AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

108TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
108–491

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 4200

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including committee cost estimate]

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

108TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
108–491

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 4200

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including committee cost estimate]

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

93–654 WASHINGTON : 2004

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

DUNCAN HUNTER, California, *Chairman*

CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania
JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, California
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, Indiana
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
JIM RYUN, Kansas
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
HEATHER WILSON, New Mexico
KEN CALVERT, California
ROB SIMMONS, Connecticut
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
ED SCHROCK, Virginia
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
TOM COLE, Oklahoma
JEB BRADLEY, New Hampshire
ROB BISHOP, Utah
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
PHIL GINGREY, Georgia
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona

IKE SKELTON, Missouri
JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
LANE EVANS, Illinois
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
MARTY MEEHAN, Massachusetts
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
JIM TURNER, Texas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ, Texas
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
BARON P. HILL, Indiana
JOHN B. LARSON, Connecticut
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
STEVE ISRAEL, New York
RICK LARSEN, Washington
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia
KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
RODNEY ALEXANDER, Louisiana
TIM RYAN, Ohio

ROBERT S. RANGEL, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	1
Purpose	2
Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations	2
Summary of Authorization in the Bill	2
Summary Table of Authorizations	3
Rationale for the Committee Bill	12
Hearings	14
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION	14
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	14
OVERVIEW	14
Aircraft Procurement, Army	17
Overview	17
Items of Special Interest	20
Airborne communications	20
Blackhawk helicopter de-icing system upgrade	20
Cashworthy crew seats	20
Modern signal processing unit	20
Missile Procurement, Army	21
Overview	21
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	24
Overview	24
Items of Special Interest	28
Air-droppable, lightweight armored direct fires system	28
Armor and vehicle protection kits	28
Bradley fighting vehicle integrated management	28
M1A2 system enhancement package	28
M777 lightweight 155 millimeter howitzer	29
Ammunition Procurement, Army	29
Overview	29
Items of Special Interest	33
Ammunition production base upgrades	33
Conventional munitions demilitarization	33
Other Procurement, Army	34
Overview	34
Items of Special Interest	44
Common system open architecture	44
Digital soldier	44
Distributed common ground system	44
Logistics support vessel	45
Physical security systems	46
Movement tracking system	46
Shortstop electronic protection system	46
Small Tugs	47
Tactical unmanned aerial vehicle	47
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	47
Overview	47
Items of Special Interest	52
AN/USC-42 miniaturized-demand assigned multiple access terminals	52
F/A-18E/F shared reconnaissance pod	52
H-1 series modifications	52
Joint primary air training system	53
Metrology and calibration program	53
P-3 series modifications	53
T-45TS and T-48	54

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

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

Page

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 252
Section 211—Future Combat Systems Program Strategy 252
Section 212—Collaborative Program for Research and Development of Vacuum Electronics Technologies 253
Section 213—Annual Comptroller General Report on Joint Strike Fighter Program 254
Section 214—Amounts for United States Joint Forces Command to be Derived Only from Defense-wide Amounts 254
Section 215—Authority of Director of Defense Research and Engineering to Award Prizes for Advanced Technology Achievements 255
Section 216—Space Based Radar 255
Section 217—Mark-54 Torpedo Product Improvement Program 255
Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense 255
Section 221—Fielding of Ballistic Missile Defense Capabilities 255

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 256
OVERVIEW 256
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 290
Budget Request Adjustments—Readiness 290
Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities 291
Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan 291
Paralyzed Veterans of America 291
Spare Engines 291
Working Capital Funds 292
Information Technology Issues 292
Overview 292
Information Technology Specific Reductions 293
Enterprise Resource Planning Program—Army National Guard 294
Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network 294
Navy Marine Corps Intranet 295
Other Matters 295
Core Logistics Capability 295
Fire Emergency and Services Program 296
Jinapsan Beach Properties in Guam 296
Moving Household Goods—Families First 296
New Mexico Training Range Initiative 297
Tents 297
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 297
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 297
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding 297
Section 302—Working Capital Funds 297
Section 303—Other Department of Defense Programs 297
Section 304—Reimbursement of Members of the Armed Forces Who Purchased Protective Body Armor during Shortage of Defense Stocks of Body Armor 297
Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions 298
Section 311—Report Regarding Encroachment Issues Affecting Utah Test and Training Range, Utah 298
Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot Issues 298
Section 321—Simplification of Annual Reporting Requirements Concerning Funds Expended for Depot Maintenance and Repair Workloads 298
Section 322—Repeal of Annual Reporting Requirement Concerning Management of Depot Employees 298
Section 323—Public-Private Competition for Work Performed by Civilian Employees of Department of Defense 298
Section 324—Public-Private Competition Pilot Program 299
Section 325—Sense of Congress on Equitable Legal Standing for Civilian Employees 299
Section 326—Competitive Sourcing Reporting Requirement 299
Subtitle D—Information Technology 300
Section 331—Preparation of Department of Defense Plan for Transition to Internet Protocol Version 6 300
Section 332—Defense Business Enterprise Architecture, System Accountability, and Conditions for Obligation of Funds for Defense Business System Modernization 300

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 344
Subtitle A—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations 344
Section 801—Rapid Acquisition Authority to Respond to Combat Emergencies 344
Section 802—Defense Acquisition Workforce Changes 344
Section 803—Limitation on Task and Delivery Order Contracts 344
Section 804—Funding for Contract Cancellation Ceilings for Certain Multiyear Procurement Contracts 344
Section 805—Increased Threshold for Requiring Contractors to Provide Specified Employee Information to Cooperative Agreement Holders 345
Section 806—Extension of Authority for Use of Simplified Acquisition Procedures 345
Section 807—Authority to Adjust Acquisition-Related Dollar Thresholds for Inflation 345
Subtitle B—United States Defense Industrial Base Provisions 345
Section 811—Defense Reciprocity Trade 345
Section 812—Amendments to Domestic Source Requirements 346
Section 813—Three-Year Extension of Restriction on Acquisition of Polyacrylonitrile (PAN) Carbon Fiber from Foreign Sources 346
Section 814—Grant Program for Defense Contractors to Implement Strategies to Avoid Outsourcing of Jobs 346
Section 815—Preference for Domestic Freight Forwarding Services 346
Subtitle C—Other Acquisition Matters 346
Section 821—Sustainment and Modernization Plans for Existing Systems while Replacement Systems are Under Development 346
Section 822—Review and Demonstration Project Relating to Contractor Employees 347
Section 823—Defense Acquisition Workforce Limitation and Reports 348
Section 824—Provision of Information to Congress to Enhance Transparency in Contracting 348

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT 348
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 348
National Defense University 348
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 348
Section 901—Change in Title of Secretary of the Navy to Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps 348
Section 902—Transfer of Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs from National Defense University to United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission 348
Section 903—Transfer to the Secretary of the Army of Responsibility for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program 349
Section 904—Modification of Obligated Service Requirements under National Security Education Program 350
Section 905—Change of Membership of Certain Councils 350
Section 906—Actions to Prevent the Abuse of Detainees 350
Section 907—Responses to Congressional Inquiries 350

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS 351
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 351
Counter-Drug Activities 351
Overview 351
Items of Special Interest 351
Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and tanker support 351
Northern Command counter-narcotics support 351
Southwest Border Fence 352
Tethered Aerostat Radar System 352
Other Activities 352
Airlift Support for Homeland Defense Missions 352
Civil Reserve Air Fleet 353
Defense Transformation 353
Global War on Terrorism 353
Homeland Defense Forces 354
Wisconsin Project's International Export Control Center 354
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 355
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 355
Section 1001—Transfer Authority 355

Page

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

Page

Section 1102—Foreign Language Proficiency Pay 362
Section 1103—Pay Parity for Civilian Intelligence Personnel 362
Section 1104—Pay Parity for Senior Executives in Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities 363
Section 1105—Prohibition of Unauthorized Wearing or Use of Civilian Medals or Decorations 363
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS 363
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 363
Subtitle A—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Global War on Terrorism 363
Section 1201—Documentation of Conditions in Iraq under Former Dictatorial Government as Part of Transition to Post-Dictatorial Government 363
Section 1202—Support of Military Operations to Combat Terrorism 363
Section 1203—Commander's Emergency Response Program 364
Section 1204—Status of Iraqi Security Forces 364
Section 1205—Guidance and Report Required on Contractors Supporting Deployed Forces in Iraq 364
Section 1206—Findings and Sense of Congress Concerning Army Specialist Joseph Darby 364
Subtitle B—Other Matters 364
Section 1211—Assignment of Allied Naval Personnel to Submarine Safety Programs 364
Section 1212—Expansion of Entities of the People's Republic of China Subject to Certain Presidential Authorities when Operating in the United States 365
Section 1213—Report by President on Global Peace Operations Initiative 365
Section 1214—Procurement Sanctions against Foreign Persons that Transfer Certain Defense Articles and Services to the People's Republic of China 366
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION 366
OVERVIEW 366
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST 368
Visa Requirements 368
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 368
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds 368
Section 1302—Funding Allocations 368
Section 1303—Temporary Authority to Waive Limitation on Funding for Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Russia 368
TITLE XIV—EXPORT CONTROLS AND COUNTERPROLIFERATION MATTERS 368
OVERVIEW 368
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 369
Defense Technology Security Administration 369
Defense Threat Reduction Agency 369
Nonproliferation Education 370
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 370
Subtitle A—Export Controls 370
Section 1401—Definitions under Arms Export Control Act 370
Section 1402—Exemption from Licensing Requirements for Export of Significant Military Equipment 371
Section 1403—Cooperative Projects with Friendly Foreign Countries 371
Section 1404—Licensing Requirement for Export of Militarily Critical Technologies 372
Section 1405—Control of Exports of United States Weapons Technology to the People's Republic of China 373
Section 1406—Strengthening International Export Controls 373
Subtitle B—Counterproliferation Matters 373
Section 1411—Defense International Counterproliferation Programs 373
Section 1412—Defense Counterproliferation Fellowship Program 374
Subtitle C—Initiatives Relating to Countries of the Former Soviet Union . 374
Section 1421—Silk Road Initiative 374
Section 1422—Teller-Kurchatov Nonproliferation Fellowships 374

Page

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

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION FOR INCREASED COSTS DUE TO OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM 375
OVERVIEW 375
SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATION 375
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 378
Procurement 378
Operations and Maintenance 378
Military Personnel 379
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 380
Section 1501—Purpose 380
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 380
Section 1511—Army Procurement 380
Section 1512—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement 380
Section 1513—Air Force Procurement 380
Section 1514—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement 380
Section 1515—Operation and Maintenance 380
Section 1516—Defense Health Program 380
Section 1517—Military Personnel 380
Section 1518—Treatment as Additional Authorization 381
Section 1519—Transfer Authority 381
Section 1520—Designation of Emergency Authorization 381
Subtitle B—Personnel Provisions 381
Section 1531—Three Year Increase in Active Army Strength Levels 381
Section 1532—Three Year Increase in Active Marine Corps Strength Levels 381
Section 1533—Extension of Increased Rates for Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance 382
Subtitle C—Financial Management Matters 382
Section 1541—Revised Funding Methodology for Military Retiree Health Care Benefits 382

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 382
PURPOSE 382
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW 382

TITLE XXI—ARMY 400
SUMMARY 400
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 400
Planning and Design 400
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 400
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 400
Section 2102—Family Housing 400
Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 400
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army 400
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2004 Projects 401
Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2003 Projects 401

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

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

Page

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

Page

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

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

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

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

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4200]

[Includes committee cost estimate]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

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

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

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 4200. The title of the bill is amended to reflect the amendment to the text of the bill. The remainder of the report discusses the bill, as amended.

PURPOSE

The bill would—(1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for procurement and for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3)

93–654

Authorize for fiscal year 2005: (a) the personnel strength for each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each reserve component of the armed forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and reserve components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize emergency appropriations for increased costs due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for the Maritime Administration.

RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORIZATION TO APPROPRIATIONS

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

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

SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZATION IN THE BILL

The President requested budget authority of $423.1 billion for the national defense budget function for fiscal year 2005. Of this amount, the President requested $402.6 billion for the Department of Defense, including $9.5 billion for military construction and family housing. The defense budget request for fiscal year 2004 also included $17.2 billion for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

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

In addition, the committee recommends $25.0 billion in budget authority for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this Act, to provide funds for additional costs due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS

The following table provides a summary of the amounts requested and that would be authorized for appropriation in the bill (in the column labeled "Budget Authority Implication of Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HEARINGS

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

The full committee conducted seven sessions. In addition, a total of 29 sessions were conducted by 6 different subcommittees on various titles of the bill.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2005 contained $76,034.3 million for procurement. This represents a $1,830.8 million increase from the amount authorized for fiscal year 2004.

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 procurement program are identified in the table below. Major issues are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Aircraft Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Airborne communications

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

The committee is aware of the urgent need for modern survival radios for Army SOF aircraft to replace older, less capable equipment that these aircraft now carry. Army SOF helicopters routinely perform search and rescue operations with all components of the U.S. armed forces, as well as with the disparate elements of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization member militaries. Growing numbers of these military organizations are migrating to modern survival systems that are incompatible with the communications equipment currently deployed on Army SOF aircraft.

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

Blackhawk helicopter de-icing system upgrade

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

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

Crashworthy crew seats

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

The crashes of CH–47s due to hostile fire and non-hostile fire incidents in Operation Iraqi Freedom demonstrate the need for crashworthy crew chief seats. The installation of crashworthy seats will increase crewmember mission efficiency and effectiveness while significantly reducing the risk of death or injury during a hard landing or controlled crash. Survivability equipment is an essential part of force protection, which is the committee's highest priority.

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

Modern signal processing unit

The budget request contained $37.2 million for AH–64 Mods, of which no funds were requested for the modern signal processing unit (MSPU) initial integration and production for the AH–64.

The MSPU is an embedded digital vibration diagnostic technology already developed by the Army for the AH–64A Apache and the AH–64D Longbow to monitor the tail rotor gearbox, the intermediate gearbox, and the auxiliary power unit clutch for incipient failures. The MSPU is a direct replacement for the 30 year old analog signal processing unit which is known to experience high failure rates and shown to be unreliable in detecting incipient gearbox

failures. The improved diagnostics of the MSPU will improve flight safety and reduce maintenance test costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.6 million to begin initial integration of the modern signal processing unit into the AH–64A and AH–64D production line and to procure the MSPU for fielding as spares for both the active Army and National Guard Apache and Longbow aircraft.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Missile Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Air-droppable, lightweight armored direct fires system

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

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

Armor and vehicle protection kits

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

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

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

Bradley fighting vehicle integrated management

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

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

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

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

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

M1A2 system enhancement package

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

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

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

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

M777 lightweight 155 millimeter howitzer

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

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

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

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Ammunition Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Ammunition production base upgrades

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

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

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

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

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

Conventional munitions demilitarization

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

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

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

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Other Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Common system open architecture

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

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

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

Digital soldier

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

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

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

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

Distributed common ground system

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Logistics support vessel

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

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

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

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

Physical security systems

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

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

Movement tracking system

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

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

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

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

Shortstop electronic protection system

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

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

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

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

Small Tugs

The budget request contained no funds for theater support vessels.

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

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

Tactical unmanned aerial vehicle

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

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

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

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Aircraft Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

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

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

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

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

F/A–18E/F shared reconnaissance pod

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

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

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

H–1 series modifications

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

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

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

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

Joint primary air training system

The budget request contained $2.5 million for procurement of Joint Primary Air Training System (JPATS) support equipment, but included no funds to procure T–6A aircraft or associated ground-based training systems.

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

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

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

Metrology and calibration program

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

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

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

P–3 series modifications

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

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

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

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

T–45TS and T–48

The budget request contained $52.4 million for one T–48 aircraft and $253.6 million for eight T–45C aircraft and its associated training system. The T–48 would be a multi-seat replacement for the T–39 aircraft used for undergraduate military flight officer training. The T–45TS is an integrated training system that combines the T–45 aircraft, simulators, and computer-based training for the Navy's intermediate-level undergraduate pilot training.

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

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

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Weapons Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Close-in weapon system block 1B

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

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

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

Evolved sea sparrow missile

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

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

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

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

Hellfire II missile

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

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

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

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

Pioneer unmanned aerial vehicle

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

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

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

Tomahawk missile

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

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

The committee understands that the Department of the Navy's programmed budget for TACTOM missiles would result in an inventory that is significantly below the Navy's stated Tomahawk required inventory levels, and notes that planned production of 293 TACTOM missiles is below both the fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2004 production rate of 350 missiles per year. Also, the committee notes that additional TACTOMs were included among the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2005 to restore inventory levels expended during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

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

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, NAVY & MARINE CORPS

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Ammunition Procurement, Navy & Marine Corps program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy & Marine Corps request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Aft ramp range retriever craft

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

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

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

Amphibious assault ship replacement program

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

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

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

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Other Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2005 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY										
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT										
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	-	9,009							-	9,009
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	-	22,271							-	22,271
	PROPELLERS										-
3	SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	-	-		7,000					-	7,000
	CVN Propeller Replacement						7,000				
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT										-
4	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	-	16,180							-	16,180
	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT										-
5	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	-	1,530							-	1,530
	PERISCOPES										-
6	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	-	62,050							-	62,050
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT										-
7	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	-	24,731							-	24,731
8	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	-	3,768							-	3,768
9	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	42,612							-	42,612
10	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	21,181							-	21,181
11	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	56,051							-	56,051
12	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	-	26,077							-	26,077
13	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	55,166							-	55,166
14	DSSP EQUIPMENT	-	21,131							-	21,131
15	CG-MODERNIZATION		114,139							-	114,139
16	LCAC	-	8,365							-	8,365
17	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	-	8,046							-	8,046
18	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	148,637		14,100					-	162,737
	Integrated Condition Assessment						11,800				
	Weapons Elevator Automation						2,300				
19	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	-	4,725							-	4,725

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Chemical biological defense for aviation and explosive ordnance disposal

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

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

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

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

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

Complementary acoustic system improvements

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

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

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

CVN replacement propeller program

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

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

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

Envelop protective covers

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

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

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

Integrated bridge system

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

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

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

Integrated condition assessment system

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

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

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

Man overboard identification program

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

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

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

Multi-climate protection clothing system

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

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

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

Programmable integrated communications terminal

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

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

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

Serial number tracking system

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

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

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

Weapons elevator automation

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Procurement, Marine Corps program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Marine Corps request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2005 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS										
	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES										
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES										
1	AAV7A1 PIP	-	58,596		46,400					-	104,996
	AAV RAM/RS Upgrade						46,400				-
2	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE	-	67,701							-	67,701
3	LAV PIP	-	41,588							-	41,588
4	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV)	-	-		8,500		8,500			-	8,500
5	MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)	-	11,844							-	11,844
6	M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS	-	36,873							-	36,873
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS										-
7	HIMARS	-	16,340							-	16,340
8	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	-	175,445							-	175,445
9	MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)	-	3,248							-	3,248
10	MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	-	4,024							-	4,024
11	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MIL	-	4,888							-	4,888
	WEAPONS										-
12	MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM	-	10,051							-	10,051
	OTHER SUPPORT										-
13	OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR	-	1,509							-	1,509
	TOTAL WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES		**432,107**		**54,900**		**54,900**		**-**		**487,007**
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT										
	GUIDED MISSILES										
14	EADS MOD	-	10,314							-	10,314
15	JAVELIN	-	-							-	-
16	PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP)	-	10,004							-	10,004
17	HIMARS ROCKETS	-	1,325							-	1,325
18	PREDATOR (SRAW)	-	-							-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT										-

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Assault breacher vehicle

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

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

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

Improved recovery vehicle

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nitrile rubber collapsible storage units

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

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

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

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Aircraft Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Advanced targeting pod

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

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

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

B–1B modifications

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

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

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

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

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

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

C–5 modifications

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

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

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

C–17

The C–17 is a strategic cargo aircraft, capable of rapid delivery to main operating bases or forward bases in the deployment area. The aircraft is also capable of performing tactical airlift and airdrop missions when required. The C–17 is currently procured under a multiyear procurement contract that delivers 15 aircraft per year with the last deliveries under the existing contract scheduled for fiscal year 2008. The Department of the Air Force currently plans for an inventory of 180 C–17 aircraft.

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

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

C–17 maintenance training system

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

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

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

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

C–130E engine upgrades

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

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

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

F–15 modifications

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

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

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

F–16 Air National Guard Force Structure

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

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

F–16 modifications

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

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

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

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

KC–767 aerial refueling tanker aircraft

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Predator unmanned aerial vehicle

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

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

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

Senior scout permanent carrier

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

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

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

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

T–38 modifications

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

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

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

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Ammunition Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Advanced extremely high frequency satellite

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

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

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

Evolved expendable launch vehicle

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

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

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

Other Procurement, Air Force

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Other Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

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

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Combat training ranges

The budget request contained $38.1 million for combat training ranges, of which $9.2 million was included for the joint threat emitter (JTE).

The JTE is an advanced, mobile, rapidly reprogrammable electronic warfare threat simulator that generates all known ground-based electronic warfare threats. The committee understands that the Air Force's Air Combat Command fielding plan for the JTE includes additional JTEs in fiscal year 2006, and believes that this schedule should be accelerated.

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

Advanced compression of tactical sensor information

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

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

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

Fixed aircrew standardized seats

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

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

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

General information technology

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

The Air Force Material Command's science and engineering lab captures, analyzes and disseminates lab test data to the Air Force's engineering and system overhaul operations. The SELDI program

facilitates this mission by providing a maintenance and logistics information management tool that allows more rapid lab data access affecting overhaul operations, provides accident investigators with immediate access to lab results of failed components, enables component failure trend analysis, and implements a new acoustic signature sensors to ensure the proper chemical composition of materials and equipment. The committee has recommended increases for the SELDI program in prior years, and continues to believe its implementation would improve operational aircraft readiness, increase flight safety and reduce support costs.

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

Point of maintenance and combat ammunition system initiative

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

The POMX/CAS is an automatic data collection program developed by the Air Force Materiel Command's Automatic Identification Technology Program Office, which streamlines mission critical data collection to reduce the burden on flight line personnel. The committee has supported the POMX/CAS in prior years.

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

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

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

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2005 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Items of Special Interest

Chemical agents and munitions destruction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The committee further notes the ongoing review of proposals for disposal at a commercial hazardous waste water disposal facility of the hydrolysate that will result from the neutralization of the bulk VX agent at Newport. The committee believes that the United States must proceed as rapidly as possible in destroying the stockpile to ensure the overall maximum safety of our citizenry and meet our international treaty commitments. At the same time we must proceed objectively and deliberately in ensuring that the disposal of the hydrolysate in a commercial hazardous waste disposal facility would not compromise the public health and safety of the citizens or the environment near such a facility. The committee directs that the Army proceed expeditiously in providing for a prompt, objective and deliberate independent review of the process for destroying the VX nerve agent stockpile at Newport and not proceed with that process until such a review is completed, the findings are made available for public scrutiny, and all concerned understand precisely the risks involved.

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

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

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

Chemical and biological defense procurement program

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

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

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

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

Countering improvised explosive devices

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

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

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

Guard and Reserve equipment

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

Indexing of class A mishaps

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

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

Joint threat work station, ground signals intelligence kits

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

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

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

Military specifications for radomes

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

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

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

Special Operations Forces binocular goggle system

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

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

Special Operations Forces MH–47 infrared engine exhaust suppressor

The budget request contained $447.3 million for Special Operations Forces (SOF) rotary wing upgrades and sustainment, but included only $2.9 million to procure the MH–47 infrared engine exhaust suppressor. The committee understands that these helicopter heat suppressors are a critical force protection requirement for the Army SOF MH–47 fleet now operating in a hostile environment, and believes that the entire fleet should be protected as soon as these suppressors can be manufactured. The committee notes that this item is on the unfunded priority list of the Commander, Special Operations Command.

The committee recommends $454.3 million, an increase of $7.0 million for SOF rotary wing upgrades and sustainment for procurement of additional MH–47 infrared engine exhaust suppressors.

Use of capability-based acquisition

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sections 101–104—Authorization of Appropriations

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

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM MATTERS

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

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

Section 112—DDG–51 Modernization Program

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 114—Force Protection for Asymmetric Threat Environment

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

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

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

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

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

Section 116—KC–767 Tanker Multiyear Procurement

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

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

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

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

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

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

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

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

ARMY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Advanced amputee treatment research and development

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

The committee notes that in Afghanistan and Iraq approximately 60 to 80 percent of all survivable combat injuries are to the extremities with 20 percent resulting in traumatic amputation. In order to provide the best care for these patients, the Surgeon General established the Walter Reed Amputee Care Center and the Army Amputee Patient Care Program at Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC). The program provides state-of-the-art treatment and is the center of a multi-site, coordinated complex of facilities involving regional military medical centers, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other military and civilian treatment facilities. The goal of the program is to ensure that amputee patients receive the kind of care that will allow them to lead lives unconstrained by their amputation.

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

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

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

Advanced battery technology initiative

The budget request contained $41.2 million in PE 62705A for applied research in electronics and electronic devices.

The committee continues to note continuing requirements for small, light-weight, efficient, and portable battery and non-battery power sources for U.S. forces and of on-going applied research and development activities of the military departments that address these requirements. The committee is aware of a number of emerging battery and non-battery power technologies that have the potential for meeting the requirements of the military services, including but not limited to alkaline cylindrical cells, cylindrical zinc air batteries, high capacity nickel/zinc rechargeable cells, lithium oxyhalide and lithium ion thin-film technology, lithium copper oxide, lithium carbon monoflouride cells, and proton exchange membrane fuel cells. The committee recommends that these technologies be considered for potential funded research and development under the services' on-going programs on the basis of technical merit, cost effectiveness, and the potential of the particular technology to meet service needs.

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

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

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

Advanced carbon nano technology

The budget request contained $131.2 million in PE 61102A for defense research sciences, but included no funding for advanced carbon nanotechnology.

The committee is aware that advanced carbon nanotechnology has the potential to open the door to the creation of new sensors and other devices.

The committee recommends $137.2 million in PE 61102A for defense research sciences, an increase of $6.0 million for a multi-institution, peer reviewed program for development of advanced carbon nanotechnology.

Advanced weapons technology

The budget request contained $16.6 million in PE 62307A for Advanced Weapons Technology.

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

The committee is also aware of the Army's need for additional funding for solid state technology laser research in support of directed energy weapons.

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

Aerostat joint project office

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

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

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

Applied communications and information networking

The budget request contained $41.8 million in PE 63008A for electronic warfare advanced technology, but included no funding for applied communications and information networking (ACIN).

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

The committee supports the application of state-of-the art commercial technology to improve military systems and recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63008A for ACIN.

Center for rotorcraft innovation

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

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

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

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

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

Center for tribology

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

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

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

Centers of excellence

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

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

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

Combat vehicle electronics

The budget request contained $16.0 million in PE 23735A for combat vehicle improvements, but included no funding to develop standardized next generation electronics architectures for current combat vehicle programs.

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

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

Defense language institute/foreign language center

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

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

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

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

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

Digital array radar technology development

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

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

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

Electronic flight planning

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

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

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

Flexible display initiative

The budget request contained $41.2 million in PE 62705A for electronics and electronic devices, but included no funding for the flexible display initiative.

The committee is aware that new flexible display technology has the potential to provide the military with technology to fabricate high definition displays on rugged conformable, flexible substrates. The committee notes that the United States Display Consortium coordinates these efforts with over 80 companies, using investments from both the public and private industry to accelerate the

development of technologies and products needed by the Army, other military services, and various national security agencies.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $13.5 million in PE 62705A for the flexible display initiative.

Force XXI battle command brigade and below blue force tracking system

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

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

Future combat systems

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

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

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

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

Geospatial information decision support for single integrated air picture

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

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

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

Human systems integration

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

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

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

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

Hydrogen proton exchange membrane

The budget request contained $69.6 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but included no funding for the hydrogen proton exchange membrane (PEM) ambient pressure fuel cell medium/heavy duty vehicle demonstration program.

The committee is aware that the hydrogen PEM fuel cell is to demonstrate zero emission, ambient pressure, highly efficient hydrogen fuel cell powered vehicles in various operating situations

and conditions. The committee notes that this development supports the government objective of tripling fuel economy while reducing harmful emissions.

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

Information dominance center

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

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

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

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

Institute for creative technologies

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

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

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

Integrated communications navigation identification avionics program

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

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

Joint and combined communications test tool product suite

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

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

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

JP–8 soldier fuel cell

The budget request contained $41.2 million in PE 62705A for electronics and electronic devices, but included no funding for JP–8 soldier fuel cell.

