel cell non-tactical vehicle initiative	5,000	Stabenow	General Motors	Detroit, MI
16	0603123N	Single generator operations lithium ion battery	9,000	Lugar	Altairnano Inc.	Anderson, IN
16	0603123N	Single generator operations lithium ion battery	9,000	Reid	Altairnano, Inc.	Reno, NV
16	0603123N	Wide band gap semiconductor materials	2,000	Levin	Dow Corning	Midland, MI
16	0603123N	Wide band gap semiconductor materials	2,000	Stabenow	Dow Corning Corporation	Midland, MI
20	0603640M	Acoustic combat sensors	2,000	Inhofe	GWACS Defense, Inc	Claremore, OK
35	0603513N	DDG-51 permanent magnet hybrid electric propulsion	7,600	Dodd	DRS Technologies	DCbury, CT
35	0603513N	DDG-51 permanent magnet hybrid electric propulsion	7,600	Kennedy	DRS Power Technology, Inc	Fitchburg, MA
35	0603513N	DDG-51 permanent magnet hybrid electric propulsion	7,600	Lieberman	DRS Power Systems	DCbury, CT
35	0603513N	High temperature superconducting (HTS) propulsion motor	5,500	Kennedy	American Superconductor	Westborough, MA
35	0603513N	High temperature superconducting (HTS) propulsion motor	5,500	Kerry	American Superconductor	Devens, MA
42	0603561N	Continue SSBN(X) design & study activities	15,000	Dodd	Electric Boat	Groton, CT
42	0603561N	Continue SSBN(X) design & study activities	15,000	Lieberman	Electric Boat	Groton, CT
42	0603561N	Continue SSBN(X) design & study activities	15,000	Reed	General Dynamics	Groton, CT
60	0603725N	Hydrokinetic power generator	2,000	Levin	Vortex Hydro	Ann Arbor, MI
60	0603725N	Hydrokinetic power generator	2,000	Stabenow	Vortex Hydro Energy, LLC	Ann Arbor, MI
62	0603739N	Highly integrated optical interconnect for military avionics	4,000	Levin	Calumet Electronics	Calumet, MI

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy						
62	0603739N	Highly integrated optical interconnect for military avionics	4,000	Stabenow	Calumet Electronics Corporation	Calumet, MI
75	0603925N	Develop directed energy weapons for asymmetric threats	10,700	Warner	Navy	Dahlgren, VA
75	0603925N	Develop directed energy weapons for asymmetric threats	10,700	Webb	Navy	Dahlgren, VA
105	0604503N	Improved towed array handler	4,100	Reed	BAE Systems	Newport, RI
109	0604558N	Submarine electronic chart updates	5,300	Nelson, Bill	The Consulting Network, Inc	Melbourne, FL
120	0604756N	Next generation Phalanx	10,700	Hatch	Colemek Systems Engineering, Utah and Raytheon, KY	Colemek Systems Engineering, UT and Raytheon, KY
120	0604756N	Next generation Phalanx	10,700	McConnell	Raytheon	Louisville, KY
121	0604757N	NULKA improvements	9,000	Kennedy	Lockheed Martain Sippican, Inc	Marion, MA
123	0604771N	Composite tissue transplantation research	2,500	Chambliss	Emory University and Naval Medical Research Center	Decatur, GA
126	0604800N	Fund competitive propulsion system	215,000	Bayh	Rolls-Royce	Cincinnati, OH
126	0604800N	Fund competitive propulsion system	215,000	Kennedy	General Electric and Rolls Royce Naval Marine	Lynn and Walpole, MA
126	0604800N	Fund competitive propulsion system	215,000	McConnell	General Electric	Evendale, Ohio and Lynn, MA
159	0101221N	LINAC	4,000	Bayh	Indiana University	Bloomington, IN
159	0101221N	LINAC	4,000	Lugar	Indiana University	Bloomington, IN
166	0204163N	Warfighter enhanced decision making	3,000	Akaka	Group IQ	Mililani, HI
177	0205633N	Radio frequency synthetic subsystems for military automated test systems	3,000	Nelson, Bill	Indra Systems, Inc.	Patuxent River, MD
177	0205633N	Rapid repair structural adhesives	1,000	Reed	Epoxies Etc, Inc	Cranston, RI
206	0708011N	Digital direct manufacturing technologies	1,700	McConnell	University of Louisville	Louisville, KY