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

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62705A for development of the JP–8 soldier fuel cell.

LEAN munitions

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

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

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

Light unmanned aerial vehicle weaponization

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

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

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

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

Light utility vehicle

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

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

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62601A to design, develop, and deliver an operational prototype LUV.

Lightweight structures initiative

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

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

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

Low cost course correction

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

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

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

M5 high performance fiber for personnel armor systems

The budget request contained $21.1 million in PE 62786A for warfighter technology, but included no funding for M5 high performance fiber.

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

The committee recognizes the urgency to provide improved personnel protection and recommends $31.1 million in PE 62786A, an increase of $10.0 million to hasten development and evaluation of M5 fiber and M5 based armor.

Medical technology applied research initiative

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

The committee notes that the primary goal of medical research and development in the Department of Defense is to sustain medical technology to effectively protect and improve the survivability of U.S. armed forces in a variety of settings including, but not limited to: conventional battlefields, areas of low-intensity conflict, and military operations other than war. Operations of U.S. forces in the global war on terrorism have placed a premium on the need for a range of medical technologies in the areas of infectious diseases, combat casualty care, military operational medicine, and health hazards for materials, that are the core applied technology for the Army's military technology applied research program.

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

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

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

Clinical research programs

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

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

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

Medium tactical truck development

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

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

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

Miniature sensor development for small and tactical unmanned aerial vehicles

The budget request contained $22.6 million in PE 62709A for night vision technology, but included no funding for miniaturized hyperspectral and coherent imaging sensors for small and tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV).

The committee notes the urgent need for better sensors for small and tactical UAVs and recommends $27.6 million in PE 62709A, an increase of $5.0 million for miniaturized hyperspectral and coherent imaging sensors for small and tactical UAVs.

Modeling and analysis of the response of structures

The budget request contained $47.2 million in PE 62784A for military engineering technology, but included no funding for modeling and analysis of the response of structures (MARS).

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

The committee recommends $52.2 million in PE 62784A, an increase of $5.0 million for MARS.

Night vision fusion

The budget request contained $50.1 million in PE 63710A for night vision advanced technology, but included no funds to accelerate development of night vision fusion technology.

The committee recognizes that night vision capability has provided our armed forces a significant advantage over their adver-

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

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

Patient monitor with defibrillator

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

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

Portable and mobile emergency broadband system

The budget request contained $41.8 million in PE 63008A for electronic warfare advanced technology, but included no funding for the portable and mobile emergency broadband system.

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

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63008A to complete critical development of the portable and mobile emergency broadband system.

Shadow tactical unmanned aerial vehicle

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

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

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

Smart responsive nanocomposites

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

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

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

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

Space and missile defense architecture analysis program

The budget request contained $91.7 million in PE 63327A for Army air and missile defense systems engineering, but included no funding for the Army Space and Missile Defense (ASMD) architecture analysis program.

The committee places a priority on the development of a transformational capability. The committee recognizes the contributions of the ASMD architecture analysis program in providing the essential analytical, modeling, and simulation tools to support advanced concepts and architectures of future forces.

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

Strategic materials strategic manufacturing initiative

The budget request contained $44.7 million in PE 62624A for weapons and munitions technology, but included no funding for the strategic materials strategic manufacturing initiative (SM2i).

The committee notes that titanium is important for weight reduction of weapons systems. The committee is aware that SM2i will link the Army's efforts to establish a reliable low-cost domestic source of titanium with advanced domestic manufacturing capabilities.

The committee supports an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62624A for SM2i.

Titanium alloy powder

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

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

Titanium extraction, mining, and process engineering research

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

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

The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million in PE 62624A for TEMPER.

Unmanned systems initiative

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

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

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

NAVY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Advanced composite structures program

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Advanced laser diode arrays

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

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

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

Advanced mine detection program

The budget request contained $58.2 million in PE 63640M for the Marine Corps advanced technology demonstration, but included no funding for the advanced mine detection program.

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

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

Advanced processor build integration

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

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

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

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

Aegis open architecture

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

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

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

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

Affordable towed array construction

The budget request contained $75.6 million in PE 64503N for submarine system equipment development, including $5.2 million to continue the development of affordable towed array technology initiatives for the development of fiber optic thin line towed arrays technology initiatives. The affordable towed array construction (ATAC) program employs fiber optic thinline arrays to provide reliability improvements by reducing system complexity, eliminating wet end electronics, enhancing littoral capability and incorporating robust array construction methods.

The committee believes that accelerating the development and fielding of fiber optic towed array technology using improved construction methods and processes would provide increased performance, reliability and operational capabilities at reduced costs.

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

Affordable weapon system

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

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

The committee notes that the ONR program has been successful in all respects. In less than four years, the AWS program demonstrated the use of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) components to construct a 400–600 mile range, subsonic (180–220 knot), loitering, 200 pound payload, precision strike missile with global positioning inertial navigation system guidance; a control unit; and a data link. The missile has both line-of-sight and satellite data links for interaction with ground stations and forward observers and is reprogrammable in flight. In operational use the missile would be launched from CONEX-type containers that hold between six and twenty missiles and could be carried on land, sea, or air platforms. The initiative has demonstrated that the COTS approach can reduce costs by an order of magnitude from traditional cruise missiles. The current missile cost in large scale production, exclusive of warhead, is estimated to be approximately $60,000.

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

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

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

Airborne mine neutralization system

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

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

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

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

Airborne reconnaissance systems

The budget request contained $10.2 million in PE 35206N for airborne reconnaissance systems, but included no funding for passive collision avoidance and reconnaissance (PCAR).

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

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

Therefore, to improve safety of UAV operations, the committee recommends $13.2 million in PE 35206N, an increase of $3.0 million for PCAR.

AN/BLQ–10 test and support

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

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

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

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

Anti-torpedo torpedo

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

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

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

Automatic radar periscope detection and discrimination

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

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

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

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

Aviation ship integration center

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

The Aviation Ship Integration Center supports the development and conceptualization of fully integrated advanced technology designs for future aircraft carriers. The center identifies, tests, and integrates transformational design changes and products for aviation capable ships and component systems, and permits the identification and resolution of potential problems early in the development cycle, thereby reducing overall engineering costs and facilitating the introduction of transformational initiatives in the CVN–21 carrier.

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

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

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

Aviation shipboard information technology initiative

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

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

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

Biomedical research imaging

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

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

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

Center for critical infrastructure protection

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

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

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

Claymore marine

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

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

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

Common submarine radio room

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

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

The committee recommends $36.4 million in PE 33140N, an increase of $17.7 million for the Navy's unfunded requirement for the CSRR.

Composite ceramic unmanned underwater vehicle

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

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

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

Consolidated undersea situational awareness

The budget request contained $79.5 million in PE 63235N for common picture advanced technology development, but included no funds to continue development of the consolidated undersea situational awareness system (CUSAS).

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

The committee notes the progress in the development of CUSAS. The system has demonstrated the capability to interface with, process, and display all sources of sensor and intelligence data onboard a U.S. submarine. The core technology has been installed and successfully demonstrated in an operational tactical submarine trainer and a follow-on at-sea demonstration is scheduled later in 2004. The committee believes that successful development of the CUSAS decision support system would provide a capability that would significantly assist submarine commanders to make rapid and informed decisions in critical combat operations.

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

DD(X) multi-mission destroyer

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Deployable joint command and control

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

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

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

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

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

Digital modular radio

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

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

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

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

DP–2 thrust vectoring system

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

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

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

Electromagnetic gun program

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Emerging/critical interconnection technology

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

The committee notes that printed circuit boards are fundamental components of military navigation, guidance and control, electronic warfare, missile, and surveillance and communications equipment. The committee notes that printed circuit boards for military systems have unique design requirements for high performance, high reliability, and the ability to operate under extreme environmental conditions that require the use of high density, highly rugged, and highly reliable interconnection technology. The committee also notes that the commercial printed circuit board industry focuses on the design and high-volume production of low-cost boards and the United States has lost much of its printed circuit board manufacturing capability to overseas sources. The committee recognizes the need to enhance the U.S. capability for development and production

of high density, highly reliable printed circuit boards for use in U.S. military systems. Congress appropriated $3.5 million in fiscal year 2004 for this program.

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

Enterprise resource planning

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

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

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

Enterprise targeting and strike system

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

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

Evolved sea sparrow missile capability for large decks

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Formable aligned carbon thermosets

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

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

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

Gallium nitride radio-frequency power technology

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

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

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

Hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier

The budget request contained $6.9 million in PE 64771N for medical system development and demonstration. No funds were specifically requested to continue the development of hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier technology.

The committee notes that there is currently no effective method of providing front-line resuscitative treatment (i.e. immediate oxygen-carrying support) for acute blood loss to wounded soldiers on the battlefield and civilian trauma victims in an out-of-hospital setting. The single major cause of death in potentially salvageable battlefield casualties is hemorrhage and blood loss, and early intervention to treat hemorrhage provides the greatest opportunity for reducing mortality and morbidity. Although blood transfusion is not practical in far forward or out-of-hospital settings, hemoglobin-based oxygen carriers have the characteristics of stability at room temperature that overcome many of the medical and logistical problems associated with red blood cell transfusion.

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

The committee recommends an increase of $13.0 million in PE 64771N to continue the program for development and clinical trials of hemoglobin-based oxygen carriers for treatment of trauma casualties.

High temperature superconducting AC synchronous ship propulsion motor

The budget request contained $82.1 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development, including $16.0 million to continue development of a 36.5 megawatt class, high temperature superconducting alternating current (AC) synchronous motor.

The committee notes that development of component technologies for the all electric warship is one of the major goals of the Navy's science and technology program. In fiscal year 2003, the Navy awarded a contract for development and demonstration of high temperature, superconducting AC synchronous motor technology in a 36.5 megawatt propulsion motor and drive system that would be designed to be compatible with Navy electric warship concepts and performance requirements, and would be available to begin Navy evaluation in fiscal year 2006. The committee is informed that the Navy's budget request is not sufficient to maintain the program schedule.

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

Hybrid POSS composites development

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

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

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

Integrated personnel protection system

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

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

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

Integrated radar optical surveillance and sighting system

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

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

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

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

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

Intermediate modulus carbon fiber qualification

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

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

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

Interrogator for high-speed retro-reflective communications

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

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

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

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

Joint integrated systems technology

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

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

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

Joint Strike Fighter

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

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

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

Laser radar data exploitation

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

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

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

Littoral combat ship

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Littoral support craft-experimental

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

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

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

Low acoustic signature motor/propulsor

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

The committee notes that the low acoustic signature motor propulsor for electrically powered undersea vehicles (LAMPREY) will demonstrate an integrated motor-propulsor and power converter with extremely low acoustic signature for undersea vehicles. When integrated with an already developed, high power lithium-propulsion system, the LAMPREY program will represent a new propulsion system for an upgraded MK–48 Advanced Capability torpedo. The LAMPREY test vehicle will also represent a 1/20th-scale submarine and will provide valuable data for a larger scale version of the propulsion system that could ultimately be used in

Virginia class submarines. Congress provided $2.1 million in fiscal year 2003 and $1.8 million in fiscal year 2004 for the LAMPREY program.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62747N to complete on-range testing of the LAMPREY test vehicle to verify acoustic performance of the propulsion system and maximum speed, range, and maneuvering characteristics.

Low-cost terminal imaging seeker

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

The committee notes that the Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, China Lake is demonstrating a low-cost precision guidance upgrade kit for a low-cost terminal imaging seeker (LCTIS) that is an out-growth of the low-cost guided imaging rocket (LOGIR) project. The committee believes that the technology which would be demonstrated in the LCTIS could have application to the advanced precision kill weapon system, the joint common missile, and the small diameter bomb and would be a risk reduction alternative for all three of these programs. The committee notes that the plan for use of additional fiscal year 2005 funding for the LCTIS project would include development and test of seeker guidance and control alternatives and seeker signal processing algorithms.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63114N for LCTIS advanced technology development and demonstration.

Low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines

The budget request contained $92.4 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology, but included no funding for low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines.

The committee continues to support the development of improved signal processing capability for unmanned aerial vehicles for precision targeting and other missions. The committee notes that the massively parallel processing technology being developed under the low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines program should provide significantly enhanced on-board sensor processing capabilities that will address the difficult computational challenge of on-board sensor processing capabilities for unmanned aerial vehicles and will greatly enhance sensor performance and surveillance capabilities. Congress appropriated $1.5 million for the program in fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63114N to accelerate advanced technology development of low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines.

Marine mammal research program

The budget request contained $63.7 million in PE 62236N for warfighter sustainment applied research, but included no funds for continuation of the marine mammal research program.

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

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

Nanoscience and nanomaterials

The budget request contained $375.8 million in PE 61153N for defense research sciences, including $65.8 million for basic research in advanced naval materials sciences.

The committee notes continuing progress in research in nanoscience and nanomaterials. The committee is also aware that the application of these new concepts and technologies in improved materials, novel structures, and integrated multifunctional composite materials and structures that address high priority Navy science and technology needs and future Navy capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 61153N for basic research in nanoscience and nanomaterials.

One megawatt molten carbonate fuel cell demonstrator

The budget request contained $1.5 million in PE 63724N for advanced component development and prototyping for the Navy energy program. No funds were requested for the development and demonstration of a one megawatt molten carbonate fuel cell.

The committee notes that reliable, grid-independent and environmentally "clean" power plants would provide many advantages for Department of Defense use. The ability of such power plants to generate electricity independent from the local electrical utilities would enhance base security by satisfying the critical military need of providing uninterruptible electrical service.

The committee recommends $7.5 million in PE 63724N, an increase of $6.0 million for the development and demonstration of a one megawatt molten carbonate fuel cell.

Open architecture warfare systems

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

The committee notes that open architecture warfare systems support the Navy's top priority of modernizing warfighting capabilities to meet the concepts described in Sea Power 21 and that open architecture is the technology enabler that supports the Navy's FORCEnet and joint interoperability. Established in a commercially based computing environment, open architecture provides the common internet protocol technology base that will be critical to the seamless interchange of information among elements of the Navy's battle management command and control systems and the operational and planning capabilities required to make network-centric warfare effective.

The Navy has identified a requirement for $21.8 million in fiscal year 2005 to fully fund the implementation of open architecture and establish a single functional information architecture for Navy surface forces. The committee notes that providing these funds in fiscal year 2005 would complete the engineering effort to modernize and report the software for Ship Self Defense System Mark 2 (SSDS MK 2) combat system applications and comply with the required technical and functional system design standards that are the necessary precursors for implementing the single integrated operational picture.

The committee recommends an increase of $21.8 million in PE 64755N for the Navy's unfunded requirement for open architecture systems development.

Open architecture wireless sensors

The budget request contained $9.3 million in PE 65013N for information technology system development and demonstration.

The committee notes that the applications of wireless networking have achieved significant cost reductions and benefits to the U.S. Navy in ship building through the use of wearable computers, personal data assistants, and wireless communications devices that enable supervisors, engineers, technicians, and construction workers to coordinate their activities more efficiently. The committee believes that the future insertion of wireless network applications through the shipboard environment and the converging of multiple networks into a single ship-wide network could facilitate significant improvements in ship operations, damage control, maintenance, and other activities.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 65013N for development and demonstration of open architecture wireless sensors and their applications to improvements in ship operations, maintenance and monitoring of ship systems, damage control, and other activities.

Organ transplant technology

The budget request contained $16.7 million in PE 63729N for warfighter protection advanced technology development. No funds were requested for continuation of the organ transfer technology program.

The committee continues to note progress in the development of immune therapies by investigators at the Naval Medical Research Center that have been shown to prevent the rejection of tissue and organ transplants without the need for continuous use of immunosuppressive drugs. In fiscal year 2001, the Chief of Naval Research initiated a program to capitalize on these newly developed methods of treatment. The committee notes the continuing progress in the clinical trials program. The committee believes that the ability to transplant massive tissue segments without rejection could revolutionize the treatment of combat casualties who suffer significant tissue loss or organ damage from blast, missile fragments, or burns.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63729N to continue the organ transfer technology clinical trials program.

Project M

The budget request contained $82.1 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development. No funds were included for continuation of Project M.

The committee notes the progress in the Office of Naval Research (ONR) program to evaluate the ability of Project M technology to mitigate the high shock and vibration experienced by the Navy SEALS Mark V patrol craft crew and passengers in high-speed special operations. The committee is aware that at-sea tests of the technology are scheduled for the summer of 2004.

The committee also notes the application of Project M technology to reduce the magnetic signature of electric propulsion motors. As the Navy places increased emphasis on the introduction of the "electric" ship and the use of electric motors for ship propulsion, reduction of the magnetic signature of the ship as a defense against magnetic-influence mines, particularly in littoral operations, will become increasingly important. The committee strongly recommends that the Navy consider the exploitation of the Project M technology for magnetic signature reduction in new construction ships such as the DD(X) destroyer and the Littoral Combat Ship.

The committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) directed the Secretary of the Navy and the Commander, Special Operations Command, to report to the congressional defense committees on plans for transition of Project M shock reduction technology to potential operational use, and the Secretary to report Department of the Navy plans for further development, evaluation, and exploitation of Project M technology for magnetic signature reduction. The committee expects the results of the shock-mitigation at-sea trials to be included in the report.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63123N to continue the development and demonstration of Project M technology.

Rapid deployment fortification wall

The budget request contained $58.2 million in PE 63640M for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstration. No funds were requested to continue the development and evaluation of the rapid deployment fortification wall.

In the fiscal year 2004 budget the committee initiated a program for development and evaluation of a rapid deployment fortification wall (RDFW) which would provide a significantly faster means for force protection than the use of sand bags. The RDFW has been selected for force protection evaluation at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. The committee is informed that additional funding for the evaluation would permit its evaluation as a vehicular barrier and a more comprehensive evaluation of the speed of installation, labor savings, construction, and structural integrity, and innovative uses of the RDFW.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63640M to continue evaluation of the RDFW.

Real-time precision targeting radar

The budget request contained $44.0 million in PE 63271N for radio frequency systems advanced technology development. No funds were requested for the AN/APY–6 radar.

The committee notes the Navy's operational requirement for reducing the targeting cycle for engaging time-critical mobile targets and enhancing the ability to detect, locate and strike these targets in all weather conditions. The committee also notes as a part of the future naval capabilities program that the Office of Naval Research is developing the AN/APY–6 multi-mode, high-resolution surveillance radar as a real-time precision targeting radar for all-weather surveillance, detection and location of such targets. The objective of the program is to provide the warfighter with a lightweight, low-cost, high-resolution radar, with synthetic aperture radar and ground moving target indicator capability for use in both manned and unmanned platforms for reconnaissance, surveillance, and targeting.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63271N for continuation of the development and demonstration of the AN/APY–6 real-time precision targeting radar.

Reduced risk ordnance

The budget request contained $10.8 million in PE 63216N for aviation survivability advanced component development and prototyping, including $1.2 million for aircrew and ordnance safety.

The committee notes that current submunitions in naval weapon systems use fuzes that have reliabilities in the range of 90 to 94 percent. As a result, a significant number of deployed submunitions fail to detonate and become unexploded ordnance that pose a safety hazard to warfighters who might encounter the unexploded submunitions on the battlefield, to technicians who must clear the battlefield, and to civilians who might come upon them accidentally.

The committee notes that in the past, highly reliable fuzes have been too expensive for use in submunitions. However, new technologies are being developed for all-electronic fuzes that would have a much higher reliability (approximately 99 percent) and could be produced at a cost that would make such fuzes affordable for use in submunitions.

The committee recommends $13.8 million in PE 63216N, an increase of $3.0 million for development and demonstration of highly reliable, all-electronic fuzes for use in submunitions.

Remote ocean surveillance system

The budget request contained $44.0 million in PE 63271N for radio frequency systems advanced technology development.

The committee notes continued progress in the development of high contrast, high resolution multi-spectral sensors and image processing technology that indicates potential capabilities for detection of objects in the ocean in real time, at various depths, and with relatively high search rates. Realization and employment of these technologies in littoral areas, estuaries, and ports would provide the capability for a remote ocean surveillance system to provide real-time capabilities for mine detection and avoidance, force protection, and identification and dissemination of information on the surface and sub-surface threat to ports and harbors.

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

Ship system component development

The budget request contained $19.0 million in PE 63513N for ship system component advanced technology development and prototyping.

The committee notes that with the integration of advanced power systems into future combat ships there is a need to address the manufacturing methods and process technology that will improve the manufacturability and affordability of advanced solid state power electronics systems early in the development cycle. This effort should begin with the manufacturing methods and processes for high density advanced motors, solid-state switches, distribution systems, and other power electronics systems that will be used in the DD(X) multi-mission destroyer.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63513N for development and demonstration of improvements in manufacturing methods and process technology for high power switches and conversion equipment that will be used in the DD(X) program.

Spectral beam combining fiber lasers

The budget request contained $44.0 million in PE 63271N for radio frequency systems advanced technology development.

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

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63271N for advanced development and evaluation of the technology for spectral beam combining fiber lasers.

Submarine payloads and sensors program

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

The committee notes that the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency/Navy submarine payloads and sensors program resulted in the development of a number of innovative, but realistic payload, sensor, and platform concepts that would enable a revolutionary expansion of capabilities and allow the submarine (Virginia Class and SSGN) to play a more decisive role in joint force operations, especially in the ability to exert greater influence over events on shore.

The committee recommends and increase of $10.0 million in PE 63561N to continue the program for continued development and demonstration of advanced submarine payloads and sensor capabilities.

Superconducting direct current homopolar motor

The budget request contained $82.1 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development, including $42.7 million for advanced development of surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and electrical systems, of which $5.0 million would continue the development and demonstration of an advanced main propulsion 36.5 megawatt prototype superconducting direct current (DC) homopolar motor.

The development of component technologies for the all-electric warship is one of the major goals of the Navy's science and technology program. The committee also notes that low temperature superconducting DC homopolar motor technology has the potential technical advantages of being smaller, lighter, and quieter than alternating current (AC) electric motors, and, if realized, would make the superconducting DC homopolar motor a potentially more suitable alternative for use in submarines or in other ship applications where these attributes are desired.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.2 million in PE 63123N to continue the program for development of a 26.5 megawatt prototype superconducting DC homopolar motor for ship main propulsion.

Tactical E-field buoy development

The budget request contained $4.5 million in PE 63254N for advanced component development and prototypes for anti-submarine warfare systems, including the continued development and evaluation of nonlinear dynamics and stochastic resonance (NDSR) for acoustic, magnetic, and other anti-submarine warfare sensor and signal processing applications.

The committee notes the continuing progress in the application of nonlinear dynamics science and technology to non-acoustic shallow water anti-submarine warfare and the potential for greatly improving anti-submarine warfare systems performance as a result of significantly increased electromagnetic detection ranges, enhanced sonar target discrimination, and improved signal processing. One result of this program has been the establishment of the effectiveness of E-field sensors using state-of-the-art sensor technology coupled with nonlinear signal processing. The committee believes that an air-launched tactical E-field buoy patterned after the Air Deployed Active Receiver sonobuoy has great potential for real-time target detection and classification.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63254N to continue the program for accelerated component and prototype design, development, and laboratory and at-sea testing of a tactical E-field buoy for littoral anti-submarine warfare.

Task force anti-submarine warfare

The budget request contained $17.6 million in PE 63553N for surface anti-submarine warfare (ASW).

Task Force Antisubmarine Warfare (ASW) was established in 2003 at the direction of the Chief of Naval Operations to examine fleet shortcomings in anti-submarine warfare operational capabilities and recommend improvements in technology, operational concepts, and training techniques. The program focuses on fundamentally changing the way ASW is conducted, to render enemy sub-

marines impotent against United States and coalition forces. According to the Navy, changing the calculus of antisubmarine warfare will require developing off-board and distributed systems, minimizing force-on-force engagements, reducing the time required to conduct an ASW engagement, and supporting rapid maneuver of ASW forces.

The committee notes that the Navy plans a multi-level trials program for development of active-passive distributed sensor systems and promising technologies proposed by industry. Two at-sea experiments are planned that would employ active-passive distributed sensor systems to test hardware concepts, evaluate candidate software algorithms, and collect the data required for further software development. The plan also includes advanced development of a minimum of two promising industry-proposed technologies. The program has been established as one of the Chief of Naval Operations highest priority unfunded requirements.

The committee recommends an increase of $16.6 million in PE 63553N for Task Force ASW multi-level trials for technical and operational evaluation of developmental ASW systems and concepts of operation.

Theater undersea warfare initiative

The budget request contained $60.1 million in PE 62235N for common picture applied research. No funds were requested to continue the theater undersea warfare initiative.

The committee notes that Congress has added a total of $14.5 million in fiscal years 2003 and 2004 for the Theater Undersea Warfare Initiative, which seeks to enhance the Navy's network centric capability for maritime patrol aircraft (MPA) and provide a near real-time, collaborative communication, command, and control capability for MPA operations. The program utilizes the High Performance Computing Center in Maui, Hawaii, to support network-centric undersea warfare (USW) and as a repository for tactical environmental data services; the oceanographic and atmospheric master library, and sensor and platform data bases. The committee notes that over the long term the Office of Naval Research intends to use the program to provide enhanced USW capabilities to the fleet and to transfer the technology developed in the program to USW support activities.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62235N to continue the theater undersea warfare initiative.

Ultrasonic detection equipment

The budget request contained $19.0 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component advanced technology development and prototyping.

The committee notes the recently completed shipboard demonstration of a commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) ultrasonic tester aboard the USS Gunston Hall that evaluated the effectiveness and the practicality of inexpensive ultrasonic testers to assess the material condition of specific shipboard components and equipment. Areas examined during the demonstration included watertight door integrity, fluid systems leakage, valve leak-by identification, compartment integrity inspections, gear-train and bearing inspections, faulty electrical component identification, and rotating machinery

integrity. The results of the demonstration indicated that the use of relatively inexpensive, COTS ultrasonic testers as a diagnostic tool to assist sailors in conducting periodic maintenance is practical and cost-effective, and supports the implementation of condition-based maintenance in the surface fleet. Based on the results of the test, the committee recommends the adoption of such testers for use in the fleet.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63513N for fielding and evaluation of COTS ultrasonic testers for use by the fleet.

VH–XX executive helicopter development

The budget request contained $777.4 million for the VH–XX executive development program, a program that is developing a replacement for the VH–3D helicopter.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy has delayed the decision to enter the system design and development (SDD) phase of the VH–XX program from fiscal year 2004 to fiscal year 2005, and understands that the VH–XX program SDD phase would select one helicopter manufacturer to develop and produce the VH–XX helicopter. The committee further understands that this decision resulted principally from the awareness of the complexities in equipping helicopter commercial variants with the communication systems required to perform the VH–XX mission. While the committee commends the Department for taking the additional time necessary to further refine requirements and to conduct design and integration planning, it notes that the budget planned for both fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005 assumed that the VH–XX SDD program would begin in the third quarter of fiscal year 2004. Since the committee believes that the VH–XX SDD program will not begin until at least the second quarter of fiscal year 2005, it also believes that $26.0 million in fiscal year 2004 appropriations can be applied to fiscal year 2005 requirements and that $194.0 requested for fiscal year 2005 exceeds requirements.

Consequently, the committee recommends $557.4 million for the VH–XX executive helicopter development program, a decrease of $220.0 million.

Virginia class multi-mission modules

The budget request contained $143.2 million in PE 64558N for Virginia class submarine design development system development and demonstration.

The committee notes the experience gained in the development, design, and implementation of multi-mission capabilities in the USS Jimmy Carter (SSN–23). The committee believes that the modular design of the Virginia class submarine continues to lend itself to the evaluation of multi-mission module concepts for that submarine that could be considered for insertion in selected hull numbers of the class to increase payload capacity, capability for technology insertion, and adaptability to new missions.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64558N to continue the program for evaluation of modular payload concepts and multi-mission modules for Virginia class submarine variants that would increase payload capacity and mission capability.

Virtual at-sea training initiative

The budget request contained $61.1 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology development.

In view of recent reductions in the number of available naval live-fire training ranges, the committee recognizes the benefit of the Department of the Navy's program to develop a technological solution to maintain fleet readiness in the area of live fire targeting and ordnance delivery. The Office of Naval Research's Virtual-at-Sea-Training (VAST) initiative is an encouraging technology solution for solving the problem of maintaining readiness despite the reduction in live fire training ranges. The committee, therefore, supports the Navy's continued development of VAST by the Office of Naval Research for transition into a Department of Defense acquisition program.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63236N for continued development of the VAST initiative.

Wide band gap semiconductor power electronics

The budget request contained $46.3 million in PE 62712E and $3.5 million in PE 62271N for applied research in wide band gap semiconductor electronics and wide band gap semiconductor electronic devices. Section 212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) requires the Secretary of Defense to carry out a cooperative program to develop and demonstrate advanced technologies and concepts for future Navy radar systems and other applications with particular emphasis on development of high frequency and high power wide band gap semiconductor materials and devices.

The committee notes the progress in the development of silicon carbide and other wide band gap materials in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency program and in the Navy program and the potential for transition of the materials technology to applications in advanced power and high frequency semiconductor devices.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62271N for wide band gap semiconductor power electronics applied research.

AIR FORCE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $21,114.7 million for Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $21,528.0 million, an increase of $413.3 million to the budget request.

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE					
		BASIC RESEARCH					
0601102F	1	Defense Research Sciences	217,304	2,000			219,304
0601102F		Chabot Space and Science Center			2,000		
0601103F	2	University Research Initiatives	115,865				115,865
0601108F	3	High Energy Laser Research Initiatives	12,331				12,331
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**345,500**	**2,000**	**2,000**		**347,500**
		APPLIED RESEARCH					
0602102F	4	Materials	73,660				73,660
0602201F	5	Aerospace Vehicle Technologies	74,679				74,679
0602202F	6	Human Effectiveness Applied Research	71,483	3,000			74,483
0602202F		Improved Performance Research Integration Tool			3,000		
0602203F	7	Aerospace Propulsion	92,650	15,500			108,150
0602203F		Integrated Cooling and Power System Magnetic Bearing			4,000		
0602203F		Fuel Cell Technology-Proton Exchange Membrane			2,000		
0602203F		Advanced Vehicle and Propulsion Center			8,500		
0602203F		Engineering Research Lab Equipment Upgrade			1,000		
0602204F	8	Aerospace Sensors	78,804				78,804
0602204F		Combat Optical Receiver for Smart Loitering Standoff Munitions		[2,000]			[2,000]
0602500F	9	Multi-disciplinary Space Technology	84,581				84,581
0602601F	10	Space Technology	88,909	8,000			96,909
0602601F		Integrated Control for Autonomous Space Systems			4,000		
0602601F		Satellite Tool Kit Technology Integration			4,000		
0602602F	11	Conventional Munitions	52,251				52,251
0602605F	12	Directed Energy Technology	36,532	10,000			46,532
0602605F		Ultra Short Pulse Laser Technology			10,000		
0602702F	13	Command Control and Communications	82,147	4,500			86,647
0602702F		Collaborative Information and Knowledge Management			4,500		

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0602805F	14	Dual Use Science and Technology Program	5,151				5,151
0602890F	15	High Energy Laser Research	45,333				45,333
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**786,180**	**41,000**	**41,000**		**827,180**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
0603112F	16	Advanced Materials for Weapon Systems	34,284	14,000			48,284
0603112F		Metals Affordability Initiative			14,000		
0603203F	17	Advanced Aerospace Sensors	30,634				30,634
0603205F	18	Flight Vehicle Technology					
0603211F	19	Aerospace Technology Dev/Demo	29,145				29,145
0603216F	20	Aerospace Propulsion and Power Technology	79,914				79,914
0603231F	21	Crew Systems and Personnel Protection Technology	32,794				32,794
0603270F	22	Electronic Combat Technology	28,282	12,000			40,282
0603270F		Day-Night Electro Optical Tracker Countermeasures			6,000		
0603270F		Light Weight Modular Support Jammer			6,000		
0603311F	23	Ballistic Missile Technology					
0603333F	24	Unmanned Air Vehicle Dev/Demo					
0603401F	25	Advanced Spacecraft Technology	60,124	14,000			74,124
0603401F		Satellite Simulation Toolkit			5,000		
0603401F		Streaker Small Launch Vehicle			6,000		
0603401F		Intelligent Free Space Optical Satellite Communication Node			3,000		
0603444F	26	Maui Space Surveillance System (MSSS)	6,306	10,000			16,306
0603444F		High Accuracy Network Determination System (HANDS)			10,000		
0603500F	27	Multi-disciplinary Advanced Development Space Technology	51,114	7,000			58,114
0603500F		Upper Stage Engine Technology			7,000		
0603601F	28	Conventional Weapons Technology	22,398	9,000			31,398
0603601F		BLU-109H			9,000		
0603605F	29	Advanced Weapons Technology	31,103				31,103
0603723F	30	Environmental Engineering Technology					

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0603789F	31	C3I Advanced Development	28,524	5,000			33,524
0603789F		Identification of Time Critical Targets			5,000		
0603801F	32	Special Programs	320,503				320,503
0603850F	33	Integrated Broadcast Service	2,294				2,294
0603924F	34	High Energy Laser Advanced Technology Program	8,547				8,547
0207423F	35	Advanced Communications Systems	12,051				12,051
0401840F	36	AMC Command and Control System	6,038				6,038
0804757F	37	Joint National Training Center	2,939				2,939
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**786,994**	**71,000**	**71,000**		**857,994**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
0603260F	38	Intelligence Advanced Development	4,612				4,612
0603287F	39	Physical Security Equipment	22,640	13,000			35,640
0603287F		Xray Base Protection System			8,000		
0603287F		Quick Reaction Perimeter Intrusion Detection			5,000		
0603421F	40	NAVSTAR Global Positioning System III	40,568				40,568
0603430F	41	Advanced EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	612,049				612,049
0603432F	42	Polar MILSATCOM (SPACE)	960				960
0603434F	43	National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite Sys (SPACE)					
0603438F	44	Space Control Technology	15,046				15,046
0603742F	45	Combat Identification Technology	19,582				19,582
0603790F	46	NATO Research and Development	3,930				3,930
0603791F	47	International Space Cooperative R&D	552				552
0603845F	48	Transformational SATCOM (TSAT)	774,836	(100,000)		(100,000)	674,836
0603850F	49	Integrated Broadcast Service	23,927				23,927
0603851F	50	Intercontinental Ballistic Missile	72,503				72,503
0603854F	51	Wideband Gapfiller System RDT&E (Space)	73,499	15,000	15,000		88,499
0603856F	52	Air Force/National Program Cooperation (AFNPC)					
0603858F	53	Space-Based Radar	327,732				327,732

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0603859F	54	Pollution Prevention	2,692				2,692
0603860F	55	Joint Precision Approach and Landing Systems	18,385				18,385
0604015F	56	Next Generation Bomber		100,000	100,000		100,000
0604327F	57	Hard and Deeply Buried Target Defeat System (HDBTDS) Program	6,383				6,383
0604731F	58	Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV)					
0604855F	59	Operationally Responsive Launch	35,362	10,000	6,000		45,362
0604855F		Blue MAJIC			4,000		
0604856F	60	Common Aero Vehicle (CAV)	21,610	12,000	12,000		33,610
0305178F	61	National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS)	307,668				307,668
		TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**2,384,536**	**50,000**	**150,000**	**(100,000)**	**2,434,536**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
0603840F	62	Global Broadcast Service (GBS)	33,447				33,447
0604012F	63	Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System (JHMCS)	2,867				2,867
0604222F	64	Nuclear Weapons Support	13,301				13,301
0604226F	65	B-1B	59,462				59,462
0604233F	66	Specialized Undergraduate Flight Training	3,359				3,359
0604239F	67	F-22	210,000				210,000
0604240F	68	B-2 Advanced Technology Bomber	245,049	98,000			343,049
0604240F		Global Strike			98,000		
0604270F	69	EW Development / B-52	138,393				138,393
0604280F	70	Joint Tactical Radio	49,856				49,856
0604287F	71	Physical Security Equipment	9,744				9,744
0604329F	72	Small Diameter Bomb (SDB)	76,489				76,489
0604421F	73	Counterspace Systems	75,863				75,863
0604435F	74	Advanced Polar MILSATCOM					
0604441F	75	Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS) High EMD	508,448	35,000	35,000		543,448
0604479F	76	Milstar LDR/MDR Satellite Communications (SPACE)	1,380				1,380
0604600F	77	Munitions Dispenser Development	28,048				28,048

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0604602F	78	Armament/Ordnance Development	8,353				8,353
0604604F	79	Submunitions	4,824				4,824
0604617F	80	Agile Combat Support	10,053				10,053
0604618F	81	Joint Direct Attack Munition					
0604706F	82	Life Support Systems	6,630				6,630
0604731F	83	Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV)					
0604735F	84	Combat Training Ranges	18,714				18,714
0604740F	85	Integrated Command & Control Applications (IC2A)	258	6,000			6,258
0604740F		Distributed Mission Interoperability Tool Kit			6,000		
0604750F	86	Intelligence Equipment	1,349				1,349
0604754F	87	Tactical Data Link Infrastructure					
0604762F	88	Common Low Observables Verification System (CLOVerS)	10,303				10,303
0604800F	89	Joint Strike Fighter (JSF)	2,307,420				2,307,420
0604851F	90	Intercontinental Ballistic Missile	91,687				91,687
0604853F	91	Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program	27,000				27,000
0605011F	92	RDT&E for Aging Aircraft	15,665	4,000	2,000		19,665
0605011F		Enterprise Availability and Cost Optimization System			2,000		
0207131F	93	A-10 Squadrons					
0207256F	94	Joint Unmanned Combat Air System	2,911				2,911
0207434F	95	Link-16 Support and Sustainment	141,012				141,012
0207443F	96	Family of Interoperable Operational Pictures (FIOP)	44,947				44,947
0207450F	97	Multi-Sensor C2 Aircraft (MC2A)	538,860				538,860
0207701F	98	Full Combat Mission Training	5,894				5,894
0305176F	99	Combat Survivor Evader Locator					
0401318F	100	CV-22	16,439				16,439
XXXXXXX	100a	KC-767		80,000	80,000		80,000
		TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**4,708,025**	**223,000**	**223,000**		**4,931,025**

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
0604256F	101	Threat Simulator Development	34,517				34,517
0604759F	102	Major T&E Investment	58,933				58,933
0605101F	103	RAND Project Air Force	24,970				24,970
0605306F	104	Ranch Hand II Epidemiology Study	4,813				4,813
0605502F	105	Small Business Innovation Research					
0605712F	106	Initial Operational Test & Evaluation	28,839				28,839
0605807F	107	Test and Evaluation Support / Eglin AFB Range	356,266				356,266
0605860F	108	Rocket Systems Launch Program (SPACE)	7,984				7,984
0605864F	109	Space Test Program (STP)	44,521				44,521
0605976F	110	Facilities Restoration and Modernization - Test and Evaluation Support	58,936				58,936
0605978F	111	Facilities Sustainment - Test and Evaluation Support	23,067				23,067
0804731F	112	Cyber Crime Center	323				323
0909900F	113	Financing for Expired Account Adjustments					
0909980F	114	AC-130U Claim	100,000				100,000
1001004F	115	International Activities	3,945				3,945
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**747,114**				**747,114**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
0605024F	116	Anti-Tamper Technology Executive Agency	7,858				7,858
0101113F	117	B-52 Squadrons	25,766				25,766
0101120F	118	Advanced Cruise Missile	7,740				7,740
0101122F	119	Air-Launched Cruise Missile (ALCM)	11,837				11,837
0101313F	120	Strat War Planning System - USSTRATCOM	23,391				23,391
0101314F	121	Night Fist - USSTRATCOM	4,987				4,987
0101815F	122	Advanced Strategic Programs	8,393				8,393
0102326F	123	Region/Sector Operation Control Center Modernization Program	19,047				19,047
0203761F	124	Warfighter Rapid Acquisition Process (WRAP) Rapid Transition Fund	24,935				24,935
0207028F	125	Joint Expeditionary Force Experiment					

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0207131F	126	A-10 Squadrons	22,590				22,590
0207133F	127	F-16 Squadrons (APG-68V9)	99,606				99,606
0207134F	128	F-15E Squadrons (APG-63V3)	115,246	17,200			132,446
0207134F		Active Electronically Scanned Array Radar			17,200		
0207136F	129	Manned Destructive Suppression	16,976				16,976
0207138F	130	F-22 Squadrons	354,528				354,528
0207141F	131	F-117A Squadrons	29,661				29,661
0207161F	132	AIM 9 Product Improvement	5,558				5,558
0207163F	133	Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM)	33,266				33,266
0207224F	134	Personnel Recovery Vehicle - New Rescue Helo	12,342				12,342
0207247F	135	AF TENCAP	10,673				10,673
0207248F	136	Special Evaluation Program	199,040				199,040
0207253F	137	Compass Call	3,990				3,990
0207268F	138	Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program	165,609				165,609
0207277F	139	Eagle Vision	1,879				1,879
0207325F	140	Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM)	45,777				45,777
0207410F	141	Air and Space Ops Center	27,695				27,695
0207412F	142	Battle Control System	11,634				11,634
0207417F	143	Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS)	288,787				288,787
0207423F	144	Advanced Communications Systems / TACP	20,066				20,066
0207424F	145	Evaluation and Analysis Program					
0207433F	146	Advanced Program Technology	249,391				249,391
0207438F	147	Theater Battle Management (TBM) C4I	37,210				37,210
0207445F	148	Fighter Tactical Data Link	50,976				50,976
0207446F	149	Bomber Tactical Data Link	120,256				120,256
0207448F	150	C2ISR Tactical Data Link	25,441				25,441
0207449F	151	Command and Control (C2) Constellation	44,035				44,035
0207581F	152	Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (Joint STARS)	89,247	11,000			100,247
0207581F		Blue Force Combat ID Upgrades			11,000		

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0207590F	153	Seek Eagle	23,159				23,159
0207591F	154	Advanced Program Evaluation	474,734				474,734
0207601F	155	USAF Modeling and Simulation	18,693				18,693
0207605F	156	Wargaming and Simulation Centers	6,377				6,377
0208006F	157	Mission Planning Systems	136,701				136,701
0208021F	158	Information Warfare Support	7,230				7,230
0208160F	159	Technical Evaluation System					
0208161F	160	Special Evaluation System					
0301310F	161	National Air Intelligence Center					
0301314F	162	COBRA BALL					
0301315F	163	Missile and Space Technical Collection					
0301324F	164	FOREST GREEN					
0301398F	165	Management Headquarters GDIP					
0302015F	166	E-4B National Airborne Operations Center (NAOC)	11,172				11,172
0303110F	167	Defense Satellite Communications System (SPACE)					
0303131F	168	Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN)	33,183				33,183
0303140F	169	Information Systems Security Program	79,625	8,000			87,625
0303140F		Worldwide Infrastructure Security Environment			8,000		
0303141F	170	Global Combat Support System	18,637				18,637
0303150F	171	Global Command and Control System	3,611	2,000			5,611
0303150F		Applied Research in Computing Enterprise Services			2,000		
0303401F	172	Communications Security (COMSEC)					
0303601F	173	MILSATCOM Terminals	272,149				272,149
0304111F	174	Special Activities					
0304311F	175	Selected Activities					
0305099F	176	Global Air Traffic Management (GATM)	7,291				7,291
0305110F	177	Satellite Control Network (SPACE)	17,833				17,833
0305111F	178	Weather Service	16,526				16,526
0305114F	179	Air Traffic Control, Approach, and Landing System (ATCALS)	7,371				7,371

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0305116F	180	Aerial Targets	5,178				5,178
0305128F	181	Security and Investigative Activities	484				484
0305142F	182	Applied Technology and Integration					
0305148F	183	Air Force Tactical Measurement and Signature Intelligence (MASINT) Systems/	7,905				7,905
0305159F	184	Defense Reconnaissance Support Activities (SPACE)	219,345				219,345
0305160F	185	Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (SPACE)					
0305164F	186	NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (User Equipment) (SPACE)	104,114				104,114
0305165F	187	NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (Space and Control Segments) / OCS	148,344				148,344
0305172F	188	Combined Advanced Applications					
0305174F	189	Space Warfare Center	411				411
0305182F	190	Spacelift Range System (SPACE)	47,253				47,253
0305191F	191	Personnel Security Investigations Program - Air Force	118,787				118,787
0305193F	192	Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO)	1,097				1,097
0305202F	193	Dragon U-2 (JMIP)	87,745	(6,300)			81,445
0305202F		ASIP Sensor Development				(6,300)	
0305205F	194	Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicles		(2,000)			(2,000)
0305205F		Network Centric Collaborative Targeting				(2,000)	
0305206F	195	Airborne Reconnaissance Systems	55,464				55,464
0305207F	196	Manned Reconnaissance Systems / COBRA BALL	13,283	11,500			24,783
0305207F		Geo Processor			4,000		
0305207F		COBRA BALL			7,500		
0305208F	197	Distributed Common Ground Systems / RAS-1R	21,232				21,232
0305219F	198	Predator UAV (JMIP)	81,346				81,346
0305220F	199	Global Hawk UAV (JMIP)	336,159	(18,000)		(18,000)	318,159
0305887F	200	Electronic Combat Intelligence Support	963				963
0305906F	201	NCMC - TW/AA System	64,822				64,822
0305910F	202	SPACETRACK (SPACE)	161,838	9,000			170,838
0305910F		Space Situational Awareness Initiative			9,000		
0305911F	203	Defense Support Program (SPACE)					

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0305913F	204	NUDET Detection System (SPACE)	35,398				35,398
0305917F	205	Space Architect	12,907				12,907
0308601F	206	Modeling and Simulation Support					
0308699F	207	Shared Early Warning (SEW)	3,345				3,345
0401115F	208	C-130 Airlift Squadron	150,242	3,000			153,242
0401115F		Realtime Weight and Balance Measurement			3,000		
0401119F	209	C-5 Airlift Squadrons	332,982				332,982
0401130F	210	C-17 Aircraft	199,692				199,692
0401132F	211	C-130J Program	36,305				36,305
0401134F	212	Large Aircraft IR Countermeasures (LAIRCM)	73,684				73,684
0401218F	213	KC-135s	1,079				1,079
0401219F	214	KC-10s	18,452	(9,100)			9,352
0401219F		KC-10 GATM				(9,100)	
0408011F	215	Special Tactics/Combat Control	1,067				1,067
0702207F	216	Depot Maintenance (Non-IF)	1,431				1,431
0702806F	217	Acquisition and Management Support	1,596				1,596
0708011F	218	Industrial Preparedness	38,012				38,012
0708012F	219	Logistics Support Activities					
0708026F	220	Productivity, Reliability, Availability, Maintain. Prog Ofc (PRAMPO)					
0708611F	221	Support Systems Development	50,238				50,238
0708612F	222	Computer Resources Support Improvement Program (CRSIP)					
0808716F	223	Other Personnel Activities	110				110
0901212F	224	Service-Wide Support (Not Otherwise Accounted For)					
0901218F	225	Civilian Compensation Program	7,272				7,272
0901538F	226	Financial Management Information Systems Development	15,732				15,732
XXXXXXX	999	Classified	5,551,279				5,551,279
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**11,356,318**	**26,300**	**61,700**	**(35,400)**	**11,382,618**
		TOTAL. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE	**21,114,667**	**413,300**	**548,700**	**(135,400)**	**21,527,967**

Items of Special Interest

Advanced vehicle and propulsion center and engineering research lab equipment upgrade

The budget request contained $92.7 million in PE 62203F for aerospace propulsion, but contained no funds for the advanced vehicle and propulsion center and engineering research lab oratory equipment upgrade.

The committee recognizes the value added to Air Force Space Command projects through the Air Force Research Laboratory's effort to merge modeling and simulation capabilities with advanced technologies involving the advanced vehicle and propulsion center. Additionally, the committee notes the need to upgrade propulsion laboratory equipment to support the exploration of emerging technologies.

The committee recommends increases of $8.5 million in PE 62203F for the advanced vehicle and propulsion center and $1.0 million for the engineering research lab equipment upgrade.

Advanced wideband signals intelligence geo-processor

The budget request contained $13.3 million in PE 35207F, but contained no funding for the advanced wideband processor and high frequency geo-processor (AWP/HGP).

The committee notes that our asymmetrical adversaries are more commonly using widely available high-technology communications for command and control networks. Airborne collectors are experiencing an increasing challenge in collecting these types of low probability of intercept (LPI)/ low probability or detection (LPD) signals in a dense co-channel environment with rapid geolocation capability. The Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) has developed a promising technology that enables signals intelligence collection suites to collect against these signals and provide real-time geo-coordinates of these signals. Flight testing is being conducted and follow-on field testing needs to be accomplished with subsequent integration of this capability into an operational intelligence collector such as the RC–135.

Therefore the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 35207F for the AWP/HGP project for the RC–135 aircraft.

B–2 development

The budget request contained $245.0 million in PE 64240F for B–2 system development, but included no funds to develop the extremely high frequency (EHF) satellite communications (SATCOM) system, or for a global strike capabilities initiative (GSCI). The B–2 is the Department of Defense's most advanced long-range strike aircraft, capable of global force projection in a highly defended target environment.

The EHF SATCOM system is being developed to provide high bandwidth communications for both nuclear and conventional B–2 missions. The committee notes that the Congress appropriated $12.6 million in fiscal year 2004 for this system, understands that $24.0 million is required in fiscal year 2005 to complete EHF SATCOM development. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $24.0 million for the EHF SATCOM system.

The GSCI would incrementally upgrade B–2 aircraft with capabilities that address warfighting gaps identified by the Air Force and Joint Force Commanders. For fiscal year 2005, the committee understands that the most urgent capabilities required through the GSCI would include: defensive management system processor upgrades; integrated avionics block development to address deficiencies in the standby flight instruments; Link 16 information exchange between B–2 and other aircraft, and flight management control processor software; and global air traffic management system upgrades. Additionally, the committee understands that the GSCI for fiscal year 2005 would begin development of small diameter bomb (SDB) integration on the B–2, and expects that this effort would eventually provide the B–2 with a capability to deliver 160 to 240 SDBs. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $74.0 million for the GSCI, and expects that $13.0 million would upgrade the defensive management system, $51.0 million would develop an integrated avionics block upgrade, and $10.0 million would provide for SDB design concepts and program planning necessary to implement an SDB development and integration program.

In total, the committee recommends $343.0 million for B–2 system development, an increase of $98.0 million.

Blue MAJIC

The budget request contained $35.4 million in PE 64855F for operationally responsive launch, but included no funding for Blue MAJIC.

The committee understands the importance of blue force tracking in the effort to reduce fratricide and increase force protection. The committee recognizes Blue MAJIC would provide the field commander a significant tool to improve blue force tracking. The committee also realizes that Blue MAJIC will pursue a strategy that furthers the employment of responsive launch and integrates current technology into operations.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64855F for Blue MAJIC.

Cobra Ball

The budget request contained $13.3 million in PE 35207F for the manned reconnaissance system, but contained no funds for Cobra Ball.

The committee notes Cobra Ball's ability to exploit unused spectral data content and its increased sensitivity and accuracy in the medium wave infrared spectrum and believes it necessary to accelerate this effort.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PE 35207F for Cobra Ball.

Combat optical receiver for smart and loitering standoff weapons

The budget request included $78.8 million in PE 62204F for aerospace sensors.

The committee directs that $2.0 million be made available within funds authorized for PE 62204F for the combat optical receiver for smart and loitering standoff weapons.

Collaborative information technologies

The budget request included $5.3 million in PE 62702F, project 4917, for collaborative information technologies to develop emerging technologies for the next generation of distributed, collaborative command and control systems.

The committee recommends an additional $4.5 million in PE 62702F, project 4917, to develop an initial operational capability for application of collaborative information technologies to joint and Air Force capability planning, technology assessment, and enterprise management activities.

Common aero vehicle

The budget request contained $21.6 million in PE 64856F for the Common Aero Vehicle (CAV).

The committee is aware that additional funding is required to complete CAV analysis; ensure validation of system components and operational capabilities; fund launch vehicle procurement; and provides flight test planning and range safety support.

The committee recommends $33.6 million in PE 64856F, an increase of $12.0 million for CAV.

Defensive electro-optical tracker countermeasures technologies

The budget request included $12.4 million in PE 63270F to develop and demonstrate advanced warning and countermeasures technologies to negate electro-optical, infrared, and laser threats to aerospace platforms.

The committee recommends an additional $6.0 million in PE 63270F to increase the technology readiness levels to accelerate transition of this capability to system development and demonstration.

Distributed mission interoperability toolkit

The budget request contained $300,000 in PE 64740F for integrated command and control applications, which includes the Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit (DMIT) program.

The committee notes that the DMIT is a suite of tools that enable an enterprise architecture for on-demand, trusted, interoperability among mission-oriented command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence (C4I) systems based on lessons learned from Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The committee notes that this program leverages best practices from the commercial sector to positively impact the Department of Defense's C4I programs through the use of open architectures, existing and emerging web standards, and state-of-the-art technologies. The committee believes DMIT will enable rapid and adaptive integration between legacy and new information systems.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $6.3 million in PE 64740F, an increase of $6.0 million.

Enterprise availability and cost optimization system

The budget request contained $15.7 million in PE 65011F for development of products and services to improve the performance of aging aircraft systems but included no funds for the enterprise availability and cost optimization system (EACOS).

The committee understands that the program offices supporting aging aircraft systems are each generating their own criteria and processes for identifying enhancements and measuring success. The committee further understands that, as a result of this situation, common problems are being addressed and resolved multiple times in dissimilar manners, and believes that the EACOS, can standardize this process and result in the identification of common solutions.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 65011F.

F–15C/D active electronically scanned array radar

The budget request contained $115.2 million in PE 27134F for F–15 development programs, but included no funds for the F–15C/D active electronically scanned array (AESA) radar.

The F–15C/D AESA radar, also known as the APG–63(V) 3 radar, would replace the current APG–63(V) 1 radar, and provide a five hundred percent improvement in reliability while reducing the APG–63(V)1's mobility requirements by eight hundred percent. The committee understands that the F–15C/D AESA radar would also provide significant operational improvements and notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included the F–15C/D AESA as his highest unfunded priority for fiscal year 2005.

Consequently, the committee recommends $132.4 million in PE 27134F, an increase of $17.2 million for F–15C/D AESA radar.

Global Hawk United States Southern Command demonstration

The budget request contained $336.2 million in PE 35220F for the Air Force Global Hawk high altitude endurance, unmanned aerial vehicle (HAE/UAV) program.

The committee notes that section 221 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2001 (Public Law 106–398) directed the Secretary of Defense to require and coordinate a concept demonstration of the Global Hawk HAE/UAV. The purpose of the demonstration was to demonstrate the capability of the Global Hawk to operate in an airborne surveillance mode, using available, non-developmental technology in a counter-drug surveillance scenario designed to replicate actual conditions typically encountered in the performance of the counter-drug surveillance mission of the U.S. Southern Command.

The committee believes the Department has not met the requirements of this congressionally directed action.

The committee has received the Air Force January 28, 2004, memorandum that states the directive will be met by utilizing the HAE/UAVs existing ground target moving indicator (GMTI) with surface search modes. The committee notes that the specific intent of section 221, is to provide an airborne air surveillance alternative for U.S. Southern Command through a concept demonstration performed under actual conditions of counter-drug airborne surveillance missions. Additionally, the committee notes that the authorized funds were to also pursue the initiation of concurrent development of an improved surveillance radar, such as an airborne moving target indicator (AMTI) capability, for this purpose.

The committee has determined that the Air Force's present plan does not meet the mandated objective contained in section 221. The

committee suspects the Air Force used the $18.0 million set aside in 2001 for the counter-drug demonstration to meet other requirements of the Global Hawk development program. The committee concludes that $18.0 million of Global Hawk requirements, as presented in the 2005 budget request, have been met through the use of the funds set aside for the counter-drug demonstration, and therefore has reduced funds for Global Hawk requirements accordingly.

The committee directs, once again, the Secretary of Defense to conduct a long endurance air-to-air radar surveillance mission concept demonstration of the Global Hawk HAE/UAV that meets the congressional intent of section 221 of Public Law 106–945.

The committee recommends $318.2 million in PE 35220F, a reduction of $18.0 million based on the failure of the Department to conduct a demonstration of the Global Hawk UAV for the Southern Command's airborne surveillance concept demonstration for the drug-interdiction mission.

Global positioning system

The budget request contained $148.3 million in PE 35165F for the global positioning system, including $40.6 million for the global positioning system block III (GPS III).

Lessons learned from recent operations have confirmed the value of precision guided munitions in warfare. The committee understands this success relies greatly on the support provided by GPS. Development of GPS III would enhance accuracy, availability and anti-jam capability, while reducing system life-cycle costs. The committee strongly supports this development effort, but is concerned that the first launch, scheduled for fiscal year 2012, is unnecessarily delayed. The committee recommends acceleration of block III satellites consistent with program priorities.