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy						
207	0708730N	National Shipbuilding Research Program	15,000	Sessions	Bender Shipbuilding	Mobile, AL
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force						
2	0601103F	Advanced design technologies for hypersonic research	2,000	Coleman	Univ of MN	Univ of MN
2	0601103F	Diamond substrates for microelectronics research	2,500	Reed	Group 4 Labs	CA, RI
2	0601103F	Information security research	2,000	Inhofe	University of Tulsa	Tulsa, OK
2	0601103F	Military decision cycle time research	1,600	Nelson, Ben	University of Nebraska - Omaha	Omaha, NE
8	0602102F	Advanced carbon fiber research and testing	2,500	Graham	Cytec Engineered Materials	Piedmont, SC
8	0602102F	Fire and blast resistant materials research	2,000	Kennedy	Triton Systems, Inc	Chelmsford, MA and Milwaukee, WI
8	0602102F	Health monitoring sensors for aerospace components	1,500	Collins	University of Maine	Orono, ME
8	0602102F	Health monitoring sensors for aerospace components	1,500	Snowe	University of Maine	Orono, ME
8	0602102F	Thermal protection systems for hypersonics	2,500	Hatch	ATK	Utah
8	0602102F	Thermal protection systems for hypersonics	2,500	Sessions	Southern Research Institute	Birmingham, AL
9	0602201F	Optical connector research	1,500	Levin	Translume Inc	Ann Arbor, MI
9	0602201F	Optical connector research	1,500	Stabenow	Translume Inc	Ann Arbor, MI
10	0602202F	Joint theater air-ground simulation system	2,500	Martinez	Dynamic Animation Systems, Inc	Orlando, FL
10	0602202F	Satellite control system training technology	2,000	Warner	Star Technologies Corporation	Great Falls, VA, Seattle, WA
10	0602202F	Satellite control system training technology	2,000	Webb	Star Technologies Corporation	Great Falls, VA, Seattle, WA
11	0602203F	Hybrid bearing development	2,000	Dodd	Purdy Transmissions	Manchester, CT
11	0602203F	Hybrid bearing development	2,000	Dole	The Timken Company	Canton, OH

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force						
11	0602203F	Hybrid bearing development	2,000	Lieberman	Timken Company	Manchester, CT
11	0602203F	Hybrid bearing development	2,000	Voinovich	The Timken Company	Canton, OH
11	0602203F	X-51B scramjet research	5,000	Corker	ATK Mission Systems	Ronkonkoma, NY & Tullahoma, TN
11	0602203F	X-51B scramjet research	5,000	Schumer	ATK Mission Systems, Tactical & Propulsion Controls Division	Ronkonkoma, NY
12	0602204F	Information quality research	1,500	Lincoln	University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Little Rock, AR
12	0602204F	Information quality research	1,500	Pryor	University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Little Rock, AR
12	0602204F	Wideband electronic sensing technologies	3,000	Reed	Applied Radar	North Kingstown, RI
13	0602601F	Seismic research program	13,000	Kennedy	Weston Geophysical Corp	Hanscom Air Force Base
13	0602601F	Seismic research program	13,000	Kerry	Weston Geophysical Corp	Lexington, MA
16	0602702F	Cyber attack mitigation technologies	2,500	Schumer	CACI Technologies	Rome, NY
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Bingaman	Competitive	N/A
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Brown	Competitive	N/A
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Casey	Competitive	N/A
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Dodd	Competitive	N/A
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Dole	Competitive	N/A
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Kohl	Competitive	N/A
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Levin	Metals Affordability Initiative	Multiple
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Lieberman	Competitive	N/A

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force						
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Reed	Competitive	N/A
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Reid	Metals Affordability Initiative Consortium	Huron, OH
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Rockefeller	Competitive	N/A
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Salazar	Metals Affordability Initiative	Multi-state
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Voinovich	Competitive	N/A
18	0603112F	Metals affordability initiative	5,000	Wyden	Competitive	N/A
19	0603203F	Reconfigurable secure computing technologies	2,000	Warner	Curtiss-Wright Controls Embedded Computing	Leesburg, VA
19	0603203F	Reconfigurable secure computing technologies	2,000	Webb	Curtiss-Wright Controls Embedded Computing	Leesburg, VA
21	0603216F	Assured aerospace fuels research	3,000	Voinovich	University of Dayton Research Institute	Dayton, OH
21	0603216F	HiSTED supersonic/hypersonic cruise missile engine	6,000	Levin	Williams International	Walled Lake, MI
25	0603401F	Thin film amorphous solar arrays	2,000	Levin	Energy Conversion Devices	Auburn Hills, MI
27	0603601F	Integrated targeting devices	3,000	Nelson, Bill	Argon ST Imaging Systems	Orlando, FL
30	0603789F	Optical interconnects research	2,000	Reid	OptiComp Corporation	Zephyr Cove, NV
32	0603924F	HEL directed energy weapon	5,000	Reed	Textron Systems	Wilmington, MA
40	0603438F	Space Situational Awareness	5,000	Kennedy	Raytheon Integrated Defense Systems (IDS)	Tewksbury, MA
40	0603438F	Space Situational Awareness	5,000	Kerry	Raytheon Integrated Defense Systems (IDS)	Tewksbury, MA
44	060384SF	TSAT	350,000	CI	N/A	N/A
55	06048S7F	Operationally Responsive Space	10,000	CI	N/A	N/A