The committee recommends the budget request.

High accuracy network determination system

The budget request contained $6.3 million in PE 63444F for the Maui space surveillance system, but included no money for the High Accuracy Network Determination System (HANDS).

The committee recognizes that HANDS would reduce the potential for collisions of space assets by reducing errors in the current space-object maintenance catalog.

The committee recommends $16.3 million in PE 63444F, an increase of $10.0 million for HANDS.

Identification of time critical targets

The budget request included $28.5 million in PE 63789F for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence (C3I), including $5.4 million to develop and demonstrate advanced data and information fusion capabilities for identification of time critical targets (targets under trees).

The committee supports the need for enhanced fusion of intelligence data. Increased funding in fiscal year 2005 would permit the demonstration of fusion technologies for continuous tracking of time critical targets and track continuity to provide more accurate common operational pictures through the use of the Distributed Common Ground System.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63789F for data fusion technologies enabling identification of time critical targets.

Integrated cooling and power system magnetic bearing technology

The budget request included $92.7 million in PE 62203F for Aerospace Propulsion Systems, including $2.2 million to continue development of advanced bearing concepts for turbine engine applications.

Advanced avionics, electronic warfare systems, and radars in new and upgraded tactical aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles provide significantly increased capability, but demand advanced solutions to meet power and cooling requirements. One enabling technology to meet these requirements is a magnetic bearing turbo-generator.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62203F for integrated cooling and power system magnetic bearing technology.

Integrated control for autonomous space systems

The budget request contained $88.9 million in PE 62601F for space technology, but contained no funds for integrated control for autonomous space systems (ICASS).

The committee notes that ICASS is intended to provide advanced satellite control and measurement technologies. The committee realizes ICASS has the potential to greatly expand the Department of Defense capability to deploy and control super-compact structures.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62601F for the development of ICASS.

Intelligent free space optical satellite communication node

The budget request contained $60.1 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but contained no funds for the intelligent free space optical satellite communication node.

The committee is concerned about the development risk of the transformational communications architecture and notes that any laser-based satellite communication system will also require a radio-frequency (RF) capability. The committee believes additional risk-mitigation development is warranted for RF and laser-capable routers and low-cost adaptive switching.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63401F to develop an intelligent free space optical communications node.

Joint surveillance target attack radar system blue force tracking and combat identification

The procurement budget request contained $45.3 million for various E–8C joint surveillance target attack radar system (JSTARS) modifications, but included no funds for the blue force tracking and combat identification (CID) upgrade. Additionally, the research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) budget request contained $89.2 for JSTARS development, but also included no funds to develop the JSTARS blue force CID.

The committee understands that, as a result of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the Department of the Air Force has identified critical needs to prosecute mobile targets; provide a common operating picture of friendly and enemy forces to warfighting decision makers; and accurately distinguish between friendly and enemy forces. The committee also understands that the JSTARS blue force tracking and CID upgrades would network friendly forces in real time with the JSTARS E–8C aircraft in all weather conditions to address these critical needs.

Consequently, the committee recommends $55.3 million for E–8C procurement modifications, an increase of $10.0 million for the JSTARS blue force tracking and CID upgrade; and $100.2 million in PE 27581F, an increase of $11.0 million to develop the JSTARS blue force combat tracking and CID components.

KC–10 global air traffic management development

The budget request contained $18.5 million in PE 41219F for the KC–10 global air traffic management (GATM) development program.

The KC–10 GATM program is an engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) program that would improve the navigation and communication systems used on KC–10 aircraft. Subsequent to submission of the budget request, the Department of the Air Force canceled the GATM development program due to cost increases. As a result of this decision, the Department informed the committee that it would prefer to transfer these funds into the procurement appropriation to acquire, among other systems, two flight training devices for $7.8 million and a high-frequency data link for $1.2 million. While the committee supports the procurement of flight training devices and communication systems, it believes that existing flight training devices are adequate to meet requirements and that the high-frequency data link can be deferred until fiscal year 2006.

Consequently, the committee recommends $9.4 million in PE 41219F, a decrease of $9.1 million, for the KC–10 GATM development program.

Lightweight modular support jammer

The budget request included $28.3 million in PE 63270F for electronic combat technology, including $12.4 million for electro-optical, infrared warning and countermeasures technology.

Countering the threat posed by infrared missiles remains a high priority for the military services. The lightweight modular support jammer (LMSJ) provides a scalable, open architecture, digital receiver and jammer capability for multiple electronic warfare programs and platforms. Additional funding would permit the integration of LMSJ with the Advanced Threat Alert and Response receiver and accelerated testing of the end-to-end system concept.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63270F for LMSJ.

Metals affordability

The budget request included $34.3 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapon systems.

The committee supports the continued government-industry collaboration provided through the Metals Affordability Initiative, pro-

viding significant improvements in the manufacturing of specialty metals for aerospace applications for the private and government sectors of the aerospace industry.

The committee recommends an additional $14.0 million in PE 63112F for the Metals Affordability Initiative.

Next generation bomber program

The budget request contained no funds in PE 64015F for the next generation bomber program.

In the committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) for fiscal year 2004, the committee noted both the increasing age of the Department of the Air Force's B–52 bomber fleet and existing plans to begin a next generation bomber program between the years of 2012 to 2015. The committee concluded that Air Force deferral of a next generation bomber program to 2012 to 2015 would be too late to assure a sufficient bomber force structure to meet future requirements for long-range strike in light of the prospect that future basing for shorter range aircraft may not be assured. Consequently, the committee recommended an increase of $100.0 million for this purpose and notes that $45.0 million was appropriated. However, the committee is dismayed that budget justification documents accompanying the fiscal year 2005 budget request reveal that these funds would be used to develop, mature and study integration of next generation style technologies with the existing bomber fleet, rather than beginning a next generation bomber program that would develop, and eventually procure, new bomber aircraft to meet future long range strike requirements.

For fiscal year 2005, the committee notes that, despite its expectation that the Department of the Air Force would begin a program to develop and procure a next generation bomber beginning in fiscal year 2004, the Department does not include any funds for this purpose until fiscal year 2008, with additional funding planned for fiscal year 2009. While the committee recognizes that the Department of the Air Force has accelerated its next generation bomber plan from the 2012 to 2015 timeframe to fiscal year 2008, the committee remains steadfast in its prior year view that development of a next generation bomber aircraft needs to be initiated, since most of the Air Force's bomber fleet consists of 94 B–52 aircraft which are now approximately 42 years old.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $100.0 million in PE 64015F for the next generation bomber program, and strongly urges the Department of the Air Force to budget for a next generation bomber program each year in its Future Years Defense Program.

Operationally responsive launch

The budget request contained $35.4 million in PE 64855F for operationally responsive launch.

The committee strongly supports an operationally responsive launch capability and its objective of developing an affordable, reliable, time responsive launch system, including Scorpius. The committee believes integration of operationally responsive launches would greatly increase the speed of delivering critical space capabilities to the warfighter.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 64855F for development of an operationally responsive launch capability, including Scorpius.

Satellite simulation toolkit

The budget request contained $60.1 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but contained no funds for integrated control for a satellite simulation toolkit (SST).

SST provides value to the acquisition and development of space systems via coherent systems engineering and virtual prototyping. The committee is aware of the need to complete development and integration of new and legacy models for the full implementation of SST based effects.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63401F for SST.

Satellite tool kit technical integration concept of operations for tactical satellite

The budget request contained $88.9 million in PE 62601F for space technology, but contained no funds for satellite tool kit technical integration.

The committee notes that satellite tool kit technical integration would provide tactical data to the warfighter indicating when a satellite overflight will occur to allow single pass tasking and downlink of time-sensitive surveillance information. This program would benefit in-theater warfighters by enabling immediate access to tactical intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets to enable the collection and delivery of timely surveillance information to enable battlefield superiority. Additionally, these assets provide surge capability to augment existing national assets or help reconstitute space capabilities lost due to enemy action.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62601F for satellite tool kit technical integration.

Space-based infrared system

The budget request included $508.4 million in PE 64441F for development of the space-based infrared system (SBIRS).

When finally deployed, SBIRS will provide improved early-warning capabilities and technical intelligence. The committee notes that the SBIRS program has had persistent cost, schedule and technical problems over the last three years of its development. Unexpected technical difficulties on the first SBIRS payload resulted in cost overruns and schedule delays. These problems and further technical difficulties have in turn resulted in a delay of at least one year for the first launch of a SBIRS satellite into geostationary orbit.

The committee notes that the Commander of United States Strategic Command testified to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee in February, 2004 that continuation of the SBIRS program is absolutely essential to his command. The committee remains supportive of the SBIRS program because of the critical nature of its mission. The committee notes the recent technical issues with the geosynchronous sensors and concurs with the recovery plan as presented by the Undersecretary of the Air Force.

The committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million in PE 64441F to address the SBIRS budget shortfall, overcome development difficulties and minimize the schedule delay.

Space-based radar

The budget request contained $327.7 million in PE 63858F for space-based radar (SBR).

The committee recognizes the benefits SBR will provide through a persistent, near real-time, high resolution surveillance capability deep into enemy territory and denied areas, benefiting both military and intelligence communities. The committee believes the country cannot afford separate SBR systems to address the needs of these two communities and, as such, it is imperative to develop this system with full support and involvement of the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community (IC). The committee strongly urges the Department and the IC to work in a joint manner toward the development of a SBR capability.

The committee notes unfavorable schedule and cost performance of several space system acquisition programs. As a result of this trend, the committee recommends a legislative provision (sec. 216) affecting the progression to Milestone B for SBR.

The committee recommends the budget request.

Space cadre

The committee is committed to the development of highly skilled and knowledgeable professionals to address the acquisition, policy, and technology aspects of space necessary to ensure United States preeminence in tomorrow's space environment. The committee is aware of the ongoing effort by the Department of Defense to institute the space human capital resources strategy as described in the February 2004 report to the congressional defense committees titled, "Space Human Capital Resources Strategy."

The committee notes that this three-phased strategy will initiate the development of a professional space cadre. The committee supports this effort and encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue this effort. The committee recommends that the Department include in its strategy a thorough review of education, training, and the development of a robust, joint space curriculum.

Space situational awareness initiative

The budget request contained $161.8 million in PE 35910F for Spacetrack, but included no funds for the space situational awareness initiative.

The committee notes the importance of this upgrade for the future of the counter space mission. Moreover, the committee understands the effort will require nearly eight years to achieve a full operational capability and believes it is prudent to initiate this effort immediately.

The committee recommends $170.8 million in PE 35910F, an increase of $9.0 million for the space situational awareness initiative.

Streaker small launch vehicle

The budget request contained $60.1 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but included no funds for the Streaker small launch vehicle (SLV).

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense desires to develop this capability to affordably launch small satellites to low earth orbits for a variety of purposes. The committee notes that the Streaker SLV has the potential to provide affordable responsive launch for small satellites.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63401F for the Streaker SLV.

Transformational satellite communications

The budget request contained $774.8 million in PE 63845F for the transformational communications satellite (TSAT) system.

The General Accounting Office expressed concerns in report GAO–04–71R about the immaturity of the TSAT technology and the significant engineering challenges facing a laser-based satellite communications system. The committee remains concerned that the TSAT system is still being driven by an aggressive schedule that does not adequately take into account the immaturity of several key enabling technologies and challenging integration issues.

While the committee supports the goal of TSAT and recognizes the modest steps the Air Force has taken to address the concerns raised in the committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) last year, the committee believes a slower, more realistic schedule for this program is warranted.

The committee recommends $674.8 million in PE 63845F, a decrease of $100.0 million for the TSAT program.

Ultra short pulse laser technology

The budget request contained $36.5 million in PE 62605F for directed energy technology, but included no funding for ultra short pulse laser technology.

The committee is aware that ultra short pulse laser technology has the potential to be a breakthrough in size, weight and effectiveness for many applications.

The committee recommends $46.5 million in PE 62605F, an increase of $10.0 million for ultra short pulse laser.

Upper stage engine technology

The budget request contained $51.1 million in PE 63500F for multi-disciplinary space technology, but contained no funds for upper stage engine technology.

Upper stage engine technology supports the Air Force's goal to improve liquid oxygen/hydrogen simulation and forecasting tools. The committee recognizes this goal will reduce the risk associated with new technology transition into upper stage engines for reusable and expendable launch vehicles.

The committee recommends $58.1 million in PE 63500F, an increase of $7.0 million for upper stage engine technology.

Wideband gapfiller system

The budget request included $73.5 million in PE 63854F and $40.3 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, for the wideband gapfiller satellite (WGS) communications system.

WGS will provide a significant increase in communications bandwidth for warfighters. The committee notes the Air Force's plan to acquire and launch three satellites over the course of fiscal years

2005 and 2007. The committee also notes plans during fiscal year 2005 to negotiate a contract to acquire two additional satellites that would be launched starting in fiscal year 2009. This plan could leave a three-year production gap between the third and fourth satellites, a gap that could increase program risk and cost resulting from parts obsolescence, personnel fluctuations, and the potential need to re-qualify subcontractors. The committee also notes that the Department of Defense supplements its satellite communications network by leasing commercial satellite communications capacity at a cost of about $300.0 million per year. The committee believes that deferring additional military satellite communications acquisition may not be cost effective.

The committee believes that the Air Force decision to proceed with WGS acquisition is correct, but the acquisition strategy that results in this production gap is not well considered.

The committee recommends $88.5 million in PE 63854F, an increase of $15.0 million for additional WGS spare parts.

Worldwide infrastructure security environment

The budget request contained $79.6 million in PE 33140F for information security systems programs, but included no funding for the worldwide infrastructure security environment (WISE).

The committee supports this initiative to provide protection and response to attacks that exploit our reliance on computers. This program will manage the complex interactions between physical access, network access, authentication, monitoring, and environmental controls to provide defense against sophisticated hackers. This program also addresses the cyber threat of the year 2010 and beyond with a unique approach to protect information on the Global Information Grid through transaction authentication.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $87.6 million in PE 33140F, an increase of $8.0 million for WISE.

DEFENSE-WIDE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $20,739.8 million for Defense-wide research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $20,769.3 million, an increase of $29.4 million to the budget request.

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEFENSEWIDE					
		BASIC RESEARCH					
0601101D8Z	1	In-House Laboratory Independent Research					
0601101E	2	Defense Research Sciences	143,729	5,000			148,729
0601101E		Optoelectronics and Optical Communications			3,000		
0601101E		Super Lattice Nanotechnology			2,000		
0601103D8Z	3	University Research Initiatives					
0601105D8Z	4	Force Health Protection					
0601108D8Z	5	High Energy Laser Research Initiatives					
0601111D8Z	6	Government/Industry Cosponsorship of University Research					
0601114D8Z	7	Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research	9,590				9,590
0601384BP	8	Chemical and Biological Defense Program	36,769	15,000	15,000		51,769
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**190,088**	**20,000**	**20,000**		**210,088**
		APPLIED RESEARCH					
0602227D8Z	9	Medical Free Electron Laser	9,668	10,000	10,000		19,668
0602228D8Z	10	Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) Science	14,192				14,192
0602234D8Z	11	Lincoln Laboratory Research Program	25,441				25,441
0602301E	12	Computing Systems and Communications Technology	342,614	(20,000)			322,614
0602301E		Program Reduction				(20,000)	
0602302E	13	Embedded Software and Pervasive Computing					
0602383E	14	Biological Warfare Defense	147,533	10,000			157,533
0602383E		Asymmetric Protocols			10,000		
0602384BP	15	Chemical and Biological Defense Program see RDA-30/121	104,385	25,000			129,385
0602384BP		Applied Research Initiative			25,000		
0602702E	16	Tactical Technology	339,175	(39,000)			300,175
0602702E		Stimulated Isomer Energy Release				(4,000)	
0602702E		Walrus Hybrid Airlift Vehicle				(10,000)	
0602702E		High-speed/Hypersonic reusable demonstration				(15,000)	

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0602702E		Program Reduction				(10,000)	
0602712E	17	Materials and Electronics Technology	502,044	(10,000)			492,044
0602712E		Program Reduction				(10,000)	
0602716BR	18	WMD Defeat Technology	249,786	10,000			259,786
0602716BR		Nuclear Weapons Effects			10,000		
0602717BR	19	WMD Defense Technologies	116,113				116,113
0602787D8Z	20	Medical Technology	10,084				10,084
0602890D8Z	21	High Energy Laser Research					
1160401BB	22	Special Operations Technology Development	13,109	3,000			16,109
1160401BB		Spike Missile Development and Production			3,000		
1160407BB	23	SOF Medical Technology Development	2,162				2,162
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,876,306**	**(11,000)**	**58,000**	**(69,000)**	**1,865,306**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
0603002D8Z	24	Medical Advanced Technology	2,063	5,000			7,063
0603002D8Z		Anti-radiation Drug and Trials Program			5,000		
0603104D8Z	25	Explosives Demilitarization Technology					
0603121D8Z	26	SO/LIC Advanced Development	32,682				32,682
0603122D8Z	27	Combating Terrorism Technology Support	46,719	27,500			74,219
0603122D8Z		SVS Collaborative and Virtual Reality Training Pilot			2,500		
0603122D8Z		Advanced Combating Terrorism Technology			25,000		
0603160BR	28	Counterproliferation Advanced Development Technologies	74,456				74,456
0603175C	29	Ballistic Missile Defense Technology	204,320	4,000	4,000		208,320
0603225D8Z	30	Joint DoD-DoE Munitions Technology Development	23,319				23,319
0603232D8Z	31	Automatic Target Recognition					
0603285E	32	Advanced Aerospace Systems	361,067	(55,000)			306,067
0603285E		Program Reduction				(20,000)	
0603285E		Walrus Hybrid Airlift Vehicle				(10,000)	
0603285E		Transfer to 63122D8Z				(25,000)	

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0603384BP	33	Chemical and Biological Defense Program - Advanced Development	117,343	35,000	35,000		152,343
0603400D8Z	34	J-UCAS	284,617				284,617
0603704D8Z	35	Special Technical Support					
0603711BR	36	Arms Control Technology					
0603712S	37	Generic Logistics R&D Technology Demonstrations	27,542	2,000			29,542
0603712S		Connectory for Rapid ID of Tech Resources			2,000		
0603716D8Z	38	Strategic Environmental Research Program	56,936				56,936
0603727D8Z	39	Joint Warfighting Program	9,936				9,936
0603739E	40	Advanced Electronics Technologies	218,151	(5,000)			213,151
0603739E		Program Reduction				(5,000)	
0603750D8Z	41	Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations	213,901				213,901
0603755D8Z	42	High Performance Computing Modernization Program	186,666	6,000			192,666
0603755D8Z		SMDC Simulation Center			6,000		
0603760E	43	Command, Control and Communications Systems	225,784	(20,000)			205,784
0603760E		Program Reduction				(20,000)	
0603762E	44	Sensor and Guidance Technology	337,117	(25,000)			312,117
0603762E		Program Reduction				(25,000)	
0603763E	45	Marine Technology					
0603764E	46	Land Warfare Technology / FCS	63,121				63,121
0603765E	47	Classified DARPA Programs	238,131	(25,000)			213,131
0603765E		Program Reduction				(25,000)	
0603766E	48	Network-Centric Warfare Technology	125,124	(15,000)			110,124
0603766E		Program Reduction				(15,000)	
0603769DSE	49	Distributed Learning Advanced Technology Development	13,756				13,756
0603781D8Z	50	Software Engineering Institute	21,599				21,599
0603805S	51	Dual Use Application Programs					
0603826D8Z	52	Quick Reaction Special Projects/Challenge Program	64,389	105,000			169,389
0603826D8Z		IED Electronic Counter Measures and Jammers			30,000		
0603826D8Z		Optical Surveillance Systems			25,000		

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0603826D8Z		Quick Reaction Counter Rocket and Mortar Capability			50,000		
0603832D8Z	53	Joint Wargaming Simulation Management Office	46,017				46,017
0603924D8Z	54	High Energy Laser Advanced Technology Program					
0603942D8Z	55	Technology Link	1,934				1,934
0605160D8Z	56	Counterproliferation Support	1,958				1,958
1160402BB	57	Special Operations Advanced Technology Development	48,803	16,000			64,803
1160402BB		Remote Sensor Power Source			4,000		
1160402BB		Advanced ID Capability for AC-130U			3,000		
1160402BB		ANGELFIRE Active Protection			6,000		
1160402BB		Surveillance Augmentation Vehicle - Insertable on Request			3,000		
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**3,047,451**	**55,500**	**200,500**	**(145,000)**	**3,102,951**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
0603228D8Z	58	Physical Security Equipment					
0603709D8Z	59	Joint Robotics Program	11,771				11,771
0603714D8Z	60	Advanced Sensor Applications Program	17,581	18,000	10,000		35,581
0603714D8Z		Multi-Wavelength Surface Scanning Biologics Sensor			3,000		
0603714D8Z		Advanced Solid State Dye Laser			5,000		
0603736D8Z	61	CALS Initiative					
0603851D8Z	62	Environmental Security Technical Certification Program	32,546				32,546
0603869C	63	Meads Concepts					
0603879C	64	Advanced Concepts, Evaluations And Systems	256,159	(50,000)		(50,000)	206,159
0603880C	65	Ballistic Missile Defense System Segment					
0603881C	66	Ballistic Missile Defense Terminal Defense Segment	937,748	47,000	47,000		984,748
0603882C	67	Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment	4,384,775	30,000			4,414,775
0603882C		Solid State S Band Radar			30,000		
0603883C	68	Ballistic Missile Defense Boost Defense Segment	492,614				492,614
0603884BP	69	Chemical and Biological Defense Program	104,195				104,195
0603884C	70	Ballistic Missile Defense Sensors	591,957	(51,000)		(56,000)	540,957

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0603884C		Post Ramos Project			5,000		
0603886C	71	Ballistic Missile Defense System Interceptor	511,262	(67,000)		(75,000)	444,262
0603886C		Boost Phase Hit-to-Kill			8,000		
0603888C	72	Ballistic Missile Defense Test & Targets	713,658				713,658
0603889C	73	Ballistic Missile Defense Products	418,608	(60,000)		(60,000)	358,608
0603890C	74	Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Core	479,764	(30,000)		(30,000)	449,764
0603890C		Wide Bandwidth Technology		[4,000]			[4,000]
0603910D8Z	75	Strategic Capability Modernization					
0603920D8Z	76	Humanitarian Demining	13,747				13,747
0603923D8Z	77	Coalition Warfare	5,886				5,886
0604400D8Z	78	J-UCAS	422,873				422,873
0604722D8Z	79	Joint Service Education and Training Systems Development					
0605017D8Z	80	Reduction Of Total Ownership Cost	27,351				27,351
0303191D8Z	81	Joint Electromagnetic Technology (JET) Program	6,679				6,679
	81a	Joint Experimentation		167,626	167,626		167,626
	81b	Joint Warfare Experiments		26	26		26
	81c	Joint Warfare Transformation Programs		22,450	22,450		22,450
		TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**9,429,174**	**27,102**	**298,102**	**(271,000)**	**9,456,276**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
0604384BP	82	Chemical and Biological Defense Program	152,379	13,000			165,379
0604384BP		Joint Biological Point Detection System			5,000		
0604384BP		Joint Service Lightweight Standoff Chemical Agent Detector			8,000		
0604618D8Z	83	MANPADS Defense Program	14,135	(14,135)		(14,135)	
0604709D8Z	84	Joint Robotics Program	13,845				13,845
0604764K	85	Advanced IT Services Joint Program Office (AITS-JPO)	18,183				18,183
0604771D8Z	86	Joint Tactical Information Distribution System (JTIDS)	18,515				18,515
0604861C	87	Theater High-Altitude Area Defense System - TMD					
0604865C	88	Patriot PAC-3 Theater Missile Defense Acquisition					

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0605013BL	89	Information Technology Development	10,683				10,683
0605013D8Z	90	Prototype Accounting Systems					
0605014SE	91	Information Technology Development	52,407				52,407
0605015BL	92	Information Technology Development-Standard Procurement System (SPS)	6,690				6,690
0605016D8Z	93	Financial Management System Improvements	94,767	(49,000)		(49,000)	45,767
0303129K	94	Defense Message System	6,623				6,623
0303140K	95	Information Systems Security Program	2,493				2,493
0303141K	96	Global Combat Support System	17,867				17,867
0303158K	97	Joint Command and Control Program (JC2)	3,000				3,000
0305840K	98	Electronic Commerce	3,466				3,466
0305840S	99	Electronic Commerce	2,345				2,345
0901200D8Z	100	BMMP Domain Management and Systems Integration	7,472				7,472
		TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**424,870**	**(50,135)**	**13,000**	**(63,135)**	**374,735**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
0603704D8Z	101	Special Technical Support	19,274				19,274
0603757D8Z	102	Training Transformation (T2)					
0603835D8Z	103	Transformation Initiatives Program	9,977				9,977
0603858D8Z	104	Unexploded Ordnance Detection and Clearance					
0604774D8Z	105	Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS)	19,691				19,691
0604875D8Z	106	Joint Systems Architecture Development	4,989				4,989
0604943D8Z	107	Thermal Vicar	7,263				7,263
0605104D8Z	108	Technical Studies, Support and Analysis	30,618	1,000			31,618
0605104D8Z		NDU Technology Pilot Program			1,000		
0605110BR	109	Critical Technology Support	1,937				1,937
0605114D8Z	110	BLACK LIGHT	21,535				21,535
0605116D8Z	111	General Support to C3I					
0605117D8Z	112	Foreign Material Acquisition and Exploitation	35,572				35,572
0605123D8Z	113	Interagency Export License Automation	5,882				5,882

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0605124D8Z	114	Defense Travel System	28,508				28,508
0605126J	115	Joint Theater Air and Missile Defense Organization	86,409				86,409
0605128D8Z	116	Classified Program USD(P)					
0605130D8Z	117	Foreign Comparative Testing	35,633	1,550			37,183
0605130D8Z		Weather SCOUT UAV			1,550		
0605170D8Z	118	Support to Networks and Information Integration	11,490				11,490
0605200D8Z	119	General Support to USD (Intelligence)	4,830				4,830
0605384BP	120	Chemical and Biological Defense Program	42,652				42,652
0605502BR	121	Small Business Innovation Research					
0605502C	122	Small Business Innovative Research - MDA					
0605502D8Z	123	Small Business Innovative Research					
0605502E	124	Small Business Innovative Research					
0605710D8Z	125	Classified Programs - C3I					
0605790D8Z	126	Small Business Innovation Research/Challenge Administration	1,999				1,999
0605798S	127	Defense Technology Analysis	7,279				7,279
0605799D8Z	128	Force Transformation	19,591	25,000			44,591
		Operationally Responsive Satellite			25,000		
0605801K	129	Defense Technical Information Services (DTIC)	45,203				45,203
0605803SE	130	R&D in Support of DoD Enlistment, Testing and Evaluation	10,598				10,598
0605804D8Z	131	Development Test and Evaluation	8,882				8,882
0605898E	132	Management Headquarters (Research and Development) DARPA	46,689				46,689
0303169D8Z	133	Information Technology Rapid Acquisition	19,958	(17,000)			2,958
0303169D8Z		Rapid Acquisition Process				(17,000)	
0305193D8Z	134	Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO)	12,878				12,878
0305193G	135	Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO)					
0901585C	136	Pentagon Reservation	13,884				13,884
0901598C	137	Management Headquarters - MDA	141,923				141,923
0901598D8W	138	IT Software Dev Initiatives	1,700				1,700
0909999E	139	Financing for Cancelled Account Adjustments					

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	14,482	20,400			34,882
XXXXXXX		Program Increase			20,400		
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**711,326**	**30,950**	**47,950**	(17,000)	**742,276**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
0604805D8Z	140	Commercial Operations and Support Savings Initiative					
0605127T	141	Partnership for Peace (PfP) Information Management System	6,995				6,995
0607384BP	142	Chemical and Biological Defense	2,178				2,178
0208043J	143	Classified Programs	1,663				1,663
0208045K	144	C4I Interoperability	41,074				41,074
0208052J	145	Joint Analytical Model Improvement Program	5,577				5,577
0300205R	146	Information Technology Systems					
0301011G	147	Cryptologic Activities					
0301301L	148	General Defense Intelligence Program					
0301318BB	149	HUMINT (Controlled)					
0301398L	150	Management Headquarters GDIP, DIA					
0301555BB	151	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
0301556BB	152	SPECIAL PROGRAM					
0302016K	153	National Military Command System-Wide Support	1,240				1,240
0302019K	154	Defense Info Infrastructure Engineering and Integration	2,517				2,517
0303126K	155	Long Haul Communications (DCS)	11,401				11,401
0303127K	156	Support of the National Communications System					
0303131K	157	Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN)	7,261				7,261
0303140D8Z	158	Information Systems Security Program	11,135				11,135
0303140G	159	Information Systems Security Program	477,846				477,846
0303149J	160	C4I for the Warrior	4,177				4,177
0303149K	161	C4I for the Warrior	24,712				24,712
0303150K	162	Global Command and Control System	43,693				43,693
0303153K	163	Joint Spectrum Center	18,941				18,941

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0303165K	164	Defense Collaboration Tool Suite (DCTS)	8,503				8,503
0303170K	165	Net-Centric Enterprise Services (NCES)	52,059				52,059
0303610K	166	Teleport Program	10,272				10,272
0304210BB	167	Special Applications for Contingencies	20,758				20,758
0304345BQ	168	National Imagery and Mapping Program					
0305102BQ	169	Defense Imagery and Mapping Program		(200)			(200)
0305102BQ		TPED of SYERS-2			3,000		
0305102BQ		National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency				(3,200)	
0305125D8Z	170	Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)	28,021				28,021
0305127BZ	171	Foreign Counterintelligence Activities					
0305127V	172	Foreign Counterintelligence Activities					
0305146BZ	173	Defense Joint Counterintelligence Program (JMIP)	32,939				32,939
0305146D8Z	174	Defense Joint Counterintelligence Program (JMIP)					
0305183L	175	Defense Human Intelligence (HUMINT) Program (DHIP)					
0305190D8Z	176	C3I Intelligence Programs					
0305191D8Z	177	Technology Development					
0305193G	178	Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO)					
0305193L	179	Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO)					
0305199D8Z	180	Net Centricity	214,222	(70,000)		(70,000)	144,222
0305202G	181	Dragon U-2 (JMIP)					
0305206G	182	Airborne Reconnaissance Systems					
0305207G	183	Manned Reconnaissance Systems					
0305208BQ	184	Distributed Common Ground Systems					
0305208G	185	Distributed Common Ground Systems					
0305208L	186	Distributed Common Ground Systems					
0305883L	187	Hard and Deeply Buried Target (HDBT) Intel Support					
0305884L	188	Intelligence Planning and Review Activities		10,000			10,000
0305884L		Measures and Signatures Intelligence Consortium			10,000		
0305885G	189	Tactical Cryptologic Activities					

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
0305889G	190	Counterdrug Intelligence Support					
0305917D8Z	191	National Security Space Architect (NSSA)					
0708011S	192	Industrial Preparedness	11,005	12,200			23,205
0708011S		Smart Machine Platform Initiative			12,200		
0708012S	193	Logistics Support Activities	11,389				11,389
0902298J	194	Management Headquarters (JCS)	22,421				22,421
1001018D8Z	195	NATO Joint STARS	30,399				30,399
1160279BB	196	Small Business Innovative Research/Small Bus Tech Transfer Pilot Prog					
1160401BB	197	Special Operations Technology Development					
1160402BB	198	Special Operations Advanced Technology Development					
1160404BB	199	Special Operations Tactical Systems Development	311,966				311,966
1160405BB	200	Special Operations Intelligence Systems Development	25,015				25,015
1160407BB	201	SOF Medical Technology Development					
1160408BB	202	SOF Operational Enhancements	57,643				57,643
XXXXXXX	999	Classified	3,563,600	5,000			3,568,600
XXXXXXX		Program Increase			5,000		
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**5,060,622**	**(43,000)**	**30,200**	**(73,200)**	**5,017,622**
		TOTAL, RDT&E, DEFENSE WIDE	**20,739,837**	**29,417**	**667,752**	**(638,335)**	**20,769,254**

Items of Special Interest

Accelerating transition and fielding of advanced technologies for emerging critical operational needs

The pace at which new technology moves from the laboratory to a fielded system has been an area of continuing concern to the Department of Defense and to Congress. Scaling technology up in size and integrating it with other technologies can present problems, not identified in the laboratory, that delay a program and/or greatly increase program costs. More emphasis and an increased share of the science and technology program have been directed toward the use of technology demonstrations and joint experiments to solve these problems before beginning an acquisition program and speeding the transition of new technology to operational capabilities the user faster and at less cost.

The transition of technology from discovery and demonstration to development and fielding is also difficult because the Department's planning and budgeting process frequently creates a funding gap. Revolutionary technologies that "change minds" and ways of doing things often occur faster than the present defense budget and the appropriations process can respond. Additionally, it is difficult to reallocate fiscal funding for a revolutionary technology within current year funding. The institutional process within the Department lacks the flexibility at all levels: service laboratory; research; development and engineering center; systems command; military departments, and the defense secretariat—to capitalize on new discoveries in academia or institute, service or national laboratory, large industry or small business, and to rapidly develop, demonstrate, and transition the new technology to the military user. There are a number of initiatives underway to address this problem: the Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration program, the Army's Rapid Fielding Initiative, the congressionally sponsored Technology Transition Initiative and the Defense Challenge program. Section 806 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) requires the Secretary of Defense to prescribe rapid acquisition and deployment procedures. Section 1443 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) provides special emergency procurement authority for use in support of contingency operations or in response to a nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological attack. During the committee hearing on the Defense science and technology budget request for fiscal year 2005, the Director, Defense and Engineering testified about the establishment of the quick reaction special projects program, which he characterized as a flexible continuum of technology transition projects that moves products from the Department to the warfighter quickly.

Many of these initiatives are at an early stage and changes to acquisition and budgeting systems to provide the Department with greater flexibility to take advantage of rapidly developing technology are slow to be institutionalized. The committee is encouraged by many of the improvements in the rapid fielding of technology to support the war on terrorism, but also recognizes that there is much to be done. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2004, any additional recommendations for measures to

accelerate the more rapid transition and fielding of advanced technologies to meet emerging critical needs.

Advanced metal casting technology

The budget request contained $27.5 million in PE 78011S, for manufacturing technology research and development, including $2.3 million for procurement readiness optimization—advanced casting technology.

The committee notes the success of collaborative problem solving environments that have been prototyped in several of the military services' engineering support activities, each of which has been custom designed to reflect the needs of the weapons systems and processes used by the military services. The committee also notes the development of casting technology for cost reduction, including advances in steel casting, development of a foundry tooling database, use of casting software visualization tools to reduce trial and error, improvements in melting and molding processes, use of cheaper tooling materials for short run production, and other technologies for reducing production time. The committee considers these interrelated programs to be of great value to the Department of Defense and to the national industrial base as well.

The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to allocate additional resources in future budgets for development of further improvements in collaborative problem solving and casting manufacturing technologies.

Advanced sensor applications program

The budget request contained $17.6 million in PE 63714D8Z for the advanced sensor applications program. The committee is concerned that promising projects executed by the Navy's PMA 264 program office are appreciably underfunded for special programs under development.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63714D8Z for the advanced sensor applications program. Additional details are contained in the classified annex to this report.

Advanced tactical laser program

The committee supports the efforts across the Department's science and technology community to develop tactically useful directed energy weapons. The committee believes that the attributes of such weapons, such as stealth, precision, and minimal collateral damage, make high powered laser tactical weapons ideal in the fight against terrorism. The committee is concerned, however, that the research effort is not directed as precisely as the weapons themselves. For example, the committee understands that chemical laser systems are the most highly developed high powered lasers, but that several efforts are underway to develop more tactically feasible solid state high powered laser systems. Given the large size of chemical laser systems, the committee believes that the Special Operations Command's (SOCOM) Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) for the development of a chemical laser system for an AC–130 gunship may not lead to a militarily useful system before solid state systems mature.

Accordingly, the committee will continue to carefully monitor the SOCOM ACTD, and directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services should the military utility assessment for the advanced tactical laser be delayed beyond fiscal year 2007.

Anti-radiation drug and trials program

The budget request contained $2.1 million in PE 63002D8Z for medical advanced technology development, including $120,000 for development of the 5-adrostendiol (5–AED) advanced radioprotectant ("anti-radiation") drug.

The committee notes progress in the development of 5–AED, the Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute leading candidate for a whole body radioprotectant drug compound: pre-clinical safety and toxicity assessments, small and large animal trials, and extension of the work to pre-clinical trials in a large animal model have been initiated.

The committee recommends $7.1 million in PE 63002D8Z, an increase of $5.0 million to support final efficacy and human toxicity trials of the 5–AED radioprotectant drug.

Asymmetric protocols for biological defense

The budget request contained $147.5 million in PE 62383E for biological warfare defense applied research.

A military or terrorist scenario in which aerosolized biological agents such as anthrax spores or smallpox virus are used would almost certainly result in mass casualties. Weaponized forms of the agents offer significant challenges to medical treatments that are not found in naturally occurring forms. While antibiotics are the only approved method for treating anthrax, the 2003 bioterrorist anthrax attack in Washington, D.C., showed that antibiotics are unfortunately not adequate to provide full treatment against inhalation anthrax. The committee also notes that there are a number of biological agents that could, with appropriate development and weaponization, be used in biological warfare or in a terrorist attack. Developing specific protection against all possible biological agents presents a significant challenge. As a result, the committee believes there is a need for therapeutics that would provide broad spectrum protection against a range of possible biological agents and also work in concert with other methods of treatment.

The committee notes research in therapeutics that shows good results from laboratory testing in mice against pox virus and against anthrax and appears to have the potential for providing broad spectrum protection. Other tests have involved therapeutics that may reinforce the innate immunity of the host. The committee believes that the results of the research to date are promising and the research should continue, but also believes that the research protocols and results to date should undergo an independent peer review. The committee directs the Director of Defense Research and Engineering to conduct such a review and report the results of the review to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2004.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62383E to continue research in asymmetric protocols that would provide broad spectrum protection for biological defense.

Ballistic missile defense

The budget request contained $9,200.0 million for ballistic missile defense.

The committee notes that the budget request reflects an increase of $1,500.0 million over the fiscal year 2004 budget request and recommends a reallocation of the fiscal year 2005 request to focus on near term missile defense capability development and testing.

The committee recommends $9,023.0 million, a reduction of $177.0 million.

Advanced concepts

The budget request contained $256.2 million in PE 63879C for Advanced Concepts, Evaluations and Systems, an increase of $106.0 million from the fiscal year 2005 projection in the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

The committee has reservations that such an increase is justified or that it can be effectively executed. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to focus their advanced concepts work on earlier block applications.

The committee recommends $206.2 million in PE 63879C, a decrease of $50.0 million.

Boost defense segment

The budget request contained $492.6 million in PE 63883C for boost defense. The committee notes with approval the Department of Defense restructuring of the Airborne Laser (ABL) program in late 2003. The committee also recognizes that the future of the ABL program depends upon successful completion of the ground laser test and the flight test of the beam-control fire control system. These milestones must be completed in order for the committee to further support the program after fiscal year 2005. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2005, on the status of these two major component tests as well as a recommendation for the future of the program.

The committee recommends the budget request for boost defense.

Core

The budget request contained $479.8 million in PE 63890C for system core activities.

The committee notes that funding for the systems engineering and integration effort has increased significantly from fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends $449.8 million, a decrease of $30.0 million. The committee encourages the Director of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to focus the national team on the near term block 2004 and 2006 efforts.

The committee also understands that development of wide bandwidth technology is critical for the MDA to transmit test data over extensive distances in support of the test and evaluation program. The committee is encouraged by the recent success of a feasibility demonstration of seamless collaboration utilizing mobile satellite communications from the Reagan Test Site to the Joint National Integration Center.

Within the funds available, the committee recommends $4.0 million for the development of wide bandwidth technology in support of the MDA test program.

Midcourse defense segment

The budget request contained $4,384.8 million in PE 63882C for the ballistic missile defense (BMD) midcourse defense segment.

The Navy has previously funded research and development efforts for an S-band radar prototype. Development of a Solid State S-Band Radar will support future Aegis BMD system capability.

The committee recommends $4,414.8 million in PE 63882C, an increase of $30.0 million for the development of a Solid State S-Band Radar to support Aegis BMD system radar capability.

Post Ramos Project

The committee notes that the Department of Defense announced its intention to terminate the Russian-American Observation Satellite (RAMOS) program earlier this year. The committee also understands that the Department desires to explore other opportunities for missile defense cooperative programs with the Russian Federation that build upon the experience gained in the RAMOS program.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63884C to explore future opportunities for missile defense cooperation with the Russian Federation.

Products

The budget request contained $418.6 million in PE 63889C for products.

The committee notes that the request represents a $113.0 million increase from a fiscal year 2005 projection in the 2004 budget request. The committee also notes that the funding for Command and Control, Battle Management and Communications (C2BMC) has increased significantly from fiscal year 2004 with C2BMC efforts spread across blocks 2004, 2006 and 2008, even though block 2004 has not undergone full operational testing. While the committee supports in principle the concept of spiral development, it also notes that development of C2BMC software is complex and that successful spirals are grounded in successful testing of an initial baseline.

The committee recommends $358.6 million in PE 63889C, a decrease of $60.0 million and urges the Department of Defense to focus C2BMC efforts on near term block requirements.

Sensors

The budget request contained $592.0 million in PE 63884C for sensors.

The committee notes that funding in PE 63884C for block 2006 ballistic missile defense radars has increased by $156.0 million from the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

The committee is concerned with the projected costs of the Forward Deployable Radar (FDR) since the FDR program uses radar technology already developed for the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system.

The committee recommends $536.0 million in PE 63884C, a decrease of $56.0 million for sensors.

System interceptor

The budget request contained $511.3 million in PE 63886C for system interceptor. The committee notes that the request reflects a $360.2 million increase from the fiscal year 2004 authorization.

The committee supports pursuing the land-based Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI) in block 2010 as an alternative to the Airborne Laser for boost phase defense. However, the committee also notes that the request contains funds for block 2012 even though the block 2010 effort just started in 2004. The block 2012 program includes options for a sea-based KEI. The block 2012 sea-based element is designed to integrate the block 2010 land-based KEI element into operational sea-based platforms.

The committee notes that block 2010 will serve as the foundation for the block 2012 program and that progress must first be achieved in the land-based KEI program prior to beginning work in earnest on future sea-based programs. The committee also notes that designation of a platform for the sea-based interceptor is dependent upon future decisions on future Navy force structure and ship design. At this stage of the KEI program, the committee views funding for a sea-based platform option as premature.

The committee recommends $436.3 million, a decrease of $75.0 million for system interceptor. The committee authorizes no funding for sea-based options in block 2012 until 30 days after the Department of Defense has submitted a report to the congressional defense committees that contains a Navy-approved plan for future force structure and existing ship and/or future ship design requirements to support operational deployment of the sea-based interceptors envisioned for block 2012.

The committee understands that the boost phase defense element is the least mature of the elements within the layered defense. Given the importance of intercepting a ballistic missile in the boost phase, the committee believes that the Department should be open to considering additional options for boost phase defense. The committee notes the speed with which United States and coalition forces have established air superiority in recent military operations. The committee is further encouraged by the successful operational demonstration of long duration unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) such as Global Hawk and the employment of the Predator UAV to remotely engage ground targets.

The committee observes that the Air Force has conducted some preliminary studies into the feasibility of using the advanced medium range air-to-air missile launched from tactical aircraft to intercept missiles in boost phase ascent. The committee believes that tactical aircraft or UAVs may offer an alternate launch platform for air intercept missiles for boost phase defense.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63886C for assessments and demonstrations related to the use of tactical aircraft or UAVs as platforms from which to interdict threat ballistic missiles in their boost phase using "hit-to-kill" technologies. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide all required test equipment and logistical support including aircraft and range support to facilitate this demonstration.

Technology

The budget request contained $204.3 million in PE 63175C for ballistic missile defense technology.

The committee is aware of the requirement for missile defense command and control elements to transmit large amounts of data to interceptors. The committee recognizes that high density optical networks can provide this capability for defense satellite systems.

The committee recommends $208.3 million in PE 63175C, an increase of $4.0 million for research into massively parallel optical interconnects.

Terminal defense segment

The budget request contained $937.7 million in PE 63881C for the ballistic missile defense terminal defense segment.

The committee notes that the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) program was negatively impacted by the boost motor propellant explosion in 2003. As a result of the explosion, a number of block 2004 program activities were deferred. The committee is particularly concerned with the deferral of risk reduction activities and schedule delays.

The committee recommends $984.7 million in PE 63881C, an increase of $47.0 million to reduce program risks and to prevent schedule delays in the THAAD program.

Business management modernization program

The budget request contained $94.8 million in PE 65016D8Z for research, development, testing and evaluation for the business management modernization program (BMMP), a Department-wide initiative to transform business processes while standardizing and integrating information systems using common, network centric processes and portfolio management.

The committee supports such business transformation initiatives that would enable interoperability among financial, accounting, human resources, logistics, acquisition, information technology infrastructure, and strategic planning and budgeting systems. In addition, the committee believes the business enterprise architecture, once implemented and controlled, will be a good start towards achieving this goal. However, the committee has serious concerns that the final cost of this program will amount to almost $1.0 billion by fiscal year 2009. Additionally, the committee is also concerned that the enterprise architecture is still incomplete at the present time. Furthermore, the Department has yet to devise a strategy to monitor the progress of this program or measure the program's development. It remains unclear whether this program will meet the Department's 2007 deadline for providing a clean financial audit opinion.

The committee notes that the Department's inability to control its business information technology investments has serious implications, including the continuous spending of billions of dollars on service-specific or non-interoperable system solutions that do not address longstanding business problems.

Additionally, the committee has serious concerns that this program lacks adequate accountability and management oversight to manage the Department's business system investments of roughly $5.0 billion in the fiscal year 2005 budget request. The committee

believes it is critical that the Department gain more effective control and accountability over its business systems funding and insists on a clear direction and an overarching architecture before funding at the level suggested in the budget request is approved.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $45.8 million for PE 65016D8Z for business management modernization, a decrease of $49.0 million.

Chemical/biological defense research, development, test and evaluation program

The budget request contained a total of $559.9 million for chemical/biological defense research, development, test, and evaluation, including $36.8 million in PE 61384BP for basic research, $104.4 million in PE 62384BP for applied research, $117.3 million in PE 63384BP for advanced technology development, $104.2 million in PE 63884BP for advanced component development and prototypes, $152.4 million in PE 64384BP for system development and demonstration, $42.7 million in PE 65384BP for RDT&E management support, and $2.2 million in PE 67384BP for operational systems development. The budget request also contained $147.5 million in PE 62383E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) biological warfare defense research program.

The committee notes that the changing chemical and biological threat, both to U.S. armed forces on the world's battlefields and to U.S. homeland security, places more emphasis on the need for responsive technology options that could address the threat; the ability to quickly assess, develop, and demonstrate the technology; and then, the ability to rapidly insert or deploy the technology in fielded systems. The committee also continues to note the wealth of new concepts and technologies of varying levels of maturity that emerge annually from the nation's science and technology base. The committee recommends the continuation of two chemical and biological defense research and development initiatives established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), one in the applied research category and one in the advanced technology development category, and the establishment of a third initiative in chemical and biological defense basic research, that would provide the opportunity for emerging technologies and concepts to compete for funding on the basis of technical merit and on the contribution that the technology could make to the chemical and biological defense capabilities of the armed forces and to homeland defense. During its review of the fiscal year 2005 budget request the committee received proposals for establishment of a number of projects that the committee recommends be considered for possible funding under the appropriate initiative.

Accelerating the research, development, and acquisition of medical countermeasures against biological warfare agents

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107), Congress directed the Secretary of Defense to accelerate the Department's efforts to develop medical countermeasures (licensed by the Food and Drug Administration) against biological warfare agents. In addition, Congress directed the Sec-

retary to contract with the Institute of Medicine and the National Research Council (IOM/NRC) for a study of the review and approval process for new medical countermeasures in order to identify new approaches to accelerate that process and to identify methods for ensuring that new countermeasures would be safe and effective.

IOM/NRC report "Giving Full Measure to Countermeasures—Addressing Problems in the DOD Program to Develop Medical Countermeasures against Biological Warfare Agents–2004," raises a number of issues concerning the current efforts of the Department of Defense chemical and biological defense program to produce medical biodefense countermeasures.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review and evaluate the IOM/NRC report and to report the results of that review to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2004. The Secretary's report shall contain an analysis of the recommendations made in the IOM/NRC report and the actions planned by the Department with respect to each of the recommendations.

Elsewhere in this report the committee has directed the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on the actions taken to implement the authorities granted in Title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–186). The Act provides the authority for the Secretary to establish an enhanced biomedical countermeasures program within the Department to protect members of the Armed Forces from attack with chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear (CBRN) agents. The committee has also recommended a provision (section 1005) that would remove funding restrictions on the development of medical countermeasures against biological warfare threats and enable the Department to respond more effectively to the increased threat that could be posed by rapid advances in biotechnology.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees, with the submission of the fiscal year 2006 defense budget request, the Department's strategic plan detailing its response to recommendations contained in the IOM/NRC report: the implementation of the additional authorities granted in Title XVI for accelerated research, development; the procurement of advanced biomedical countermeasures; and the repeal of funding restrictions on the development of countermeasures against biological warfare threats. This plan should provide the basis for the development by the Secretary of Defense of a strategic plan for the rapid development of biomedical countermeasures for protection of members of the Armed Forces against current and future biological agent threats.

Chemical/biological defense basic research initiative

The committee recommends that the technologies to be considered for funding under the basic research initiative include, but are not limited to the following:

(1) Engineered pathogen identification and countermeasures ("Bug to Drug");

(2) Fluorescence activated sensing technology; and

(3) Multi-purpose biodefense immunoarray.

The committee recommends $51.8 million in PE 61384BP, an increase of $15.0 million for the chemical/biological defense basic research initiative.

Chemical/biological defense applied research initiative

The committee recommends that the projects and technologies to be considered for funding under the applied research initiative include, but are not limited to the following:

(1) Adaptive infrared imaging spectroradiometer-wide area-detector;

(2) Air containment monitoring technology;

(3) Automated system for liquid phase detectors of toxic compounds;

(4) Genomic-based bioterrorism agent detection and countermeasures;

(5) Heat shock protein vaccine creation process;

(6) LHA–SAW biosensor prototype development;

(7) Low cost chemical-biological protective shelters;

(8) Membrane research for next generation chemical-biological protective suits;

(9) Mustard gas antidote (STIMAL);

(10) Rapid anti-body based biological countermeasures; and

(11) Rapid decontamination system for nerve agents.

The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 62384BP for the chemical/biological defense applied research initiative.

Chemical/biological defense advanced technology development initiative

The committee recommends that the projects and technologies to be considered for funding under the advanced technology development initiative include, but not be limited the following:

(1) Hand-held biological agent detection system;

(2) Immuno biological/chemical threat agent detector;

(3) Non-invasive vectored vaccine development; and

(4) Recombinant protein vaccines.

The committee recommends $152.3 million in PE 63384BP, an increase of $35.0 million for the chemical/biological defense advanced technology development initiative.

Joint biological point detection system

The budget request contained $152.4 million in PE 64384BP for chemical and biological defense system development and demonstration, including $8.6 million for joint biological point detection system (JBPDS) system development and demonstration.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64384BP for continued product improvement and enhancement of the JBPDS.

Joint service lightweight standoff chemical agent detector

The budget request contained $152.4 million in PE 64384BP for chemical and biological defense system development and demonstration, including $20.1 million for joint service lightweight standoff chemical agent detector (JSLSCAD) system development and demonstration.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 64384BP to continue development and evaluation of the JSLSCAD.

Connectory for rapid identification of technology resources

The budget request contained $27.5 million in PE 63712S for generic logistics research and development technology demonstrations, but included no funding for the connectory of rapid identification of technology sources for the Department of Defense. The connectory pilot would provide the Department with instant access to the industrial technology base, permitting rapid identification of promising sources of new, creative technical solutions for current combat and anti-terrorism problems.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63712S for connectory for rapid indentification of technology resources.

Counter-terrorism technology support

The combating terrorism technology support program develops technology and prototype equipment that address needs and requirements with direct operational application in the national effort to combat terrorism. The program addresses defense, interagency, and international requirements for combating terrorism technology. Projects support antiterrorism, counter terrorism, intelligence and terrorism consequence management activities to: conduct tactical operations; protect military forces, civilian personnel, installations, infrastructure elements and the general population from terrorist attack; detect, neutralize, and mitigate the effect of conventional and unconventional devices; conduct surveillance and tracking of terrorists; conduct threat and incident assessments; and process and disseminate information.

The committee notes and highly commends the contributions made by the Technical Support Working Group (TSWG) in the development, demonstration, and fielding of advanced technologies for the fight against terrorism. The committee encourages the TSWG to coordinate with counterpart activities within the government of the United Kingdom and the government of Israel to take advantage of the experience of their activities in the development and fielding of advanced technologies for force protection and for combating terrorism.

In title XV of this report, the committee has recommended an increase of $75.0 million for combating terrorism technology support. In addition, the committee directs that, of the funds provided in title II of this report for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, up to $25.0 million may be made available for the establishment of cooperative programs with the government of the United Kingdom and the government of Israel for the development of advanced technologies and prototype equipment for combating terrorism. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to give priority consideration to the experience of the government of Israel and the government of the United Kingdom in establishing such programs.

Defense advanced research projects agency

The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has been a leader and innovator in basic scientific research and defense

science and technology for decades. The committee has supported ever-increasing funding for DARPA as the only agency not tied to a military service mission and the demands of a service budget to produce quick results. The committee encourages DARPA to continue to examine the "far side," and investigate concepts that may never come to fruition.

Nevertheless, DARPA remains a Defense Agency and must be closely attuned to real defense requirements. Furthermore, the pursuit of the more futuristic technologies on the "far side" must be tempered by the hard fact that we are a nation at war. Our commanders and troops in Iraq have immediate needs for innovative technical solutions across a variety of disciplines. The committee commends DARPA on its quick reaction support and fielding of advanced innovative technologies to meet emerging critical operational needs of our forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom and elsewhere in support of the global war on terrorism.

The committee believes, however, that DARPA should redirect some of its more futuristic efforts to the solution of today's combat problems. Those immediate needs involving detection, sensing, protection, surveillance and a host of other issues may well be "DARPA hard" problems that the Agency should be examining, rather than some of the more futuristic efforts in the DARPA program.

The committee recognizes that DARPA receives input from the military departments, Joint Staff, combatant commanders, and other defense agencies, as the agency leadership builds a program to address national-level problems, operational dominance, and exploitation of high-risk, high-payoff technologies. The committee commends the director of DARPA for his outreach program and operational liaison initiatives. The committee believes, however, that increased emphasis needs to be placed on liaison with the combatant commanders and directs the director of DARPA to establish continuing contact with engaged combatant commanders to determine how DARPA may assist in solving today's real world combat problems, while at the same time continuing promising research into long term creative technologies. In support of these liaison initiatives, the committee strongly recommends that additional military billets be assigned to DARPA and that military officers assigned to DARPA be given joint service credit at the completion of their tour of duty with the agency.

Although the committee is pleased with the overall progress in the defense science and technology program, the committee believes that increased priority must be given to the nearer-term requirements of the combatant commanders and U.S. armed forces in the field. Consequently, the committee makes a series of recommendations for general reductions in DARPA programs:

[In millions of dollars]

62301E—Computing systems and communications technology	(20.0)
62702E—Tactical technology	(10.0)
62712E—Materials and electronics technology	(10.0)
63285E—Advanced aerospace systems	(20.0)
63739E—Advanced electronics technology	(5.0)

63760E—Command, control and communications systems	(20.0)
63762E—Sensor and guidance technology	(25.0)
63765E—Classified DARPA programs	(25.0)
63766E—Network-centric warfare technology	(15.0)

These recommendations are made without prejudice to the particular account identified.

Defense science and technology funding

The budget request contained $10.6 billion for the Department of Defense (DOD) science and technology program, including all defense-wide and military service funding for basic research, applied research, and advanced technology development. The request included $1.8 billion for the Army, $1.7 billion for the Navy, $1.9 billion for the Air Force, and $5.1 billion for Defense Agency science and technology, including $3.1 billion for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). The committee recommends $11.1 billion for the Department of Defense science and technology program, an increase of $874.0 million to the budget request. The committee's recommendation includes $2.1 billion for the Army, an increase of $304.8 million; $1.8 billion for the Navy, an increase of $ 201.7 million; $2.0 billion for the Air Force, an increase of $114.0 million; and $5.2 billion for Defense agency science and technology, an increase of $64.5 million (including $2.9 billion for DARPA, a decrease of $204.0 million). Elsewhere in this report the committee has recommended a provision (section 214) that would transfer funding for the joint experimentation program from the Navy to a Defense-wide account.