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force						
67	0604425F	SBSS 10	10,000	CI	N/A	N/A
69	0604441F	SBIRS ops and training	30,000	CI	N/A	N/A
80	0604800F	Fund competitive propulsion system	215,000	Bayh	Rolls-Royce	Cincinnati, OH
80	0604800F	Fund competitive propulsion system	215,000	Kennedy	General Electric and Rolls Royce Naval Marine	Lynn and Walpole, MA
80	0604800F	Fund competitive propulsion system	215,000	McConnell	General Electric	Evendale, Ohio and Lynn, MA
80	0604800F	Technology development for F135 engine	35,000	Lieberman	Pratt and Whitney	East Hartford, CT
80	0604800F	Technology development for F135 engine	2,500	Warner	Sparta Composites	Suffolk, VA
80	0604800F	Technology development for F135 engine	2,500	Webb	Sparta Composites	Suffolk, VA
94	0604759F	High speed test track	4,000	Bingaman	General Atomics	San Diego CA
94	0604759F	High speed test track	4,000	Domenici	General Atomics	Holloman AFB, NM
108	0101113F	B-52 Combat Network Communications Technology (CONECT) program	9,500	Conrad	Boeing Integrated Defense Systems	Wichita, KS
108	0101113F	B-52 Combat Network Communications Technology (CONECT) program	9,500	Dorgan	Boeing Integrated Defense Systems	Wichita, KS
108	0101113F	B-52 Combat Network Communications Technology (CONECT) program	9,500	Landrieu	Boeing Integrated Defense Systems	Wichita, KS
108	0101113F	B-52 Combat Network Communications Technology (CONECT) program	9,500	Vitter	Boeing Integrated Defense Systems	Wichita, KS
145	0207581F	Improve maturity of MP-RTIP sensor suite for larger aircraft	98,000	Chambliss	Northrop Grumman Corp	Robins AFB, GA
145	0207581F	Improve maturity of MP-RTIP sensor suite for larger aircraft	98,000	Lieberman	Northrop Grumman Norden Systems	Norwalk, CT
145	0207581F	Improve maturity of MP-RTIP sensor suite for larger aircraft	98,000	Martinez	Northrop Grumman Integrated Systems	Melbourne, FL

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force						
174	0305111F	Integrate all terrain, weather & risk assessment information into one display	6,000	Nelson, Ben	ProLogic	Omaha, NE
182	0305159F	FINDER	25,000	CI	N/A	N/A
182	0305159F	Phased array	27,000	CI	N/A	N/A
198	0305219F	UAV sense and avoid	10,000	Reid	Sierra Nevada Corporation	Sparks, NV
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide						
4	0601114D8Z	DEPSCoR program increase	8,000	Collins	University of Maine	Orono, ME
4	0601114D8Z	DEPSCoR program increase	8,000	Inhofe	DEPSCoR	Norman, OK; Stillwater, OK, Tulsa, OK
4	0601114D8Z	DEPSCoR program increase	8,000	Nelson, Ben	University of Nebraska - Lincoln	Lincoln, NE
4	0601114D8Z	DEPSCoR program increase	8,000	Reed	DEPSCoR	RI Companies and University
6	0601384BP	In-vitro models for biodefense vaccines	1,000	Nelson, Bill	University of Central Florida	Orlando, FL
6	0601384BP	Superstructural particle evaluation	3,000	Dole	East Carolina University	Greenville, NC
10	0602234D8Z	Next generation OTHR risk reduction	2,800	CI	N/A	N/A
14	0602384BP	Agent fate response tool	2,000	Levin	Kettering University	Flint, MI
14	0602384BP	Agent fate response tool	2,000	Stabenow	Kettering University	Flint, MI
14	0602384BP	Chem-bio IR detector	3,000	Collins	Orono Spectral Solutions, Inc	Orono, ME
14	0602384BP	Multivalent Marburg/Ebola vaccine	4,500	Graham	GenPhar	Mount Pleasant, SC
14	0602384BP	Rapid response chem-bio countermeasures	4,000	Nelson, Bill	University of South Florida	Tampa, FL
14	0602384BP	Therapeutics against botulism	5,000	Nelson, Ben	University of Nebraska - Lincoln	Lincoln, NE
19	0602716E	Three dimensional integrated circuit research	2,500	Craig	Boise State University	Boise, ID

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide						
19	0602716E	Three dimensional integrated circuit research	2,500	Dole	RTI International	Research Triangle, NC
19	0602716E	Three-dimensional integrated circuit research	2,500	Crapo	Boise State University	Boise, ID
21	0602718BR	Blast mitigation and protection	2,000	Warner	George Mason University	Fairfax, VA
21	0602718BR	Blast mitigation and protection	2,000	Webb	George Mason University	Fairfax, VA
21	0602718BR	National incident management system	4,000	Warner	Virginia Tech	Blacksburg, VA
21	0602718BR	National incident management system	4,000	Webb	Virginia Tech	Blacksburg, VA
23	1160401BB	FOPEN radar technologies	2,000	Akaka	Novasol	Honolulu, HI
24	1160407BB	Portable TBI diagnosis systems	1,500	Lincoln	SFC Fluidics	Fayetteville, AR
24	1160407BB	Portable TBI diagnosis systems	1,500	Pryor	SFC Fluidics	Fayetteville, AR
27	0603122D8Z	TBI threshold research	2,000	Cornyn	Applied Research Associates	San Antonio, TX
33	0603384BP	Engineered biological detectors	2,700	Reed	BCR Diagnostics, Inc	Jamestown, RI
33	0603384BP	Improved CBR filters	2,000	Warner	New World Associates	Fredericksburg, VA
33	0603384BP	Improved CBR filters	2,000	Webb	New World Associates	Fredericksburg, VA
33	0603384BP	Raman chemical ID system	2,500	Kennedy	Ahura Scientific	Wilimington, MA
35	0603648D8Z	C2 gap filler JCTD	22,800	CI	N/A	N/A
39	0603680D8Z	High performance defense manufacturing technology program	10,000	CI	N/A	N/A
41	0603712S	Biofuels research program	4,000	Levin	Defense Logistics Agency	Fort Belvior, VA
41	0603712S	Emerging critical interconnection technology program	2,000	Bayh	IPC Association Connecting Electronics Industries / SAIC / NAVSEA Crane	Crane, IN
41	0603712S	Emerging critical interconnection technology program	2,000	Lugar	IPC Association Connecting Electronics Industries/ SAIC/ NAVSEA	Crane, IN

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide						
41	0603712S	Mobile microgrid research	3,000	Levin	NextEnergy	Detroit, MI
41	0603712S	Mobile microgrid research	3,000	Stabenow	NextEnergy Center	Detroit, MI
41	0603712S	Vehicle fuel cell & hydrogen logistics program	10,000	CI	N/A	N/A
44	0603720S	Superlattice nanotechnology research	3,000	Dole	University of North Carolina Charlotte -Northrop Grumman	Charlotte, NC; Baltimore, MD
59	0603826D8Z	Special warfare domain awareness	2,000	Collins	Technology Systems Inc	Wiscasset, ME
59	0603826D8Z	Special warfare domain awareness	2,000	Snowe	Technology Systems, Inc	Brunswick, ME
60	0603828D8Z	WMD exercises	1,500	Warner	Center for Asymmetric Warfare	Tidewater Region, VA
60	0603828D8Z	WMD exercises	1,500	Webb	Center for Asymmetric Warfare	Tidewater Region, VA
70	0603714D8Z	ASAP	20,000	CI	N/A	N/A
72	0603881C	Short-range ballistic missile defense	28,000	Wicker	ATK	AZ/MA
72	0603881C	Upper-tier follow-on to Arrow	30,000	Graham	Boeing	Alabama
72	0603881C	Upper-tier follow-on to Arrow	30,000	Wicker	ATK	Iuka, MS
75	0603884BP	Real-time viral agent detectors	4,000	Dole	Virus Detection Systems Corp	Cary, NC
76	0603884C	Mobile sensor network concept	5,000	Kennedy	Raytheon Integrated Defense Systems	Tewksbury, MA
81	0603892C	Aegis BMD/SM-3 enhancements	80,000	Lincoln	Raytheon Company	East Camden, AR
81	0603892C	Aegis BMD/SM-3 enhancements	80,000	Pryor	Raytheon Company	East Camden, AR
94	0604016D8Z	Asset lifecycle program	3,500	Akaka	Referentia	Honolulu, HI
94	0604016D8Z	Corrosion control, prevention and prediction research	3,000	Wicker	The University of Southern Mississippi	Hattiesburg, MS

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide						
96	0604670D8Z	COMPOEX	2,500	Akaka	BAE Systems	Honolulu, HI
100	0604400D8Z	UAV modeling & simulation	15,000	CI	N/A	N/A
103	0604165D8Z	Hypersonic boost glide vehicle	45,000	Sessions	Space and Missile Defence Command	Huntsville, AL
121	0604940D8Z	Range network enterprise technologies	3,500	Chambliss	Prologic, GA National Guard	Savannah, GA
121	0604940D8Z	Range network enterprise technologies	3,500	Isakson	GA Air National Guard, ProLogic Inc	Savannah, GA
121	0604940D8Z	SAM hardware simulators	5,000	Chambliss	Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, GA
121	0604940D8Z	SAM hardware simulators	5,000	Isakson	Georgia Institute of Technology	Georgia Tech and Smyrna, GA
139	0605790D8Z	Anti-tamper software systems	3,000	Collins	ANGEL Secure Networks, Inc	Massachusetts and Maine
139	0605790D8Z	Anti-tamper software systems	3,000	Snowe	Angel Technologies	Orono, ME
184	0303140G	Software assurance	1,000	Levin	University of Detroit Mercy	Detroit, MI
184	0303140G	Software assurance	1,000	Stabenow	University of Detroit Mercy	Detroit, MI
221	0305885G	Final e-Curfew	25,000	CI	N/A	N/A
225	0708011S	Industrial base innovation fund	30,000	CI	N/A	N/A
TITLE: 3						
Operation and maintenance, Army						
60		Unmanned aircraft systems concept development	3,000	Sessions	Navigator Development Group, Inc	Enterprise, AL
80		Shipping containers	2,000	Graham	Charleston Marine Containers	Charleston, SC
100		Life cycle logistics contracting	21,600	CI	N/A	N/A