The committee regards defense science and technology investment as critical to maintaining U.S. military technological superiority in the face of growing and changing threats to U.S. national security interests around the world. Adjusted for inflation, the fiscal year 2005 request represents an increase of about $200.0 million, but shows a decline from the fiscal year 2004 appropriation of $12.2 billion. The committee notes that the budget request at a level of 2.6 percent of the total DOD budget, does not meet the goal of 3 percent established by the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review. However, the committee received testimony from DOD witnesses during the committee hearing on the defense science and technology program that confirmed that the goal for science and technology funding remains 3 percent of the total DOD budget.

The committee notes that the military departments are responsible for approximately 51 percent of the defense science and technology budget (Army 17 percent, Navy 16 percent, and Air Force 18 percent) and Defense Agencies account for 49 percent, including 29 percent in DARPA. Defense agencies focus on science and technology specific to the particular agency or, in the case of DARPA, on national-level problems, operational dominance, and exploitation of high-risk, high-payoff technologies. The military departments' science and technology programs focus on the development and transition of more mature technologies into future weapons systems that are key to the ability of the individual military departments to achieve their transformation objectives.

The past year has provided numerous examples of successful technology development and deployment. The men and women of the U.S. armed forces are better equipped, trained, and protected because of revolutionary breakthroughs emerging from the technology base. The committee commends the Department for the response of the Defense science and technology base to the emerging critical operational needs in support of the global war on terrorism and Operation Iraqi Freedom. Elsewhere in this report the committee has recommended increased funding to further accelerate the transition of advanced technologies.

Despite the positive aspects of the Department's science and technology program, the committee is concerned about long-term projections for reductions in DOD science and technology as a percentage of total obligation authority and in short-term trends in the science and technology accounts of some of the military departments and defense agencies. The committee cannot emphasize too strongly the need for the Department to maintain a strong and robustly funded science and technology program that will provide the advanced technologies needed to assure technical dominance of our armed forces on any current or future battlefield.

Expanding the role of small businesses in the defense acquisition process

The committee subscribes to the view that small businesses are the nation's engine of technology innovation. The Department of Defense (DOD) spends significant sums annually on Phase I and Phase II Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) technology development. In many cases, however, successful results of the department's investment have not been transitioned into the mainstream of system acquisition programs.

The committee believes that our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines deserve to have the best tools possible as they wage the global war on terrorism. The committee notes the recent Navy-Marine Corps quick-response SBIR solicitation seeking immediate innovative technology approaches for protecting Marines from improvised explosive devices, rocket-propelled grenades, mortars, rockets, and missiles during combat. Broader participation by the nation's small business community is needed now to meet emergent DOD requirements in support of the global war on terrorism, as well as to improve the capability and lower the cost of weapon systems through application of advanced technologies developed by small businesses.

The committee strongly endorses the President's Executive Order 13329, Encouraging Innovation in Manufacturing, directing that SBIR awards involving manufacturing and manufacturing technology be given priority. This is an essential step in broadening the defense industrial base and creating new manufacturing capacity in the United States. In recent years Congress has clarified SBIR Phase III contracting authority and data rights provisions in an attempt to clear the way for the military services to transition promising Phase I and Phase II SBIR technology development efforts to the mainstream of defense acquisition. The committee is encouraged by the small cadre of DOD program managers who have effectively transitioned SBIR technology into their programs through award of Phase III contracts. The committee believes that strong

leadership from the Office of the Secretary of Defense is necessary in order to ensure that all the benefits from the Department's significant annual SBIR technology development investment are realized.

The committee recognizes that an essential element of acquisition reform is the continuing evolution of the acquisition culture in the Department by program managers who possess the insight and commitment to take advantage of small innovative businesses through Phase III transition of SBIR technology. The committee directs that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD (AT&L)) encourage DOD acquisition program managers and prime contractors to make significantly more SBIR Phase III contract awards than has been done in the past. The committee further directs the USD (AT&L) to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 31, 2005, to (1) provide information on DOD SBIR Phase III awards during the past three years; (2) describe what action the Office of the Secretary of Defense has taken to encourage DOD acquisition program managers to award SBIR Phase III contracts at a higher rate and to make award of SBIR Phase III contracts a priority within the Defense Acquisition system; and (3) identify specific Phase III transitions that have been conducted or are planned in fiscal year 2005.

High-speed/hypersonic reusable demonstration

The budget request contained $339.2 million in PE 62702E for tactical technology applied research, including $15.0 million for the high-speed/hypersonic reusable demonstration.

The committee supports the objectives of the high-speed/hypersonic reusable demonstration. However, because there are higher priority, near-term requirements associated with the global war on terrorism, the committee believes that the DARPA high-speed, hypersonic reusable demonstration should be deferred.

The committee recommends a decrease of $15.0 million in PE 62702E, and no funding for the high-speed/hypersonic reusable demonstration.

Horizontal fusion

The budget request contained $214.2 million in PE 35199D8Z for Net Centricity, which includes the horizontal fusion program, and $23.3 million for Washington Headquarters Services major equipment, which includes $10.5 million for horizontal fusion. The committee is aware that horizontal fusion reflects a significant shift in the Department of Defense's (DOD) approach to intelligence data. Currently intelligence analysts process and analyze data before delivering it to the field for use. The Department realized the more efficient way to provide timely intelligence to the warfighter is to post data quickly, allowing analysts in the field to do unit specific analysis. This philosophical shift necessitates significant changes in the systems that hold the information and form the basis of the DOD network.

However, the committee is concerned that the scale of the Department's undertaking is unprecedented, even compared to the commercial sector's use of metadata, which tags data with descriptive information and lists it in a central registry, to manage its applications. The committee is concerned that the scope of this pro-

gram to exploit data on this level without a systems architecture to define data and terms to ensure that the information is consistent for all users could compromise intelligence and cause technological failures. The committee believes the Department must set the rules, standards, protocols, and other parameters to determine who or what entity is ultimately responsible for the data, before the funding at the level proposed in the budget request can be productively expended.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $144.2 million in PE 35199D8Z for continued research, a reduction of $70.0 million, and $18.9 million for Washington Headquarters Services major equipment procurement, a reduction of $4.4 million for horizontal fusion.

Implementation of defense biomedical countermeasures

Title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2004 (Public Law 108–186) provides authority for the Secretary of Defense to establish an enhanced biomedical countermeasures program within the Department of Defense to protect members of the Armed Forces from attack with chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear (CBRN) agents. This title of Public Law 108–136 parallels H.R. 2122, the Project Bioshield Act of 2003, which was developed in response to the Bioshield initiative announced by the President in his State of the Union address to the Congress on January 20, 2004; passed in the House of Representatives; and introduced in the Senate. Title XVI addresses research and development, procurement, and emergency use of biomedical countermeasures.

Section 1601 requires the Secretary of Defense to establish a program to accelerate research and development of biological countermeasures to CBRN threats and provides authorities to speed research.

Section 1602 authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into an interagency agreement with the Secretaries of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services to provide for acquisition by the Secretary of Defense for use by the Armed Forces of biomedical countermeasures procured for the Strategic National Stockpile by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. Section 1602 also authorizes the Secretary of Defense to transfer those funds to the Secretary of Health and Human Services that are necessary to carry out such agreements and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to expend any such transferred funds to procure such countermeasures for use by the Armed Forces, or to replenish the stockpile.

Section 1603 establishes conditions under which the Secretary of Health and Human Services may authorize emergency use by the general public of certain drugs, devices, or biological products based on a determination by the Secretary of Defense that there is a military emergency involving a heightened risk to United States military forces of attack with specified CBRN agents. Section 1603 would also authorize the President to waive the right of service members to refuse the administration of such a biomedical countermeasure.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2004, on the actions taken to implement the authorities granted in title XVI of the Act.

Man portable air defense system defense program

The budget request included $14.1 million in PE 64618D8Z for systems development and demonstration (SDD) for a network-centric, portable, ground-based, counter-man portable air defense system (MANPADS).

SDD programs require validated requirements and technologies that have been demonstrated in at least a laboratory or test range environment. There are no validated requirements for this program, nor have any technologies been demonstrated. Further, the committee understands the concept for this program was considered by the Department of Homeland Security for its on-going program to protect civilian aircraft from the MANPADS threat and was rejected. Consequently, this program would be unique to the military services. Finally, the committee believes the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) should not be managing programs that are inherently within the purview of the military services.

If OSD, in its oversight role, believes that there is sufficient merit in the concept engendered in this request, it should mandate incorporation of the concept within one of the several counter-MANPADS programs resident within the military services and defense agencies as part of their research and development programs.

The committee recommends no funds in PE 64618D8Z for fiscal year 2005, a decrease of $14.1 million.

Measures and signatures intelligence consortium

The budget request contained no funds in PE 35884L for intelligence planning and review for the Measures and Signatures Intelligence (MASINT) Consortium.

The MASINT Consortium, led by the Defense Intelligence Agency, began in fiscal year 2003 by congressional directive to coordinate basic and applied science research as it relates to the Intelligence Community (IC) and the Department of Defense. The committee believes this is an IC requirement that encourages the advancement of basic and applied systems research within the MASINT discipline. Amplifying information on this issue may be found in the classified annex to this report.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 35884L for the MASINT Consortium.

Medical free electron laser

The budget request contained $9.7 million in PE 62227D8Z for medical free electron laser applied research.

The committee notes that the medical free electron laser program seeks to develop advanced, laser-based applications for military medicine and related materials research. Because free electron lasers provide unique pulse features and tunable wavelength characteristics that are unavailable in other laser devices, their use broadens the experimental options for the development of new laser-based medical technologies. The program is a merit-based, peer-reviewed, competitively awarded research program, the majority of which is focused on developing advanced procedures for rapid diagnosis and treatment of battlefield related medical problems.

The committee recommends $19.7 million in PE 62227D8Z, an increase of $10.0 million to continue the merit-based, peer-re-

viewed, competitively awarded program in medical free electron laser applied research.

Multi-wavelength surface scanning biologics sensor

The budget request contained $17.6 million in PE 63714D8Z for the advanced sensor applications program.

The committee notes on-going research in the use of multi-wavelength excitation spectral technology for the detection and identification of biologic agents that are not discernible with conventional sensors. The committee understands that successful demonstration of this technology for two dimensional fluorescence that spectrally resolve the target in both excitation and emission dimensions could provide the capability to detect and identify biological agents and a significant improvement in the scanning and screening of potentially contaminated locations. Congress appropriated $2.0 million in fiscal year 2004 to continue previously funded work on the technology and support evaluation of a laboratory test bed system with a wide range of simulated and target bacteria and pathogens and environmental backgrounds. The committee understands that the success of these efforts has motivated further testing of the laboratory test bed prototype to support the design and development of a second generation or "beta" system with significantly expanded capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63714D8Z to continue the program for development and demonstration of two-dimensional fluorescence spectral sensing instruments for the real-time detection and identification of pathogens.

National Defense University technology pilot program

The budget request contained $30.6 million in PE 65104D8Z for the Office of the Secretary of Defense technical studies, support, and analysis.

The committee notes that the National Defense University (NDU), supported by funding provided by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, has established a pilot research and analysis program focused on defense policy issues that have significant technology elements. The committee further notes that the objective of this program is to determine how the United States can maintain its competitive edge against other military adversaries at a time when commercial information technology (IT) is readily available on the global market. The committee is interested to learn the results of NDU's proposed pilot programs for fiscal year 2005 which include the use of IT for stabilization efforts and reconstruction operations in Iraq, and homeland security.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $31.6 million for PE 65104D8Z, an increase of $1.0 million for the NDU technology pilot program.

Nuclear weapons effects applied research

The budget request contained $249.8 million in PE 62716BR for applied research in weapons of mass destruction defeat technology, including $67.8 million for applied research in weapons effects technology.

The committee continues to note that the budget for nuclear weapons effects applied research has declined dramatically since

the early 1990s and the decline in the budget has been accompanied by a decline in the capability for and expertise in analysis of nuclear weapons effects. The current program uses a combination of computer analysis, simulation and protection technology to address key issues regarding the survivability of critical U.S. systems in a potential nuclear environment, including missile defense interceptors, satellite electronics, and warfighting command, control, communications and intelligence (C3I) systems and facilities. The committee believes that the U.S. nuclear weapons effects analysis capability needs to be revitalized to address emerging 21st Century threats, such as the potential for terrorist use of radiological dispersion devices ("dirty bombs") or crude nuclear weapons in an urban environment; the potential effect of electromagnetic pulse generated by a nuclear weapon on C3I and other electronic systems; the potential use of small nuclear weapons for defeat of chemical or biological agents, or for defeat of hard and buried targets; and analysis of requirements for defense of critical assets.

The committee recommends $259.8 million in PE 62716BR, an increase of $10.0 million for nuclear weapons effects applied research.

Operationally responsive satellite

The budget request contained $19.6 million in PE 65799D8Z for Force Transformation Directorate, but contained no funds for operationally responsive satellites.

With the advent of operationally responsive launches, the committee believes research and development should begin on the use of satellites that would fit this new family of launch vehicles and address near-term warfighter requirements. These new satellites should provide critical capabilities from space in an affordable, reliable, and timely manner. This new perspective on satellite acquisition represents a truly transformational strategy and, as such, should be managed by the Secretary of Defense's new Office of Force Transformation.

The committee recommends $44.6 million in PE 65799D8Z, an increase of $25.0 million for the development of operationally responsive satellites.

Smart machine platform initiative

The budget request contained $11.0 million in PE 78011S for Industrial Preparedness, of which no funds were requested for the Smart Machine Platform Initiative.

The committee has been encouraged by the efforts of the machine tool industry to develop breakthrough technology for defense manufacturing applications by which the next generation of machine technology will provide the capability to monitor and modify a work plan during the production process. This smart machine technology would substantially reduce both the cost and time to develop defense products.

The committee recommends $23.2 million for PE 78011S, an increase of $12.2 million for the Smart Machine Platform Initiative.

Space and missile defense command simulation center

The budget request contained $186.7 million for the high performance computing modernization program, which includes the

Army Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) Simulation Center. The center is a mission critical computer facility established to provide supercomputer computational assets with high performance network and storage support for the development, testing, and integration of strategic defense technologies and simulations including computational physics and chemistry, weapons design, and force modeling for SMDC, the Missile Defense Agency (MDA), and the military services. The committee understands that the SMDC needs to upgrade its information technology systems to meet computational demands for simulation, testing, and evaluation of advanced interceptors and sensors. The committee believes the technology upgrades are important to the work the SMDC is presently conducting.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $192.7 million in PE 63755D8Z, an increase of $6.0 million for the SMDC.

Special operations advanced technology development

The budget request contained $48.8 million in PE 116402BB for special operations advanced technology development, but contained no funding for development of long term battery-free power sources, the advanced target identification capability for AC–130U gunships, the ANGELFIRE active protection system, and the surveillance augmentation vehicle-insertable on request (SAVIOR) system.

The committee is aware of the need for power sources that may be used to supply power to remote monitoring and surveillance sensors for long periods of duration. Furthermore, the committee understands that promising technology exists that may meet that military requirement by converting ambient light to power.

The advanced target identification system is a significant enhancement to the gunship radar and will enable the crew to make accurate and near instantaneous identification of friendly and enemy vehicles on the battlefield. To complete the project, funding is needed to fully integrate identification software with a family of ground and airborne systems.

ANGELFIRE is a promising integrated sensor and countermeasure package with the potential to provide increased protection to lightly protected military aircraft and vehicles in hostile environments. Such systems are urgently needed in today's increasingly lethal operating environments.

The SAVIOR system also promises to increase force protection for troops operating in cluttered, urban environments. SAVIOR is a mobile, intelligent sensor suite that can alert ground forces to the presence of a threat with its intensive surveillance network.

The committee recommends $64.8 million for PE 1160402BB special operations advanced technology development, increases of $4.0 million to develop battery free power sources for sensors, $3.0 million for the advanced identification capability for AC–130 gunships, $6.0 million to develop the ANGELFIRE active protection system, and $3.0 million for development of the SAVIOR system.

Special operations technology development

The budget request contained $13.1 million in PE 116401BB for special operations technology development, but included no funding for shoulder fired smart round (SPIKE) urban warfare system de-

velopment. The SPIKE missile fills a critical need for a low-cost, light-weight fire and forget missile for ground troops to use against lightly armored and other material targets and has possible maritime application as well.

The committee recommends $16.1 million in PE 116401BB, an increase of $3.0 million for SPIKE missile development.

Stimulated isomer energy release

The budget request contained $339.2 million in PE 62702E for tactical technology applied research, including $4.0 million for stimulated isomer energy release.

The committee is aware that the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency (DARPA) is funding research to investigate the feasibility of stimulating the release of energy stored in nuclear isomers. The committee understands that the DARPA-sponsored research is investigating two of the most difficult technical challenges in this program and that the research is being conducted in the national laboratories, the Department of Energy, the military service laboratories, and other facilities. Given the significant policy issues associated with any eventual use of an isomer weapon and given the inability of distinguished scientists to replicate the reported successful triggering experiment of 1998, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should not be engaged in this research. The proper agency to investigate the feasibility of this technology is the National Nuclear Security Administration and its national laboratory complex. The committee questions the utility of this research in any circumstances and is particularly skeptical of research into nuclear isomer production before triggering is shown to be possible.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to terminate this program, and recommends no funding for the stimulated isomer energy release in PE 62702E, a reduction of $4.0 million.

Tasking, processing, exploitation, and dissemination of SYERS–2 data

The budget request contained no funding in PE 35102BQ for defense imagery and mapping.

The committee is concerned that multi-spectral data from the SYERS–2 sensor is not being exploited by the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency (NGA).

The committee recommends $3.0 million in PE 35102BQ, an increase of $3.0 million to permit the NGA to fully process, exploit, and disseminate SYERS–2 data.

Use of research and development funds to procure systems

The committee has observed the increasing use of funds designated for research and development (R&D) purposes to acquire operational platforms. The fiscal 2005 budget proposal would take the practice to unprecedented levels, with three DD(X) and two LCS ships, three E–2C aircraft, and eleven VH-XX helicopters proposed for acquisition with R&D funds.

The use of R&D funds for prototypes and truly developmental items is both proper and prudent. This practice also makes sense when, following the completion of testing, a test asset still has use-

ful capability to bring to the operational fleet. However, it is difficult to believe that nearly half of the VH-XX fleet, for example, qualifies as prototypes or dedicated test assets. The fact that the platforms may occasionally be used for some testing purposes does not, in the committee's view, qualify them as research craft. Indeed, the committee would be surprised were the department actually proposing to regularly carry the President on prototype aircraft.

While the committee recognizes the increased flexibility of R&D funds in acquiring platforms, there is concern that placing acquisition programs in the R&D budget, particularly at their early, least stable stage, threatens other programs, particularly in science and technology. The R&D budget is a very small pool from which to fund acquisitions of large items like ships, and as procurements are must-pay bills, typical procurement cost-growth would put the rest of the R&D budget at risk.

The committee's action with regard to particular programs funded in R&D should therefore be seen not only as a reflection of the merits of those items, but also as an expression of concern over the rapidly expanding portion of the R&D budget being used for purposes other than R&D.

Walrus

The budget request contained $339.2 million in PE 62702E for tactical technology applied research, including $10.0 million for the Walrus program, and $361.0 million in PE 63285E for advanced aerospace systems advanced technology development, including $10.0 million for the Walrus program.

The committee notes that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) Walrus program would combine technologies for high-strength and low structural weight airframes, high efficiency propulsion systems; and heavy-lift cargo transport investigated in earlier DARPA programs. The Walrus program would develop and evaluate a very large "hybrid" airlift vehicle concept that is designed to fly through a combination of aerodynamics and gas buoyancy. The first phase of the program would include system studies and development of a notional objective vehicle and would be followed by a competitive second phase that would lead to the development, design, build, and initial flight test of an advanced technology demonstration air vehicle with air lift capability comparable to a C–130 aircraft. As envisioned, an objective vehicle would be capable of lifting over 500 tons across intercontinental distances.

The committee acknowledges the Department of Defense's objective of being able to deploy quickly to overseas theaters from the continental United States. Nevertheless, the committee is also aware of previous programs in the late 1980s and early 1990s that envisioned very large, long-endurance airship concepts for intertheater lift, which after some initial enthusiasm were not pursued because of the large costs associated with the development and production of such systems. The committee has also received no estimates of the potential development and production costs for the Walrus concept. Because there are higher priority, near-term requirements associated with the global war on terrorism, the com-

mittee believes that the work on the DARPA Walrus program should be deferred.

Accordingly, the committee recommends no funding for the Walrus program, a reduction of $10.0 million in PE 62702E and a reduction of $10.0 million in PE 63285E.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Overview

The budget request contained $305.1 million for Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.

The committee recommends $305.1 million, no change to the budget request.

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

PE Name	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE					
0603941D8Z	1	Test & Evaluation Science & Technology	16,295				16,295
0604940D8Z	2	Central Test and Evaluation Investment Development (CTEIP)	123,562				123,562
0605118D8Z	3	Operational Test and Evaluation	42,390				42,390
0605131D8Z	4	Live Fire Testing	10,209				10,209
0605804D8Z	5	Development Test and Evaluation	112,679				112,679
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE	**305,135**				**305,135**

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would establish research, development, test and evaluation authorization levels for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005.

Section 202—Amount for Defense Science and Technology

This section would establish defense science and technology authorization levels for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—Future Combat Systems Program Strategy

This section would limit authorization of appropriations for Future Combat Systems (FCS) in fiscal year 2005 to $2.2 billion until the following is submitted to Congress prior to the Milestone B update:

(1) An independent program cost estimate;

(2) A report on the maturity levels of critical technologies;

(3) A report on the status of the network and command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance components; and

(4) The key performance parameters.

This section would also require the Secretary of the Army to certify that the following requirements are applied to the Future Combat Systems program:

(1) At the design readiness review, 90 percent of engineering drawings will be releasable to manufacturing;

(2) Before production facilitization and long lead items are contracted for, the performance of the information network is demonstrated to be acceptable, including the contributions of complementary programs such as the Joint Tactical Radio System and the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical;

(3) Before the initial production decision, prototypes of each system demonstrate their collective ability to meet system of system requirements when integrated with the network.

FCS is a revolutionary system of systems that the Army is developing to equip its future forces. FCS consists of an information network that links a suite of 18 new smaller and lighter manned and unmanned ground vehicles, air vehicles, sensors, and munitions. The success of FCS depends on the ability of the network to collect, process, and deliver vast amounts of information such as imagery and communications and the performance of the individual systems themselves.

The committee supports the Army's transformation goals and the desired capabilities that the FCS program promises. However, the committee is greatly concerned about the Army's ability to deliver these capabilities within cost and schedule estimates. The Army has never managed any program of the size and complexity of FCS:

18 systems, 32 critical technology areas, 34 million lines of code, 129 trade studies, and 157 other necessary systems outside of the FCS program structure.

In its March 2004 report, the General Accounting Office indicated the FCS program has many of the same risk markers that have led to problems on other programs. These include:

(1) An extremely challenging and unforgiving requirement to outperform the current heavy force at a fraction of the weight and logistics footprint;

(2) Reliance on numerous advanced yet immature technologies to meet the requirement; and;

(3) A schedule that proceeds to production in an unprecedented 5½ years.

The committee is aware of the fiscal realities that make it difficult to fund simultaneously the development of transformational future military systems and the maintenance and sustainment of current military systems. FCS will field 15, brigade like, Units of Action by 2025. This will constitute about one-third of the active component of the Army. The Army does not have a plan and has not budgeted funds to sustain the current force through 2025. The committee believes that the current force must be provided with a sufficient sustainment and modernization budget such that this force remains capable, reliable, interoperable, and relevant until FCS can assume the majority of the responsibility for the Army's mission.

Section 212—Collaborative Program for Research and Development of Vacuum Electronics Technologies

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a program for research and development in advanced vacuum electronics technology to meet Department of Defense (DOD) requirements for radio frequency electromagnetic systems. The program would be carried out collaboratively by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Army, and other appropriate elements of the Department of Defense. The provision would also increase the fiscal year 2005 budget request for vacuum technology research and development by a total of $15.0 million, an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62771N for vacuum electronics applied research and an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63771N for vacuum electronics advanced technology development.

The committee has long recognized the unique needs of the Department of Defense for high power vacuum electronics for radar and other electromagnetic systems, and has advocated increased funding for research and development in advanced vacuum electronics technology. The committee reports on H.R. 1402 (H. Rept. 106–162) and on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–436) noted the committee's support for a robust vacuum electronics research and development program in the Department of Defense and other federal agencies. The committee has reviewed the results of the Secretary of the Navy's report to Congress on the DOD vacuum electronics program and the Department's April 2001 Technology Area Review and Assessment (TARA) on creating a balanced tri-service investment strategy for RF vacuum electronics and solid-state power electronics technologies. In the committee report on H.R. 4546, the

committee endorsed the TARA views on the criticality of support for both vacuum electronics and solid-state power electronics technologies. The committee notes the TARA review's recommendations for increased funding in the tri-service vacuum electronics program and for establishment of a combined tri-service initiative to rapidly advance wide band gap semiconductor device technology to enable advanced military radar and other systems requiring power electronics in the mid-to-long term.

Section 212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) required the Secretary of Defense to establish a collaborative program for development of advanced radar systems, which has focused on developing the technology for high frequency and high power wide band gap semiconductors recommended in the TARA review. Section 212 of this Act would implement the TARA recommendation for the tri-service vacuum electronics program.

The committee expects the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), acting through the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, to ensure a balanced investment strategy for vacuum electronics and solid state power technologies that will meet DOD requirements for current and future systems that use radio frequency power electronics.

Section 213—Annual Comptroller General Report on Joint Strike Fighter Program

This section would establish an annual review of the Joint Strike Fighter system development and demonstration (SDD) program by the Comptroller General to be submitted to Congress by March 15, of each year. The report would include the extent to which such SDD program is meeting established performance, cost, and schedule goals; the plan for such SDD for the next fiscal year; and a conclusion whether such SDD program is likely to be completed at a cost not in excess of the most recent Selected Acquisition Report. The final report required by this section would be submitted on March 15, 2009.

Section 214—Amounts for United States Joint Forces Command to be Derived Only from Defense-wide Amounts

This section would transfer funding for the joint warfare experimentation program and related Joint Forces Command programs from Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy to a Defense-wide account.

In 1998, the Secretary of Defense chartered the combatant commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command, as the executive agent for conducting joint warfighting concept development and experimentation within the Department of Defense. The committee believes that, as the Department's executive agent for joint warfighting concept development and experimentation, the command's budget for joint warfare experimentation and related programs should be independent of, and separate from the budgets of the military departments. The committee also notes that the precedent that has been established by the Department in maintaining the budgets for the Joint Staff and defense agencies separate from the budgets of the military departments. The committee also observes that main-

taining the budget for the joint warfare experimentation and transformation programs as a part of budget request for the Navy's science and technology program tends to create a false impression of funding levels for the latter.

The committee directs the transfer of funding for the Joint Forces Command joint experimentation, joint warfare experiments and joint warfare transformation programs from Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy to Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, as follows:

(1) $167.7 million for Joint Experimentation from Navy PE 32727N to Defense-wide PE 63xx1;

(2) $26,000 for Joint Warfare Experiments from Navy PE 63757N to Defense-wide PE 63xx2, and;

(3) $22.5 million for Joint Warfare Transformation Programs from Navy PE 64787N to Defense-wide PE 63xx3.

Section 215—Authority of Director of Defense Research and Engineering to Award Prizes for Advanced Technology Achievements

This section would amend the process by which the Secretary of Defense carries out a program to award cash prizes in recognition of outstanding achievements in basic, advanced, and applied research, technology development, and prototype development that have the potential for application to the performance of the military missions of the Department of Defense. The amendment would provide that the program would be carried out by the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, rather than through the Director, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

Section 216—Space Based Radar

This section would prohibit the Space Based Radar program from proceeding to Department of Defense acquisition milestone B. The program may not proceed until 30 days after meeting the requirement to notify the congressional defense committees and the intelligence committees of the completion of an independent cost estimate, a technology maturity and readiness assessment, and the system design concept.