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Operation and maintenance, Army						
110		Barracks repairs	7,768	CI	N/A	N/A
350		Redistribution of equipment	50,000	CI	N/A	N/A
380		Ammunition, inspections and warehousing	25,000	CI	N/A	N/A
Operation and maintenance, Navy						
60		Aircraft depot maintenance	63,000	CI	N/A	N/A
80		Damage control management	3,000	Warner	CACI	Northern Virginia, Tidewater Region, VA
250		MK 45 gun depot overhauls	9,000	McConnell	BAE Systems	Louisville, KY
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps						
10		Marine Corps shelters	2,500	Warner	Base-X Inc	Fairfield, VA
10		Marine Corps shelters	2,500	Webb	Base-X Inc	Fairfield, VA
20		Mobile corrosion protection	7,600	Akaka	Carwell Products	Nationwide
20		Mobile corrosion protection	7,600	Schumer	Carwell Products, Inc	Cheektowaga, NY
Operation and maintenance, Air Force						
10		B-52 flying hours	47,900	Conrad	US Air Force	N/A
10		B-52 flying hours	47,900	Dorgan	US Air Force	N/A
10		B-52 flying hours	47,900	Landrieu	US Air Force	N/A
10		B-52 flying hours	47,900	Vitter	US Air Force	N/A
60		B-52 depot maintenance	48,000	Conrad	US Air Force	N/A
60		B-52 depot maintenance	48,000	Dorgan	US Air Force	N/A
60		B-52 depot maintenance	48,000	Landrieu	US Air Force	N/A
60		B-52 depot maintenance	48,000	Vitter	US Air Force	N/A
60		Engine trailer life extension	3,000	Reid	Phoenix Aerospace	Moundhouse, NV
80		Land mobile radios	2,100	Reid	98 Range Wing	Nellis AFB, NV

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Operation and maintenance, Air Force						
90		National Security Space Institute	2,800	Allard	Air Force Space Command	CO Springs, CO
480		Advanced ultrasonic inspections	1,000	Inhofe	Veracity Technology Solutions, LLC	Midwest City, OK
Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide						
60		STARBASE Academies	5,200	Isakson	OSD	numerous
60		STARBASE Academies	5,200	Levin	Assistant Secretary of Defense, Reserve Affairs	N/A
170		POW/MIA research and ops in North Korea	13,700	CI	N/A	N/A
270		Defense readiness reporting system	16,200	CI	N/A	N/A
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Akaka	Military Installations Nationwide	Military Installations Nationwide
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Allard	N/A	N/A
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Bond	N/A	N/A
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Boxer	N/A	N/A
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Burr	N/A	N/A
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Cardin	N/A	N/A
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Cochran	N/A	N/A
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Dole	Office of the Secretary of Defense (Range and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI))	Funds to be expended throughout NC
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Inouye	N/A	Army Garrisson HI
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Isakson	N/A	N/A
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Landrieu	N/A	N/A
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Martinez	N/A	N/A

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide						
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Nelson, Bill	N/A	N/A
270		Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	20,000	Salazar	N/A	N/A
Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve						
80		Mobile corrosion protection	4,800	Schumer	Carwell Products, Inc	Cheektowaga, NY
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard						
10		Aircraft humidity protection	5,000	Warner	Logis-Tech, Inc	Richmond, VA
10		Aircraft humidity protection	5,000	Webb	Logis-Tech, Inc	Richmond, VA
10		Expandable light air mobility shelters	6,500	Levin	AAR Mobility Systems	Cadillac, MI
10		Expandable light air mobility shelters	6,500	Stabenow	AAR Mobility Systems	Cadillac, MI
70		Extended cold weather clothing system	1,000	Carper	Army National Guard	Elkton, MD
70		Extended cold weather clothing system	1,000	Reed	Kenyon and Duro Industries	Kenyon, RI and Fall River, MA
70		Weapons skills trainer	3,500	Nelson, Bill	Cubic Simulation Systems Division	St Augustine, FL
80		Emergency Satellite Communications	4,000	Cornyn	Texas Army National Guard	N/A
80		Mobile corrosion protection	4,800	Akaka	Carwell Products	Nationwide
80		Mobile corrosion protection	4,800	Akaka	Carwell Products	Nationwide
80		Rapid data management system	9,500	Collins	Global Relief Technologies	Portsmouth, NH
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard						
10		Controlled humidity protection	3,600	Graham	SC Army National Guard	Columbia, SC
10		Crypto-linguist/Intel Officer Initiative	750	Hagel	Nebraska ANG	Offutt AFB, NE
10		Crypto-linguist/Intel Officer Initiative	750	Nelson, Ben	Nebraska Nat'l Guard	Omaha, NE

TITLE: 4

Military personnel, Air Force

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Military personnel, Air Force						
		End strength for B-52 operation and maintenance	12,500	Landrieu	US Air Force	Minot AFB, ND; Barksdale AFB, LA
		End strength for B-52 operation and maintenance	12,500	Vitter	US Air Force	Minot AFB, ND, Barksdale AFB, LA
		End strength for B-52 operation and maintenance	12,500	Conrad	US Air Force	Minot AFB, ND; Barksdale AFB, LA
		End strength for B-52 operation and maintenance	12,500	Dorgan	US Air Force	Minot AFB, ND, Barksdale AFB, LA
National Guard personnel, Air Force						
		Crypto-linguist/Intel Officer Initiative	3,332	Hagel	Nebraska ANG	Offutt AFB, NE
		Crypto-linguist/Intel Officer Initiative	3,332	Nelson, Ben	Nebraska Nat'l Guard	Omaha, NE
TITLE: 5						
Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide						
998		Impact Aid	30,000	CI	N/A	N/A
998		Impact Aid - special assistance to local education agencies	10,000	CI	N/A	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Akaka	Defense Department	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Boxer	Defense Department	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Clinton	Defense Department	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Conrad	Defense Department	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Durbin	Defense Department	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Lautenberg	Defense Department	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Menendez	Defense Department	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Mikulski	Defense Department	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Reed	Defense Department	N/A

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide						
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Roberts	Defense Department	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Salazar	Defense Department	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Webb	Defense Department	N/A
998		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities	5,000	Whitehouse	Defense Department	N/A
TITLE: 13						
Operation and maintenance, miscellaneous appropriations						
10		Cooperative Threat Reduction	20,000	CI	N/A	N/A
TITLE: 14						
Defense Health Program - research and development						
5	63115HP	TBI and PTSD research initiative	3,000	Inouye	University of Hawaii, Manoa	Honolulu, HI
TITLE: 21						
Military construction, Army						
		Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	3,100	Stevens	Army	Fort Richardson, AK
		System Software Engineering Annex Phase III	16,500	Sessions	Army	Redstone Arsenal, AL
		System Software Engineering Annex Phase III	16,500	Shelby	Army	Redstone Arsenal, AL
		Saddle Road, Phase 5A	15,000	Akaka	Army	Pohakuloa Training Area, HI
		Saddle Road, Phase 5A, 5B	21,300	Inouye	Army	Pohakulo Training Area, HI
		Ready Service Magazine Complex	8,300	Bayh	Army	Crane Army Ammo Activity, IN
		Ready Service Magazine Complex	8,300	Lugar	Army	Crane Army Ammo Activity, IN
		School Age Services Center	10,000	Alexander	Army	Fort Campbell, KY
		School Age Services Center	10,000	Corker	Army	Fort Campbell, KY
		School Age Services Center	10,000	McConnell	Army	Fort Campbell, KY
		Access Control Point	6,100	Levin	Army	Detroit Arsenal, MI

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Military construction, Army						
		Access Control Point	6,100	Stabenow	Army	Detroit Arsenal, MI
		Mine Detection Training Facility and K-9 Kennel	10,800	Bond	Army	Fort Leonard Wood, MO
		Upgrade Munition Igloos Phase 2	7,500	Casey	Army	Letterkenny Army Depot, PA
		Upgrade Munition Igloos Phase 2	7,500	Specter	Army	Letterkenny Army Depot, PA
		Training Support Center, Phase 1	13,600	Warner	Army	Fort Eustis, VA
		Training Support Center, Phase 1	13,600	Webb	Army	Fort Eustis, VA
TITLE: 22						
Military construction, Navy						
		Indoor Small Arms Range	11,000	Dodd	Navy	Naval Submarine Base New London, CT
		Indoor Small Arms Range	11,000	Lieberman	Navy	Naval Submarine Base New London, CT
		Energetics Systems and Technology Lab Complex	12,050	Cardin	Navy	NWSC, Indian Head, MD
		Energetics Systems and Technology Lab Complex	12,050	Mikulski	Navy	NSWC, Indian Head, MD
		Dry Dock #3 Waterfront Support Facility	20,660	Collins	Navy	Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, ME
		Dry Dock #3 Waterfront Support Facility	20,660	Gregg	Navy	Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, ME
		Dry Dock #3 Waterfront Support Facility	20,660	Snowe	Navy	Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, ME
		Dry Dock #3 Waterfront Support Facility	20,660	Sununu	Navy	Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, ME
		Battalion Maintenance Facility & Equip Yard	5,870	Wicker	Navy	CBC Gulfport, MS
		Fitness Center	6,340	Cochran	Navy	Naval Air Station Meridian, MS
		Fitness Center	6,340	Wicker	Navy	Naval Air Station Meridian, MS
		Main Gate Security Improvements	8,160	Lautenberg	Navy	Earle Naval Weapons Station, NJ
		Main Gate Security Improvements	8,160	Menendez	Navy	Earle Naval Weapons Station, NJ