Section 217—Mark–54 Torpedo Product Improvement Program

This section would provide $2.0 million of funds authorized in Navy, Research and Development for the Mark–54 Product Improvement Program.

SUBTITLE C—BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Section 221—Fielding of Ballistic Missile Defense Capabilities

This section would allow the Department of Defense to use research, development, test and evaluation funding to develop and field ballistic missile defense capabilities with funds appropriated in fiscal years 2005 and 2006.

The committee is concerned with the Department's plans to transition program elements of the ballistic missile defense program from the Missile Defense Agency to the military services. The committee notes that section 223(a) of the National Defense Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) requires the Secretary of Defense to submit with the annual budget request the potential date of availability of individual ballistic missile defense program elements for fielding, and the estimated date for the transfer of individual ballistic missile defense system elements from the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to the secretary of a military department. The committee expects that the fielding and acquisition strategy provided by the Department will assist the committee in considering future requests by the Department to use research, development, test and evaluation funds for the development and fielding of ballistic missile capabilities.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $140.6 billion for operation and maintenance funds throughout the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee reviewed this request to evaluate whether readiness accounts are properly funded and managed for a peacetime environment. The committee conducted a focused review on joint training, logistics transformation, prepositioned assets, as well as the overall readiness of military units.

The committee believes the Secretary of Defense and DOD leadership recognize the importance of joint training and are taking appropriate action to implement the Joint National Training Capabilities program. DOD leadership also appears committed to improving logistics and providing total asset visibility of supplies and personnel to the combatant commanders. The committee will continue in its oversight role to evaluate whether various training exercises and logistics systems migrate toward a joint environment or whether military-unique training and stove-piped logistics systems continue to be the norm. The committee believes any program identified as joint, total, or global will face some level of resistance. The burden will be on the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to adopt and endorse programs that benefit the Department as a whole, rather than merely benefiting a particular service or agency.

The committee also believes the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments have a unique opportunity to replenish their prepositioned materials and equipment in a manner most beneficial to global security. Many lessons were learned as to the value of prepositioned equipment and how to manage such assets. The committee hopes DOD leadership takes advantage of these lessons and adjusts its prepositioning program accordingly.

Finally, the committee notes the challenge of evaluating a peacetime budget when the nation is at war. The budget request contained no additional funds to support the operating tempo for units deployed for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Title XV of this bill accordingly addresses this issue and the need for additional operational and maintenance funds.

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	APPROPRIATION SUMMARY					
	Department of the Army					
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	26,133,411	(294,800)	24,000	(318,800)	25,838,611
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	2,008,128	(4,400)	6,600	(11,000)	2,003,728
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	4,440,686	(15,000)	31,500	(46,500)	4,425,686
	Total Department of the Army	**32,582,225**	**(314,200)**	**62,100**	**(376,300)**	**32,268,025**
	Department of the Navy					
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	29,789,190	(265,700)	9,500	(275,200)	29,523,490
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	3,632,115	5,500	5,500		3,637,615
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	1,240,038				1,240,038
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	188,696				188,696
	PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND					
	Total Department of the Navy	**34,850,039**	**(260,200)**	**15,000**	**(275,200)**	**34,589,839**
	Department of the Air Force					
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	28,471,260	(1,327,694)	164,300	(1,491,994)	27,143,566
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	2,239,790	(13,000)		(13,000)	2,226,790
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	4,422,838	26,100	78,800	(52,700)	4,448,938
	Total Department of the Air Force	**35,133,888**	**(1,314,594)**	**243,100**	**(1,557,694)**	**33,819,294**
	Defense-Wide					
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**17,494,076**	**(176,670)**	**118,330**	**(295,000)**	**17,317,406**
	Transfer Accounts, Miscellaneous, and Other					
	TRANSFER ACCOUNTS	1,305,336				1,305,336
	MISCELLANEOUS	509,025	25,000	50,000	(25,000)	534,025
	Total Miscellaneous	**1,814,361**	**25,000**	**50,000**	**(25,000)**	**1,839,361**
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:	**121,874,589**	**(2,040,664)**	**488,530**	**(2,529,194)**	**119,833,925**

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM					
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	17,203,369	171,175	334,675	(163,500)	17,374,544
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION	72,407				72,407
PROCUREMENT	364,635				364,635
TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	17,640,411	171,175	334,675	(163,500)	17,811,586
CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS PROGRAM					
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE		1,138,801	1,138,801		1,138,801
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION		154,209	154,209		154,209
PROCUREMENT		78,980	78,980		78,980
TOTAL, CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS PROGRAM		1,371,990	1,371,990		1,371,990
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG PROGRAMS	852,697				852,697
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL					
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	242,362	(51,000)			191,362
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION	2,100				2,100
PROCUREMENT	100				100
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	244,562	(51,000)			193,562
TOTAL OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS	18,737,670	1,492,165	1,706,665	(163,500)	20,229,835
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds	510,886	(138,000)		(138,000)	372,886
Defense Working Capital Funds - DeCA	1,175,000				1,175,000
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,269,252	(50,000)		(50,000)	1,219,252
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund					
Armed Forces Retirement Home	61,195				61,195
TOTAL, REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS	3,016,333	(188,000)		(188,000)	2,828,333

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	Operation and Maintenance, Army					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	LAND FORCES	**4,152,294**	**(29,000)**		**(29,000)**	**4,123,294**
010	DIVISIONS	1,520,706				1,520,706
020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	472,692				472,692
030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	445,344				445,344
040	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	515,730	(19,000)			496,730
	Unjustified growth in contract logistics support and sustainment				(10,000)	
	Network Enterprise Technology Command				(9,000)	
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,197,822	(10,000)			1,187,822
	Unjustified growth in combat training centers				(10,000)	
	LAND FORCES READINESS	**3,355,819**	**2,500**	**6,500**	**(4,000)**	**3,358,319**
060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,787,147	6,500			1,793,647
	Hydration on the move			3,000		
	Vehicle batteries			2,500		
	Military Skills Engagement			1,000		
070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	537,567	(4,000)			533,567
	Tactical exploitation system				(4,000)	
080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,031,105				1,031,105
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**8,970,368**	**(25,200)**		**(25,200)**	**8,945,168**
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	5,609,973	(25,200)			5,584,773
	Visual Information Support				(13,000)	
	Installation Management Activity				(10,000)	
	DCSIM and DOIM Staff Operations				(2,200)	

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,956,128				1,956,128
110	MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	251,474				251,474
120	UNIFIED COMMANDS	94,850				94,850
130	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	1,057,943				1,057,943
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01	**16,478,481**	**(51,700)**	**6,500**	**(58,200)**	**16,426,781**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION					
	MOBILITY OPERATIONS	**461,999**				**461,999**
140	STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	327,345				327,345
150	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	126,163				126,163
160	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	8,491				8,491
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 02	**461,999**				**461,999**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
	ACCESSION TRAINING	**404,589**				**404,589**
180	OFFICER ACQUISITION	107,554				107,554
190	RECRUIT TRAINING	20,766				20,766
200	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	41,961				41,961
210	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	234,308				234,308
	BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING	**1,803,314**	**(12,000)**	**3,000**	**(15,000)**	**1,791,314**
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	506,557	3,000			509,557
	Satellite communications for learning (SCOLA)			3,000		
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	575,406				575,406
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	102,832				102,832

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	618,519	(15,000)			603,519
	Unjustified growth in training support				(15,000)	
	RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING	**1,137,008**	**(14,000)**		**(14,000)**	**1,123,008**
300	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	461,157	(14,000)			447,157
	Recruiting Information Support System				(4,000)	
	MEPCOM Management Information Reporting System				(10,000)	
310	EXAMINING	131,206				131,206
320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	296,311				296,311
330	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	111,003				111,003
340	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	137,331				137,331
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03	**3,344,911**	**(26,000)**	**3,000**	**(29,000)**	**3,318,911**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	SECURITY PROGRAMS	**883,510**				**883,510**
360	SECURITY PROGRAMS	883,510				883,510
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	**1,857,257**				**1,857,257**
370	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	570,923				570,923
380	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	490,261				490,261
390	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	439,466				439,466
400	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	356,607				356,607
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	**2,797,113**	**(82,800)**	**14,500**	**(97,300)**	**2,714,313**
410	ADMINISTRATION	702,719	(19,500)			683,219
	Unjustified growth in headquarters management				(19,500)	
420	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	610,866	(63,300)			547,566

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	Personnel Transformation				(13,000)	
	Army Knowledge Enterprise Architecture				(4,000)	
	Management Headquarters Information Management				(13,000)	
	Defense Civilian Personnel Data System - sustainment				(2,200)	
	Logistics Modernization Program				(2,700)	
	Logistic Post Production Software Support				(3,500)	
	Army Personnel Electronic Records Management System				(7,000)	
	Army Human Resources Command Core Automation Support				(20,000)	
	Information Technology Agency				(12,400)	
	Training Instrumentation for Air and Missile Defense Units			5,000		
	National Guard's Enterprise Resource Planning Program			3,500		
	National Guard's Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network			6,000		
430	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	267,365				267,365
	Excessive growth in civilian personnel operations					
440	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	191,686				191,686
450	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	848,391				848,391
460	ARMY CLAIMS	115,453				115,453
470	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	60,633				60,633
	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	**310,140**				**310,140**
500	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	250,026				250,026
510	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	60,114				60,114
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04	**5,848,020**	**(82,800)**	**14,500**	**(97,300)**	**5,765,220**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Excessive unobligated balances		(52,300)		(52,300)	(52,300)
	Civilian pay overstatement		(82,000)		(82,000)	(82,000)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Army	**26,133,411**	**(294,800)**	**24,000**	**(318,800)**	**25,838,611**

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	Operation and Maintenance, Navy					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	AIR OPERATIONS	**5,809,016**	**(55,500)**		**(55,500)**	**5,753,516**
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	3,002,769				3,002,769
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,066,452				1,066,452
030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	66,565				66,565
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	111,146				111,146
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	498,508	(40,000)			458,508
	Unjustified growth for technical publications				(25,000)	
	Navy Air Logistics Data Analysis				(15,000)	
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	995,596	(15,500)			980,096
	Navy Converged Enterprise Resource Planning Program				(15,500)	
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	67,980				67,980
	SHIP OPERATIONS	**8,251,431**	**(11,000)**	**4,000**	**(15,000)**	**8,240,431**
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	2,604,963	(15,000)			2,589,963
	Fleet response plan efficiencies				(15,000)	
080	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	622,119				622,119
090	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE					
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	3,910,439	4,000			3,914,439
	Stainless steel sanitary spaces			4,000		
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,113,910				1,113,910
	COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT	**2,607,192**	**(40,000)**		**(40,000)**	**2,567,192**
120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	379,929				379,929
130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	16,946				16,946
140	SPACE SYSTEMS & SURVEILLANCE	136,231				136,231

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
150	WARFARE TACTICS	266,032				266,032
160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY & OCEANOGRAPHY	256,003				256,003
170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,362,179	(40,000)			1,322,179
	Unjustified growth for JFCOM and PACOM				(40,000)	
180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	186,658				186,658
190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,214				3,214
	WEAPONS SUPPORT	**1,484,494**	**2,000**	**2,000**		**1,486,494**
200	CRUISE MISSILE	155,731				155,731
210	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	830,393				830,393
220	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	51,043				51,043
230	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	447,327	2,000			449,327
	NULKA - electronic decoy maintenance			2,000		
	BASE SUPPORT	**4,525,713**	**(27,000)**		**(27,000)**	**4,498,713**
250	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,330,363				1,330,363
260	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,195,350	(27,000)			3,168,350
	Navy / USMC Base Level Communications				(27,000)	
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01	**22,677,846**	**(131,500)**	**6,000**	**(137,500)**	**22,546,346**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION					
	READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES	**548,199**				**548,199**
270	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	548,199				548,199
	ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	**220,012**				**220,012**
280	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	7,619				7,619
290	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	212,393				212,393

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	**44,827**				**44,827**
300	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	26,119				26,119
310	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,523				1,523
320	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	17,185				17,185
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 02	**813,038**				**813,038**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
	ACCESSION TRAINING	**230,887**				**230,887**
330	OFFICER ACQUISITION	120,835				120,835
340	RECRUIT TRAINING	7,716				7,716
350	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	102,336				102,336
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	**1,210,219**				**1,210,219**
360	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	434,374				434,374
370	FLIGHT TRAINING	420,829				420,829
380	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	116,770				116,770
390	TRAINING SUPPORT	238,246				238,246
	RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	**536,490**	**(10,000)**	**2,000**	**(12,000)**	**526,490**
400	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	282,526	(10,000)			272,526
	Naval Sea Cadets			2,000		
	Other Navy Military Personnel and Readiness				(12,000)	
410	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	146,508				146,508
420	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	67,556				67,556
430	JUNIOR ROTC	39,900				39,900

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03	**1,977,596**	**(10,000)**	**2,000**	**(12,000)**	**1,967,596**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	**2,009,611**	**(16,000)**		**(16,000)**	**1,993,611**
460	ADMINISTRATION	773,940				773,940
470	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	3,893				3,893
480	CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	110,614				110,614
490	MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	198,465				198,465
500	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	317,284				317,284
510	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	605,415	(16,000)			589,415
	Other Navy Military Personnel and Readiness				(16,000)	
520	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES					
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	**1,750,848**	**1,500**	**1,500**		**1,752,348**
530	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	189,634				189,634
540	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS					
550	PLANNING, ENGINEERING & DESIGN	252,972				252,972
560	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	840,666				840,666
570	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT					
580	HULL, MECHANICAL & ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	55,505				55,505
590	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	51,683				51,683
600	SPACE & ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	70,166				70,166
610	NAVAL CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	290,222	1,500			291,722
	Office of Naval Intelligence - small ship registry			1,500		
	SECURITY PROGRAMS	**549,648**				**549,648**
620	SECURITY PROGRAMS	549,648				549,648

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	10,603				10,603
630	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS & AGENCIES	10,603				10,603
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04	**4,320,710**	**(14,500)**	**1,500**	**(16,000)**	**4,306,210**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Excessive unobligated balances		(97,700)		(97,700)	(97,700)
	Civilian pay overstatement		(12,000)		(12,000)	(12,000)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy	**29,789,190**	**(265,700)**	**9,500**	**(275,200)**	**29,523,490**
	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	EXPEDITIONARY FORCES	1,103,292	5,500	5,500		1,108,792
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	633,914	5,500			639,414
	Hydration on the move			1,000		
	Vehicle batteries			2,500		
	Tent lighting system			2,000		
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	367,293				367,293
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	102,085				102,085
	USMC PREPOSITIONING	79,891				79,891
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	72,128				72,128
050	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	7,763				7,763
	BASE SUPPORT	1,477,807				1,477,807
060	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	451,012				451,012

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
070	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,026,795				1,026,795
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01	**2,660,990**	**5,500**	**5,500**		**1,188,683**

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
	ACCESSION TRAINING	**10,890**				**10,890**
080	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,539				10,539
090	OFFICER ACQUISITION	351				351
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	**188,542**				**188,542**
100	SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	45,155				45,155
110	FLIGHT TRAINING	174				174
120	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	8,972				8,972
130	TRAINING SUPPORT	134,241				134,241
	RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION	**161,594**				**161,594**
140	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	113,988				113,988
150	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	34,336				34,336
160	JUNIOR ROTC	13,270				13,270
	BASE SUPPORT	**231,132**				**231,132**
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	68,553				68,553
180	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	162,579				162,579
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03	**592,158**				**592,158**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	**357,079**				**357,079**
190	SPECIAL SUPPORT	274,508				274,508
200	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	37,300				37,300
210	ADMINISTRATION	45,271				45,271

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	BASE SUPPORT	21,888				21,888
230	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,191				3,191
240	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	18,697				18,697
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04	**378,967**				**357,079**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	**3,632,115**	**5,500**	**5,500**		**3,637,615**
	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	AIR OPERATIONS	11,644,303	47,616	164,300	(116,684)	11,691,919
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,275,334	155,300			3,430,634
	B-1A Lancer Bomber support			157,400		
	KC-767 Tanker support			3,500		
	Hydration on the move			2,000		
	Joint crew protection masks			1,400		
	Combat Air Systems Activities, 480th Intel Squadron				(9,000)	
020	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	331,333				331,333
030	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	346,322				346,322
040	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	1,274,599				1,274,599
060	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,318,159				1,318,159
050	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,085,761	(39,300)			2,046,461
	Depot maintenance program realignment to Air National Guard				(39,300)	
080	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,017,301				1,017,301
070	BASE SUPPORT	1,995,494	(68,384)			1,927,110
	Unjustified growth for foreign national indirect hires				(10,484)	

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Air Combat Command				(8,000)	
	Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Pacific				(9,000)	
	Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Europe				(10,000)	
	Engineering & Installation, Air Combat Command				(5,600)	
	Engineering & Installation, Space Command				(4,000)	
	Engineering & Installation, Air Mobility Command				(6,300)	
	Engineering & Installation, Pacific				(5,000)	
	Engineering & Installation, Europe				(10,000)	
	COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS	**2,587,468**	**(30,212)**		**(30,212)**	**2,557,256**
090	GLOBAL C3I & EARLY WARNING	1,147,163				1,147,163
100	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	204,543				204,543
110	OTHER COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	622,524	(30,212)			592,312
	Unjustified growth for service support to NORTHCOM				(26,212)	
	Combatant Commanders Intelligence Capabilities				(4,000)	
120	JCS EXERCISES	32,756				32,756
130	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	240,380				240,380
140	TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE AND SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	340,102				340,102
	SPACE OPERATIONS	**1,708,527**				**1,708,527**
150	LAUNCH FACILITIES	343,565				343,565
160	LAUNCH VEHICLES	100,135				100,135
170	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	237,995				237,995
180	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	68,655				68,655
190	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	258,376				258,376
210	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	171,469				171,469
200	BASE SUPPORT	528,332				528,332
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01	**15,940,298**	**17,404**	**164,300**	**(146,896)**	**15,957,702**

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION					
	MOBILITY OPERATIONS	3,291,759	(39,500)		(39,500)	3,252,259
220	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,919,987				1,919,987
230	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	51,824				51,824
240	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	170,623				170,623
260	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA					
250	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	410,679	(39,500)			371,179
	Depot maintenance program realignment to Air National Guard				(39,500)	
280	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	200,928				200,928
270	BASE SUPPORT	537,718				537,718
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 02	**3,291,759**	**(39,500)**		**(39,500)**	**3,252,259**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
	ACCESSION TRAINING	321,872				321,872
290	OFFICER ACQUISITION	73,788				73,788
300	RECRUIT TRAINING	6,034				6,034
310	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	84,381				84,381
330	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION (AC/	85,892				85,892
320	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	71,777				71,777
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	2,168,417				2,168,417
340	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	336,818				336,818
350	FLIGHT TRAINING	775,819				775,819
360	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	158,967				158,967
370	TRAINING SUPPORT	108,450				108,450

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
380	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	12,914				12,914
390	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION	190,592				190,592
100	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	584,857				584,857
	RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	**514,625**				**514,625**
410	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	143,369				143,369
420	EXAMINING	3,281				3,281
430	OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	159,129				159,129
440	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	158,738				158,738
450	JUNIOR ROTC	50,108				50,108
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03	**3,004,914**				**3,004,914**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	**2,925,282**				**2,925,282**
460	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	883,478				883,478
470	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	432,323				432,323
480	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	171,501				171,501
490	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	105,158				105,158
500	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	260,580				260,580
510	BASE SUPPORT	1,072,242				1,072,242
	SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**2,258,693**	**(68,700)**		**(68,700)**	**2,189,993**
520	ADMINISTRATION	299,617				299,617
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	377,574	(28,800)			348,774
	Combat Information Transport System				(6,400)	
	Military Personnel Data Systems				(2,400)	
	Pentagon Communications Agency				(20,000)	

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
540	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	262,281	(9,500)			252,781
	Central civilian career permanent change station program				(9,500)	
550	RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	129,437				129,437
560	ARMS CONTROL	41,645				41,645
570	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	728,942				728,942
580	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	39,457				39,457
590	CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	21,722				21,722
610	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	12,848				12,848
600	BASE SUPPORT	345,170	(30,400)			314,770
	Unjustified growth				(30,400)	
	SECURITY PROGRAMS	**1,024,129**				**1,024,129**
630	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,024,129				1,024,129
	SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS	**26,185**				**26,185**
640	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	26,185				26,185
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04	**6,234,289**	**(68,700)**		**(68,700)**	**6,165,589**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Civilian separation incentives		(40,798)		(40,798)	(40,798)
	Working Capital Fund, Transportation		(967,200)		(967,200)	(967,200)
	Working Capital Fund, Supply Management		(150,000)		(150,000)	(150,000)
	Excessive unobligated balances		(49,400)		(49,400)	(49,400)
	Civilian pay overstatement		(29,500)		(29,500)	(29,500)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	**28,471,260**	**(1,327,694)**	**164,300**	**(1,491,994)**	**27,143,566**

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES					
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	243,062	(38,900)			204,162
	Unjustified growth for military air and sea lift cargo				(27,100)	
	Unjustified growth for joint exercises				(11,800)	
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,992,613	1,000			1,993,613
	Hydration on the move			1,000		
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**2,235,675**	**(37,900)**	**1,000**	**(38,900)**	**2,197,775**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION					
030	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	40,599				40,599
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	**40,599**				**40,599**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
040	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	14,050				14,050
050	OTHER PROGRAMS					
060	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	103,532				103,532
070	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	5,296				5,296
080	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	5,968				5,968
090	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	56,067	10,000			66,067
	Joint Advertising and Market Research			10,000		
100	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE					
110	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	7,343				7,343
120	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	90,263	4,600			94,863
	Continuing Education			2,000		
	Joint Forces Staff College Infrastructure			2,600		

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
130	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	96,244				96,244
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03:	**378,763**	**14,600**	**14,600**		**393,363**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
140	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	110,528				110,528
150	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	101,389				101,389
160	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	368,119				368,119
200	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	25,484				25,484
210	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	265,379	19,000			284,379
	Commercial technologies for maintenance activities			15,000		
	Rapid frequency identification technology			4,000		
220	DEFENSE POW / MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	15,964				15,964
230	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	20,456	1,000			21,456
	Program increase			1,000		
240	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	319,483	1,500			320,983
	Program increase			1,500		
250	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY	1,761,852	57,200			1,819,052
	DOD Supplemental Impact Aid			50,000		
	Joint Counterintelligence Training Academy			7,200		
260	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	318,940				318,940
270	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,029,592				1,029,592
280	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	4,310				4,310
290	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,090,558				1,090,558
300	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	83,922				83,922
310	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	277,100	(50,000)			227,100
	Program reduction to prevent transition to working capital fund				(50,000)	
320	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	278,884				278,884
340	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	44,756				44,756

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
350	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	805,813	(112,570)			693,243
	FEHB premiums for mobilized federal employees			10,000		
	USD(I)				(20,000)	
	Capitol cost sharing				(27,300)	
	Environment readiness				(10,000)	
	Public affairs				(11,500)	
	Secretary's analytical agenda				(7,000)	
	Unjustified growth				(20,000)	
	Persistent Stratospheric Vehicles			4,230		
	DJCC - Research Technology Protection			4,800		
	Counterintelligence Law Enforcement Watch Center			4,000		
	Paralyzed Veterans Association			1,000		
	Chief Information Officer Programs				(12,000)	
	Comptroller Business Management Modernization Program				(25,400)	
	Horizontal Fusion				(3,400)	
360	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	142,457				142,457
370	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	447,166	(10,000)			437,166
	BRAC Commission				(10,000)	
380	OTHER PROGRAMS	7,326,887				7,326,887
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**14,839,039**	**(93,870)**	**102,730**	**(196,600)**	**14,745,169**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Excessive unobligated balances		(59,500)		(59,500)	(59,500)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	**17,494,076**	**(176,670)**	**118,330**	**(295,000)**	**17,317,406**

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	LAND FORCES	**970,213**				**970,213**
010	DIVISION FORCES	7,640				7,640
020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	34,607				34,607
030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	318,411				318,411
040	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	150,421				150,421
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	459,134				459,134
	LAND FORCES READINESS	**290,225**				**290,225**
060	FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	153,475				153,475
070	LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	65,202				65,202
080	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	71,548				71,548
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**587,880**	**6,600**	**6,600**		**594,480**
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	379,112	5,600			384,712
	Family Support Programs			5,600		
100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	201,141				201,141
110	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	7,627				7,627
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Tuition Assistance		1,000	1,000		1,000
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**1,848,318**	**6,600**	**6,600**		**1,854,918**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	159,810				159,810
120	ADMINISTRATION	52,180				52,180
130	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	9,116				9,116
140	PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	8,201				8,201
150	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	90,313				90,313
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**159,810**				**159,810**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Military Technician Mobilization Underexecution		(11,000)		(11,000)	(11,000)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	**2,008,128**	(4,400)	**6,600**	(11,000)	**2,003,728**
	Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS	633,603				633,603
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	483,526				483,526
030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	16,494				16,494
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	1,592				1,592
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	131,607				131,607
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	384				384
	RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS	156,041				156,041
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	59,127				59,127
080	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	531				531
090	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE					
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	92,787				92,787

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,596				3,596
	RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	**224,589**				**224,589**
110	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	6,732				6,732
120	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	224,589				224,589
	RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT	**5,548**				**5,548**
130	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,548				5,548
	BASE SUPPORT	**182,273**				**182,273**
140	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	73,410				73,410
150	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	108,863				108,863
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**1,208,786**				**1,208,786**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**31,252**				**31,252**
160	ADMINISTRATION	6,930				6,930
170	CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT					
180	MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	8,797				8,797
190	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,347				3,347
200	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,667				5,667
210	OTHER SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	6,511				6,511
	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS					
220	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS					
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**31,252**				**31,252**

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	**1,240,038**				**1,240,038**
	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	MISSION FORCES	**156,112**				**156,112**
010	OPERATING FORCES	72,940				72,940
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	12,132				12,132
030	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT					
040	TRAINING SUPPORT	25,544				25,544
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION					

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	BASE SUPPORT	**45,496**				
060	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	12,126				12,126
070	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	33,370				33,370
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**156,112**				**156,112**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**32,584**				**32,584**
080	SPECIAL SUPPORT	8,948				8,948
090	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	580				580
100	ADMINISTRATION	10,407				10,407
110	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT					
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,013				8,013
	BASE SUPPORT	**4,636**				
130	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	4,636				4,636
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**32,584**				**32,584**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	**188,696**				**188,696**
	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	AIR OPERATIONS	**2,132,168**				**2,132,168**
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,329,717				1,329,717
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	74,077				74,077

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	410,893				410,893
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	53,056				53,056
040	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	264,425				264,425
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**2,132,168**				**2,132,168**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**107,622**				**107,622**
060	ADMINISTRATION	60,270				60,270
080	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	14,516				14,516
070	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	25,485				25,485
090	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,707				6,707
100	AUDIOVISUAL	644				644
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**107,622**				**107,622**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Military Technician Mobilization Underexecution		(13,000)		(13,000)	(13,000)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	**2,239,790**	**(13,000)**		**(13,000)**	**2,226,790**
	Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	LAND FORCES	**2,157,247**				**2,157,247**
010	DIVISIONS	558,168				558,168
020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	629,062				629,062

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	333,393				333,393
040	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	615,838				615,838
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,786				20,786
	LAND FORCES READINESS	**553,644**	**1,000**	**1,000**		**554,644**
060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	180,163	1,000			181,163
	Hydration on the move			1,000		
070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	142,914				142,914
080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	230,567				230,567
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**1,471,595**	**30,000**	**30,000**		**1,501,595**
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	577,028	30,000			607,028
	Family Assistance Centers			30,000		
100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	384,044				384,044
110	MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	451,167				451,167
120	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	59,356				59,356
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**4,182,486**	**31,000**	**31,000**		**4,213,486**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	**258,200**				**258,200**
130	ADMINISTRATION	110,669				110,669
140	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	26,341				26,341
150	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	35,376				35,376
160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	85,814				85,814
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**258,200**				**258,200**

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Tuition Assistance		500	500		500
	Excessive unobligated balances		(14,500)		(14,500)	(14,500)
	Military Technician Mobilization Underexecution		(32,000)		(32,000)	(32,000)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	**4,440,686**	**(15,000)**	**31,500**	**(46,500)**	**4,425,686**
	Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	AIR OPERATIONS	**4,385,950**	**78,800**	**78,800**		**4,464,750**
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	2,685,471				2,685,471
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	362,114				362,114
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	676,647	78,800			755,447
	Depot maintenance program realignment from Air Force			78,800		
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	230,642				230,642
050	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	431,076				431,076
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**4,385,950**	**78,800**	**78,800**		**4,464,750**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**36,888**				**36,888**
060	ADMINISTRATION	27,490				27,490
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,398				9,398
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**36,888**				**36,888**