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Military construction, Navy						
		Marine Corps Officer Candidate School HQ Facility	5,980	Warner	Navy	Marine Corps Base, Quantico, VA
		Marine Corps Officer Candidate School HQ Facility	5,980	Webb	Navy	Marine Corps Base, Quantico, VA
TITLE: 23						
Military construction, Air Force						
		Fire/Crash Rescue Station	15,000	Kyl	Air Force	Davis Monthan AFB, AZ
		Large Crash Rescue Station	12,100	Boxer	Air Force	Travis AFB, CA
		Large Crash Rescue Station	12,100	Feinstein	Air Force	Travis AFB, CA
		Land Acquisition - 23 Acres	4,900	Allard	Air Force	Peterson AFB, CO
		Land Acquisition - 23 Acres	4,900	Salazar	Air Force	Peterson AFB, CO
		Satellite Operations Support Facility	8,000	Martinez	Air Force	Cape Canaveral Air Station, FL
		Satellite Operations Support Facility	8,000	Nelson, Bill	Air Force	Cape Canaveral Air Station, FL
		Upgrade Electrical Distribution, Phase VI	8,700	Akaka	Air Force	Hickam AFB, HI
		Logistics Readiness Center (P&D only)	1,800	Craig	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB, ID
		Logistics Readiness Center (P&D only)	1,800	Crapo	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB, ID
		Security Forces Complex	14,600	Landrieu	Air Force	Barksdale AFB, LA
		Security Forces Complex	14,600	Vitter	Air Force	Barksdale AFB, LA
		Indoor Firing Range	6,600	Wicker	Air Force	Keesler AFB, MS
		Upgrade Weapons Storage Area, Phase 1	10,000	Baucus	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB, MT
		Upgrade Weapons Storage Area, Phase 1	10,000	Tester	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB, MT
		Consolidated Support Center	12,200	Burr	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB, NC
		Consolidated Support Center	12,200	Dole	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB, NC

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Military construction, Air Force						
		Fire Station	13,000	Conrad	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB, ND
		Fire Station	13,000	Dorgan	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB, ND
		38th Recon Squadron Facility	11,800	Nelson, Ben	Air Force	Offutt AFB, NE
		Airfield Fire Rescue Station, Nellis	9,800	Ensign	Air Force	Nellis AFB, NV
		Airfield Fire Rescue Station, Nellis	9,800	Reid	Air Force	Nellis AFB, NV
		Consol Digital Airport Surveill Radar (DASR)/RAPCON Facility	10,200	Inhofe	Air Force	Altus AFB, OK
		Physical Fitness Center	9,900	Graham	Air Force	Shaw AFB, SC
		Base Entry and Perimeter Gates	11,000	Johnson	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB, SD
		Multipurpose C-130 Maintenance Hangar	21,000	Cornyn	Air Force	Dyess AFB, TX
		Multipurpose C-130 Maintenance Hangar	21,000	Hutchison	Air Force	Dyess AFB, TX
		Three-bay Fire Station	5,400	Bennett	Air Force	Hill AFB, UT
		Three-bay Fire Station	5,400	Hatch	Air Force	Hill AFB, UT
		Missile Service Complex (P&D only)	810	Barrasso	Air Force	F.E Warren AFB, WY
		Missile Service Complex (P&D only)	810	Enzi	Air Force	F.E Warren AFB, WY
TITLE: 24						
Military construction, Defense-wide						
		Ammo Demilitarization Facility Phase IX	10,000	McConnell	OSD	Blue Grass Army Depot, KY
		CV-22 Flight Simulator Facility	8,300	Bingaman	Air Force	Cannon AFB, NM
		CV-22 Flight Simulator Facility	8,300	Domenici	Air Force	Cannon AFB, NM
TITLE: 26						
Military construction, Army National Guard						
		Bethel Readiness Center	16,000	Murkowski	Army National Guard	Bethel Armory, AK

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Military construction, Army National Guard						
		Bethel Readiness Center	16,000	Stevens	Army National Guard	Bethel Armory, AK
		Infantry Platoon Battle Course (P&D only)	204	Lincoln	Army National Guard	Fort Chaffee MTC, AR
		Infantry Platoon Battle Course (P&D only)	204	Pryor	Army National Guard	Fort Chaffee MTC, AR
		Readiness Center	16,186	Durbin	Army National Guard	Urbana Armory, IL
		Barracks Replacement, Phase I	16,943	Levin	Army National Guard	Camp Grayling, MI
		Barracks Replacement, Phase I	16,943	Stabenow	Army National Guard	Camp Grayling, MI
		Infantry Squad Battle Course	2,000	Levin	Army National Guard	Camp Grayling, MI
		Infantry Squad Battle Course	2,000	Stabenow	Army National Guard	Camp Grayling, MI
		Field Maintenance Shop (P&D only)	2,058	Ensign	Army National Guard	Las Vegas, NV
		Field Maintenance Shop (P&D only)	2,058	Reid	Army National Guard	Las Vegas, NV
		Readiness Center	11,375	Ensign	Army National Guard	Elko, NV
		Readiness Center	11,375	Reid	Army National Guard	Elko, NV
		Readiness Center (P&D only)	682	Smith	Army National Guard	The Dalles Armory, OR
		Readiness Center (P&D only)	682	Wyden	Army National Guard	The Dalles Armory, OR
		Army Aviation Support Facility (addtion to FY08)	5,000	Reed	Army National Guard	N Kingstown, RI
		Barracks/Dining/Admin and Parking Complex Phase I	14,463	Johnson	Army National Guard	Camp Rapid, SD
		Barracks/Dining/Admin and Parking Complex Phase I	14,463	Thune	Army National Guard	Camp Rapid, SD
		Readiness Center	10,200	Leahy	Army National Guard	Ethan Allen Range, Jericho, VT
		Readiness Center	10,200	Sanders	Army National Guard	Ethan Allen Range, Jericho, VT
Military construction, Air National Guard						
		Engine Inspection and Maintenance Facility	4,000	Lincoln	Air National Guard	Little Rock AFB, AR
		Engine Inspection and Maintenance Facility	4,000	Pryor	Air National Guard	Little Rock AFB, AR
		Alert Crew Headquarters	4,200	Allard	Air National Guard	Buckley AFB, CO

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Military construction, Air National Guard						
		Alert Crew Headquarters	4,200	Salazar	Air National Guard	Buckley AFB, CO
		Replace C-130 Aircraft Maintenance Shops	11,600	Biden	Air National Guard	New Castle County Airport, DE
		Replace C-130 Aircraft Maintenance Shops	11,600	Carper	Air National Guard	New Castle County Airport, DE
		Vehicle Maintenance and Communications Training	5,600	Grassley	Air National Guard	Fort Dodge, IA
		Vehicle Maintenance and Communications Training	5,600	Harkin	Air National Guard	Fort Dodge, IA
		Smoky Hill Range Support Facility	7,100	Brownback	Air National Guard	Smoky Hill ANG Range, KS
		Digital Ground Station	14,300	Kennedy	Air National Guard	Otis ANG Base, MA
		Digital Ground Station	14,300	Kerry	Air National Guard	Otis ANG Base, MA
		Fuel Cell Hangar	4,500	Coleman	Air National Guard	Duluth 148th FW Base, MN
		Fuel Cell Hangar	4,500	Klobuchar	Air National Guard	Duluth 148th FW Base, MN
		Relocate Munitions Storage Complex	3,400	Wicker	Air National Guard	Gulfport-Biloxi IAP, MS
		Pararescue Facility, 106th Rescue Wing, Phase 2	7,500	Clinton	Air National Guard	Gabreski Airport, Westhampton, NY
		Pararescue Facility, 106th Rescue Wing, Phase 2	7,500	Schumer	Air National Guard	Gabreski Airport, Westhampton, NY
		Combat Communications Training Complex (P&D only)	1,100	Brown	Air National Guard	Springfield-Beckley ANG Base, OH
		Combat Communications Training Complex (P&D only)	1,100	Voinovich	Air National Guard	Springfield-Beckley ANG Base, OH
		Construct Air Traffic Control Tower	7,700	Reed	Air National Guard	Quonset State Airport, RI
		Replace Squadron Operations	8,000	Alexander	Air National Guard	Knoxville, TN
		Replace Squadron Operations	8,000	Corker	Air National Guard	Knoxville, TN
		262 Info Warfare Aggressor Squadron (IWAS) Facility	8,600	Cantwell	Air National Guard	McChord AFB, WA
		262 Info Warfare Aggressor Squadron (IWAS) Facility	8,600	Murray	Air National Guard	McChord AFB, WA

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

LINE	PE	DESCRIPTION	CHANGE (thousands)	MEMBER CI = committee initiative	SUGGESTED RECIPIENT	SUGGESTED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
Military construction, Air National Guard						
		Communications and Audio Visual Training Facility	6,300	Kohl	Air National Guard	Truax Field, WI
		C-5 Upgrade Taxiways (P&D only)	850	Byrd	Air National Guard	EWVRA Sheperd Field, WV
		Fuel System/Corrosion Control Hangar	27,000	Byrd	Air National Guard	Yeager Airport, Charleston, WV
Military construction, Air Force Reserve						
		Construct New Control Tower	6,450	Chambliss	Air Force Reserve	Dobbins ARB, GA
		Construct New Control Tower	6,450	Isakson	Air Force Reserve	Dobbins ARB, GA
		Joint Services Lodging Facility – Phase 2 (P&D only)	900	Brown	Air Force Reserve	Youngstown ARS, OH
		Joint Services Lodging Facility – Phase 2 (P&D only)	900	Voinovich	Air Force Reserve	Youngstown ARS, OH
TITLE: 31						
Department of Energy						
		NNSA Security	21,900	CI	N/A	N/A
		NNSA Security	18,100	Cornyn	Pantex	Amarillo, TX
TITLE: 32						
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board						
		DNFSB authorization	3,000	CI	N/A	N/A

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Departmental Recommendations

By letter dated February 5, 2008, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2009, and for other purposes." The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 5192 to the Committee on Armed Services on February 26, 2008.

Executive Communication 5192 is available for review at the committee.

Committee Action

The committee ordered reported a comprehensive original bill and a series of original bills for the Department of Defense, military construction and Department of Energy authorizations by voice vote.

The committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 passed by roll call vote, 24–0, as follows: In favor: Senators Levin, Kennedy, Byrd, Lieberman, Reed, Akaka, Nelson of Florida, Nelson of Nebraska, Bayh, Pryor, Webb, McCaskill, McCain, Warner, Inhofe, Sessions, Collins, Chambliss, Graham, Dole, Cornyn, Thune, Martinez and Wicker. Opposed: None.

The roll call votes on motions and amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the markup have been made public and are available at the committee.

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during floor debate on the legislation.

Regulatory Impact

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2009.

Changes in Existing Law

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary

to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.

○