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Military Technician Mobilization Underexecution		(19,000)		(19,000)	(19,000)
	Excessive unobligated balances		(33,700)		(33,700)	(33,700)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	**4,422,838**	**26,100**	**78,800**	**(52,700)**	**4,448,938**
	TRANSFER ACCOUNTS					
010	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	400,948				400,948
020	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	266,820				266,820
030	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	397,368				397,368
040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	23,684				23,684
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES	216,516				216,516
	TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS	**1,305,336**				**1,305,336**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS					
060	U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	10,825				10,825
070	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS					
080	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	30,000	(25,000)		(25,000)	5,000
190	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	59,000				59,000
200	PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND					
	Defense Industrial Base Capabilities Fund		50,000	50,000		50,000
220	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	409,200				409,200
	TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS	**509,025**	**25,000**	**50,000**	**(25,000)**	**534,025**
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:	**121,874,589**	**(2,040,664)**	**488,530**	**(2,529,194)**	**119,833,925**

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM					
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	17,203,369	171,175	334,675	(163,500)	17,374,544
Information Technology Reduction				(50,000)	
Earlier TRICARE Eligibility for RC Families and Members			113,000		
Waiver of TRICARE Deductibles for RC Families			2,000		
Protection against Balance Billing for Mobilized Reservists			500		
Enrollment of Certain Young Children in Dental Plan			500		
Improved Transition Assistance Program			170,000		
TRICARE Coverage of Certain Ready Reservists			30,000		
Additional TRICARE Prime Remote Beneficiaries			1,000		
Cooperative Education for Sexual Health Decision Making			175		
Sub-Acute Care Transition Program			500		
Marshall Islands Diabetes Program			2,000		
Landstuhl Medical Center			10,000		
DOD Cooperative Health Care Program			5,000		
GAO Estimate Annual DHP Unobligated Funds				(113,500)	
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION	72,407				72,407
PROCUREMENT	364,635				364,635
TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**17,640,411**	**171,175**	**334,675**	**(163,500)**	**17,811,586**
CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS PROGRAM					
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE		1,138,801	1,138,801		1,138,801
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION		154,209	154,209		154,209
PROCUREMENT		78,980	78,980		78,980
TOTAL, CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS PROGRAM		1,371,990	1,371,990		**1,371,990**

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG PROGRAMS	**852,697**				852,697
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL					
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	242,362	(51,000)			191,362
Mid Range Financial Improvement Program				(51,000)	
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION	2,100				2,100
PROCUREMENT	100				100
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**244,562**	**(51,000)**		**(51,000)**	**193,562**
TOTAL, OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS	**18,737,670**	**1,492,165**	**1,706,665**	**(214,500)**	**20,229,835**
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds	510,886	(138,000)		(138,000)	372,886
ARMY	184,260	(67,000)			117,260
Industrial mobilization capacity				(67,000)	
NAVY	65,326	(59,000)			6,326
Aviation spare engine procurement				(59,000)	
AIR FORCE	81,300	(12,000)			69,300
Perishable medical and dental readiness material				(12,000)	
DEFENSE-WIDE	180,000				180,000
Defense Working Capital Funds - DeCA	1,175,000				1,175,000
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,269,252	(50,000)		(50,000)	1,219,252
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund					
Armed Forces Retirement Home	61,195				61,195
TOTAL, REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS	**3,016,333**	**(188,000)**		**(188,000)**	**2,828,333**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS—READINESS

The committee recommends the following adjustments to the fiscal year 2005 budget request:

[In millions of dollars]

Department of the Army Adjustments:	
BA–1 Hydration on the Move	+3.0
BA–1 Military Skills Engagement Training Simulator (Laser Shot Software)	+1.0
BA–1 Vehicle Batteries	+2.5
BA–1 Tactical Exploitation System	(4.0)
BA–1 Contractor Logistic Support—unjustified growth	(10.0)
BA–1 Combat Training Centers—unjustified growth	(10.0)
BA–3 Satellite Communications for Learning Project (SCOLA)	+3.0
BA–3 Training Support—unjustified growth	(15.0)
BA–4 Administration—unjustified growth	(19.5)
Unobligated Balances	(52.3)
Civilian Pay Overstatement	(82.0)
Army Reserve—Family Assistance Centers	+5.6
Army National Guard—Hydration on the Move	+1.0
Army National Guard—Family Support Programs	+30.0
Army National Guard—Unobligated Balances	(14.5)
Department of the Navy Adjustments:	
BA–1 Stainless Steel Sanitary Spaces	+4.0
BA–1 NULKA Electronic Decoy Cartridge	+2.0
BA–1 Technical Publications	(25.0)
BA–1 Fleet Response Plan Efficiencies	(15.0)
BA–1 Combatant Commanders Program-unjustified growth	(40.0)
BA–4 Small Ship Registry	+1.5
Unobligated Balances	(97.7)
Civilian Pay Overstatement	(12.0)
United States Marine Corps Adjustments:	
BA–1 Hydration on the Move	+1.0
BA–1 Vehicle Batteries	+2.5
BA–1 Tent Lighting System	+2.0
Department of the Air Force Adjustments:	
BA–1 B–1A Lancer Bombers	+157.4
BA–1 Hydration on the Move	+2.0
BA–1 Joint Crew Protection Mask	+1.4
BA–1 KC–767 Tankers	+3.5
BA–1 Combat Air Systems Activities	(9.0)
BA–1 Foreign Nat'l Indirect Hires—unjustified growth	(10.5)

BA–1 NORTHCOM—unjustified growth	(26.2)
BA–1 Combatant Commander Intel Capabilities	(4.0)
BA–4 Personnel Programs	(9.5)
BA–4 Base Support-unjustified growth	(30.4)
Civilian Separation Incentives	(40.8)
Unobligated Balances	(49.4)
Civilian Pay Overstatement	(29.5)
Depot Maintenance Realignment to ANG	(78.8)
Air National Guard Depot Maintenance Realignment	+78.8
Air National Guard Unobligated Balances	(33.7)
Defense-wide Activities Adjustments:	
Joint Chiefs of Staff—unjustified growth	(38.9)
Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities	+15.0
Rapid Frequency Identification Technology	+4.0
Hydration on the Move	+1.0
Defense Technology Security Administration	+1.0
Defense Threat Reduction Agency	+8.7
Washington Headquarters Services—BRAC Commission	(10.0)
Office of Secretary of Defense—FEHB	+10.0
Office of Secretary of Defense—Persistent Stratospheric Vehicles	+4.2
Office of Secretary of Defense—Research Technology Protection	+4.8
Office of Secretary of Defense—Counterintelligence Law Enforcement Watch Center	+4.0
Office of Secretary of Defense—Paralyzed Veterans Association	+1.0
Office of Secretary of Defense—unjustified growth	(95.8)
Defense Security Service	(50.0)
Unobligated Balances	(59.5)

Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities

The committee continues to support the Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities (CTMA) program. The Department of Defense (DOD) created the CTMA program in 1998 as the only program designed to bring the most modern and advanced manufacturing processes used by commercial industries to the DOD maintenance depots and organic maintenance activities. It is the committee's understanding that depot commanders support the economic efficiencies this program can provide.

Therefore, the committee recommends the addition of $15.0 million for the Defense Logistics Agency to continue the CTMA program. The committee believes the addition of these funds will allow depot-level activities to continue the successful participation in

manufacturing technology demonstration projects in collaboration with more than 150 of the leading U.S. manufacturers.

Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan

The budget request contained $51.0 million for the Department of Defense, Office of Inspector General, to implement the Mid-Range Improvement Plan. The committee understands the goal of this plan is for the Department of Defense to obtain clean and auditable financial statements in fiscal year 2007. To date, the committee has not received any information estimating the cost of this plan in future fiscal years. As addressed elsewhere in this report, the committee cannot support the plan until additional information is provided, and thus recommends a decrease of $51.0 million to the Department of Defense, Office of Inspector General.

Paralyzed Veterans of America

The committee supports programs sponsored by the Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) designated for servicemen and women returning from Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Programs such as the PVA Outdoor Sports Heritage Fund encourage and assist soldiers to get out of the hospitals and engage in outdoor activities. Accordingly, the committee recommends $1.0 million for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the PVA Outdoor Sports Heritage Fund to continue this worthwhile effort.

Spare Engines

The budget request contained no funds to purchase Navy spare aviation engines. Instead, the Secretary of the Navy intends to purchase these engines with obligation authority within the Department of Defense working capital fund. In the past, engines were purchased with appropriated aviation procurement funds. The committee believes it is inappropriate to fund spare aviation engines within the working capital fund. The proposed mechanism would delay using appropriated funds to purchase these engines. The committee notes that section 8041 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–87) states, "[T]he fiscal year 2005 budget request shall be . . . submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in the procurement appropriation account in this act shall be budgeted for the proposed fiscal year 2005 procurement appropriation and not in the . . . Department of Defense Working Capital Funds." Therefore, the committee recommends a transfer of $59.0 million from the defense working capital fund to the Department of the Navy's aviation procurement account.

Working Capital Funds

Working capital funds serve a vital role in providing financial transaction flexibility for working capital fund activities and its customers. When working capital activities achieve a surplus in the annual operating result, consideration should be given to adjusting customer rates. Working capital activities that do not adjust rates are not appropriately returning surplus funds to customers. In ad-

dition, the committee is aware that many working capital fund activities have cash in excess of the Department of Defense rules. The committee, therefore, recommends the following reductions.

[In millions of dollars]

Air Force Working Capital Fund, Supply Management	(150.0)
Air Force Working Capital Fund, Transportation	(917.2)

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ISSUES

Overview

The committee strongly believes information technology (IT) is a critical enabler for the Department of Defense (DOD) to meet and defeat both conventional and asymmetric threats in 21st Century warfare. The committee supports the Department's goal to have joint, network-centric, distributed forces to provide rapid reaction for any situation. However, the Department is far from achieving that objective.

While the Department has implemented and expanded the Global Information Grid's (GIG) potential capabilities, which will be an enormous enhancement in supporting our military forces, the committee remains concerned that warfighters may not be able to utilize these capabilities if individual service architectures, investments, and service specific systems limit interoperability. The crux of the issue is DOD execution, enforcement and evolution of its systems architecture to allow warfighters to capitalize on IT investments that use command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, reconnaissance, surveillance systems (C4ISR) which are enabled through the GIG.

The committee supports the Department's design and implementation of an enterprise architecture to build and support a fully functioning network that every serviceman or woman can access and exploit. Such a network is intended to resolve the interoperability issues that currently plague the military services.

The committee is concerned that the Department has not maintained adequate oversight and scrutiny over its business systems investments to ensure funds are spent on joint solutions that would provide the best value. While the Department is presently taking several actions to improve the situation, the committee is concerned that it has not put into place the organizational structure and process controls to properly align business systems investments with the business enterprise architecture. Therefore, the various military services and defense agencies have continued to make their own investment decisions, each following different criteria by designing and procuring its own business IT systems. This lack of an institutionalized investment strategy has contributed to the Department's current complex, error-prone, non-integrated IT systems environment.

The committee proposes legislation that would increase the level of scrutiny and responsibility exercised by the business domain owners, and recommends a series of reductions in apparently redundant or legacy IT programs and those that lack proper justification to explain growth from last year's budget request.

Information Technology Specific Reductions

The Department of the Defense budget request for information technology (IT) includes both IT and national security systems (NSS). While the committee supports network centric operations and warfare initiatives that support military missions, as well as operational and organizational changes that have the net effect of supporting our warfighters, the committee remains concerned about the Department's lack of control and management oversight of the development and investments in business IT systems. The committee is also concerned that the Department has created joint IT systems whose program offices lack authority to devise, implement, and enforce systems architectures; control expenditures; or execute programs according to schedule and performance standards. The committee believes the Department needs to better manage and oversee many of the IT and NSS systems to prevent the proliferation of service-centric systems that do not interoperate with one another. Therefore, the committee recommends adjustments in the following programs:

[In millions of dollars]

Department of the Army Adjustments:	
Training Instrumentation for Air and Missile defense (AMD Units	+5.0
Army National Guard Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Program	+3.5
Army National Guard Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network (NDFON)	+6.0
Deputy Chief of Staff for Information Management and Director of Information Management (DCSIM/DOIM) Staff Operations	(2.2)
Installation Management Activity	(10.0)
Network Enterprise Technology Command (EAC Support)	(9.0)
Visual Information Support	(13.0)
MEPCOM Management Information Reporting System	(10.0)
Recruiting Information Support System	(4.0)
Army Human Resources Command Core Automation Support	(20.0)
Army Knowledge Enterprise Architecture	(4.0)
Army Personnel Electronic Records Management System	(7.0)
Defense Civilian Personnel Data System-Sustainment	(2.2)
Information Technology Agency	(12.4)
Logistics Modernization Program	(2.7)
Logistic Post Production Software Support	(3.5)
Management Headquarters Information Management	(13.0)

Personnel Transformation	(13.0)
Department of the Navy Adjustments:	
Navy Air Logistics Data Analysis	(15.0)
Navy Converged Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Program	(15.5)
Navy/USMC Base Level Communications	(27.0)
Other Navy Military Personnel and Readiness (Training and Recruiting)	(12.0)
Other Navy Military Personnel and Readiness (Admin and Servicewide Activities)	(16.0)
Department of the Air Force Adjustments:	
Air Force Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Air Combat Command	(8.0)
Air Force Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Pacific	(9.0)
Air Force Base Level Communications Infrastructure, Europe	(10.0)
Air Force Engineering and Installations, Air Combat Command	(5.6)
Air Force Engineering and Installations, Space Command	(4.0)
Air Force Engineering and Installations, Air Mobility Command	(6.3)
Air Force Engineering and Installations, Pacific	(5.0)
Air Force Engineering and Installations, Europe	(10.0)
Air Force Combat Information Transport System	(6.4)
Air Force Military Personnel Data System	(2.4)
Air Force Pentagon Communications Agency	(20.0)
Defense-wide Activities Adjustments:	
Chief Information Officer Programs, OSD	(12.0)
Comptroller Business Management Modernization Program	(25.4)
Health Program	(50.0)
Horizontal Fusion	(3.4)

Enterprise Resource Planning Program—Army National Guard

The budget contained no funding for the Army National Guard enterprise resource planning program (ERP) which would identify the business processes in the Army National Guard and compare them to the Army ERP programs.

The committee believes this may be a valuable study and could benefit the Army National Guard to determine how it may leverage existing Army and other Department of Defense's initiatives, to include the Business Management Modernization Program (BMMP). Such ERP would also allow the Army National Guard to do collabo-

rative planning between national headquarters and the various state guard bureaus.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $3.5 million for the Army National Guard enterprise resource planning program, and directs the Chief, Army National Guard to use the BMMP and the defense business enterprise architecture as the baseline and standards for this program's development and integration.

Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network

The budget request contained no funding for the Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network (NDFON) for the Army National Guard.

This program will provide a dedicated high-speed, high-bandwidth fiber optic network backbone to service National Guard communications operations. NDFON will be a secure, reliable, and survivable network capable of supporting current and projected communications requirements. The committee notes that this program has the capability to provide the National Guard armories with a robust communications backbone to provide rapid, coordinated response to potential incidents. The committee understands that NDFON will comply with the Global Information Grid's architecture to maximize communications, networking, and collaboration between the armories and the Department of Defense.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in operation and maintenance for the Army National Guard to complete engineering studies for the NDFON program.

Navy Marine Corps Intranet

The budget request contained $1.6 billion for the Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI). The committee notes that over 300,000 users are now supported by this program. The program is providing support and connectivity to hundreds of deployed troops in the Iraqi war zone.

The committee notes that the focus of NMCI has changed from deploying systems to achieving efficient steady-state operations, as shown by the Department of the Navy and its contractor conducting negotiations to improve the execution of the $7.0 billion NMCI contract for all users. The contract presently supports a larger number of legacy systems for longer periods of time than envisioned when first awarded. The committee is aware the Navy may have underestimated the number of software applications in its inventory, initially estimating that it had only 5,000 applications, when the real number may be as high as 67,000. Additionally, the committee notes that the Navy has not practiced due diligence to identify and turn off these legacy applications and their associated computer networks. The committee is concerned because to date, only two legacy networks whose functionality is intended to migrate to the NMCI have been terminated. The committee understands the Navy operates other information technology systems that were never intended to operate in the NMCI environment.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to complete the migration or terminate all legacy networks and applications whose functionality is intended to migrate to the NMCI environment by September 30, 2005. If this transition is not completed by such date, the Secretary of the Navy will provide a report

as to how the Department of the Navy plans to fund these legacy systems beyond September 30, 2005. The committee believes the contractor should not be held responsible to support those legacy networks and applications the Secretary of Navy does not migrate to the NMCI environment by this date.

OTHER MATTERS

Core Logistics Capability

Under section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, the Department of Defense must maintain a core logistics capability. The committee understands that until recently, the Department of the Navy considered the maintenance and repair of subsystems to aviation mission essential weapon systems as a core logistics capability and thus performed at a public depot. The committee is concerned that the practice referred to above has been cancelled, yet a new policy is not in place. Thus, the committee directs the Secretary of Navy to continue with the older practice used to identify core logistics capability, until the Secretary notifies the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee of the new policy.

Fire Emergency and Services Program

The Department of Defense, Inspector General, cited in its report, "DoD Fire and Emergency Services Program," D–2003–121, that staffing and apparatus shortfalls could adversely impact firefighter safety and installation missions. The committee is concerned that fire houses, personnel, and other fire suppression resources at military bases may be below minimal safety standards. The committee believes it is imperative that military base commanders operate fire departments at or above National Fire Protection Association standards as they apply to staffing, equipment and other readiness capabilities, and fulfill all of the Inspector General's recommendations.

Jinapsan Beach Properties in Guam

The committee is concerned with a long-standing, unresolved issue regarding public access to Jinapsan Beach, Guam. This area of land is privately owned and accessible only through Department of Air Force or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service owned land. In response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the Air Force closed the public road through Andersen Air Base to Jinapsan Beach. The Department then initiated an environmental impact statement (EIS) to evaluate three alternative access routes. The EIS is still not complete. The Department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are in disagreement over the timing and circumstances of the EIS. The committee urges the parties to resolve this dispute and encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to employ the services of an outside organization conversant with these issues in order to expedite completion of the EIS and determine a permanent alternative route of access to privately-owned properties at Jinapsan Beach.

Moving Household Goods—Families First

The Department of Defense spends more than $1,700.0 million annually on moving military families. The committee believes that the Department has long experienced problems with moving household goods. In November 2002, the Secretary of Defense submitted to various congressional committees three initiatives to improve the moving household goods program, which would add an additional 13 percent over current program costs. The Comptroller General reviewed this report and concluded that all three initiatives offer solutions to several long standing problems and should be implemented (U.S. General Accounting Office, "Monitoring Costs and Benefits Needed While Implementing a New Program for Moving Household Goods," April 2003). The Comptroller General raised a concern, however, on whether the three initiatives could be implemented within the proposed 13 percent cost increase. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary to reevaluate its cost estimate, to quantify the risk or likelihood of achieving its goals within 13 percent cost projection, and to develop the range of possible cost increases associated with the risk, by December 1, 2004. The committee also directs the Comptroller General to review and report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, by February 2, 2005, whether the Secretary has adequately performed the committee's directed task.

New Mexico Training Range Initiative

The Committee is pleased with the Department of Air Force's progress towards the establishment of the New Mexico Training Range Initiative (NMTRI), including Melrose Range, Sumner Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace and the Pecos and Taiban Military Operations Areas. It is the committee's understanding that the Air Force is projected to complete an environmental impact statement (EIS) by September 2005. The Committee encourages the Air Force and all other parties involved to continue to pursue September 2005 as the final deadline for the completed EIS with regards to the NMTRI at Melrose Range.

Tents

There are 36 major types of tents used in the military services. The Director, Defense Logistics Agency, is responsible for purchasing these tents, primarily from small businesses. There is, however, no regular or consistent requirement for additional or new tents. Thus, the small businesses that make up a significant portion of this industrial base have difficulty meeting surge requirements. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2005, on what actions the Secretary can take to promote a more consistent requirement for tents or to assist the small business industrial base in meeting surge requirements.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize $119.8 billion in operation and maintenance funding for the military departments and defense-wide activities.

Section 302—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize $2.8 billion for working capital funds of the Department of Defense and the National Defense Sealift Fund.

Section 303—Other Department of Defense Programs

This section would authorize $20.2 billion for other Department of Defense Programs for (1) the Defense Health Program; (2) Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction; (3) Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide; and (4) the Defense Inspector General.

Section 304—Reimbursement of Members of the Armed Forces Who Purchased Protective Body Armor during Shortage of Defense Stocks of Body Armor

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse soldiers who purchased protective body armor for use while deployed in connection with Operation Noble Eagle, Operation Enduring Freedom, or Operation Iraqi Freedom, if the soldier did not receive the protective body armor before engaging in such operations where such body armor might be necessary. Reimbursement would be available to soldiers who purchased the body armor between September 1, 2001, and December 31, 2003.

SUBTITLE B—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

Section 311—Report Regarding Encroachment Issues Affecting Utah Test and Training Range, Utah

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, within one year of enactment of this Act, on the current and anticipated encroachments on the use and utility of the special use airspace of the Utah Test and Training Range (UTTR), including encroachments initiated by other executive agencies. The report would include recommendations the Secretary considers appropriate, including legislation that would address encroachment-related concerns.

SUBTITLE C—WORKPLACE AND DEPOT ISSUES

Section 321—Simplification of Annual Reporting Requirements Concerning Funds Expended for Depot Maintenance and Repair Workloads

This section would amend section 2466(d) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report on the percentage of funds expended or expected to be expended for depot maintenance and repair workloads in the public and private sectors. This report would cover prior, current, and budget years in which data is more reliable. The Comptroller General recommended such a change in its September 15, 2003, audit report, "Depot Maintenance: DOD's 50–50 Reporting Should be Streamlined," (GAO–03–1023).

Section 322—Repeal of Annual Reporting Requirement Concerning Management of Depot Employees

This section would repeal section 2472(b) of title 10, United States Code, which currently requires the Secretary of Defense to report annually to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services the number of Department of Defense employees employed and expected to be employed during that fiscal year to perform depot level maintenance and repair of materiel. The committee agrees to repeal this annual report and understands that the Secretary shall readily provide such data upon request.

Section 323—Public-Private Competition for Work Performed by Civilian Employees of Department of Defense

This section would amend section 2461(b) of title 10, United States Code, to ensure the Secretary of Defense formally compares the cost of civilian employee performance with the costs of contractor performance before converting a function performed by 10 or more civilians. This section would also require the Secretary to conduct a formal comparison before modifying, reorganizing, dividing, or changing any function within the Department of Defense. Finally, this section would authorize the Secretary to waive the requirement of a formal comparison when there is a written determination that national security interests are so compelling as to preclude a comparison. The waiver would be required to be published within the Federal Register.

Section 324—Public-Private Competition Pilot Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a two-year pilot program under which 10 percent of all functions that are considered new are competed pursuant to Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 (A–76). In those instances where the winning party is a small business or a contractor whose employees are represented by a private labor union, the Department of Defense shall not receive credit towards compliance with the 10 percent requirement. This section would also require the Secretary to conduct A–76 competitions to determine whether work currently performed by a contractor should be performed by government em-

ployees. The Secretary shall conduct such studies so that the number of contractor employee studies are approximately 10 percent of the number of government employees studied. The Secretary does have authority to waive these requirements when national security interests are so compelling as to preclude compliance. This waiver would be required to be published in the Federal Register. This section would also require the Department of Defense, Inspector General, to report to Congress on the result of the pilot program.

Section 325—Sense of Congress on Equitable Legal Standing for Civilian Employees

This section would express the sense of Congress that Department of Defense civilian employees should receive legal standing to challenge a public-private competition before the General Accounting Office or the United States Court of Federal Claims.

Section 326—Competitive Sourcing Reporting Requirement

This section would require the Department of Defense, Inspector General, to submit a report to Congress addressing whether the Department of Defense employs a sufficient workforce to conduct public-private competitions and whether the Secretary of Defense has implemented a tracking system to asses the cost and quality of service contractors. The system shall be made available to the public and updated quarterly. The tracking system shall include the cost to conduct a study under Office and Management and Budget Circular A–76; the cost of employee performance before the study began; the cost of the most efficient organization; the anticipated cost of contractor performance; the cost for the performance of the function by the contractor; a description of the quality control process used to monitor contract performance with an assessment whether contractor achieved, exceeded, or failed to achieve the quality control standards.

SUBTITLE D—INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Section 331—Preparation of Department of Defense Plan for Transition to Internet Protocol Version 6

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a transition plan to evaluate how the Department of Defense's (DOD) information technology (IT) systems may be impacted by the Department's decision to transition from the current protocols to Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6). The committee is well aware that this decision affects every piece of network equipment that is used by DOD's Global Information Grid (GIG). While the committee is not a proponent of any particular protocol, the committee seeks to ensure that IPv6 will provide, at a minimum, the same capabilities that are available today. Therefore, the committee has raised concerns about the possible implications of the Department's decision to move to this protocol, including quality of service issues and the use of best commercial practices to adopt this protocol. This section would also direct the Secretary to use the Naval Research Lab, in conjunction with the United States Strategic Command, to conduct and manage the tests required in this section.

Section 332—Defense Business Enterprise Architecture, System Accountability, and Conditions for Obligation of Funds for Defense Business System Modernization

This section would repeal section 1004 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), that requires the development and implementation of a defense business enterprise architecture, and requires obligations over $1.0 million for defense business system modernization initiatives to be certified as consistent with that enterprise architecture. This section would, instead, establish accountability for defense business systems by assigning defense domains, or designated Department of Defense (DOD) officials, the authority and responsibility for their business systems, including the establishment of domain-specific investment review processes. In addition, this section would improve transparency in defense business systems investments by requiring the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual budget that identifies such systems, the funds devoted to them, and the officials responsible for such systems. This section would also charge the domain owners for implementing and evolving their portion of the single DOD business enterprise architecture. The committee is concerned that the Department continues to invest billions of dollars in systems that fail to provide integrated business systems, timely and reliable information, and other important financial and business information for the daily operations. The committee believes the explicit assignment of management for the business enterprise architecture and definitive domain accountability, authority, and control is necessary to effectively achieve integrated business operations and systems to support the warfighter.

Section 333—Establishment of Joint Program Office to Improve Interoperability of Battlefield Management Command and Control Systems

This section would establish a joint program office to manage the Department of Defense's myriad of battlefield management command and control systems to provide a common operational picture of the battlefield for all users. The committee understands that the Department has struggled for many years to develop and field command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems that interoperate effectively across all of the military services. A primary reason for this struggle is that the military services and other defense agencies plan and acquire systems to meet their own operational requirements, and not necessarily joint warfighting concepts.

The committee notes that the Department recently drafted a Joint Battle Management Command and Control Roadmap that is intended to lead to a more integrated, interoperable set of command and control and battlespace awareness capabilities for joint force commanders to use in military operations. The committee understands that initially the United States Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) was given oversight and directive authority for the Family of Interoperable Operational Pictures (FIOP), which will eventually integrate air, ground, maritime, and possibly space into one common operational picture.

Unfortunately, JFCOM estimates that it will take up to two years to develop a joint architecture, by which time, several hundred million dollars will have been spent on the single integrated air picture program, while the other supporting systems that the FIOP is intended to integrate will also be in various stages of development under the funding and direction of the military services.

Furthermore, while JFCOM has authority to direct the FIOP development efforts, the actual program implementation will be done by the military services under separate program offices. The committee is deeply troubled by the lack of joint responsibility over program implementation that may jeopardize the possibility of achieving standardization and integration among these systems, and is concerned that funding for the various programs is the responsibility of the military services.

SUBTITLE E—READINESS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Section 341—Annual Report on Department of Defense Operation and Financial Support for Military Museums

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to include in the annual budget justification materials a complete inventory of military museums operated with funds appropriated to the Department of Defense (DOD) or the military services. For each museum, this section would require the Secretary to provide:

(1) A description of the museum facility;

(2) Funds requested to operate, maintain, and repair the museum facility;

(3) The number of DOD civilian personnel and uniformed service members employed or assigned to the museum;

(4) A list of non-museum functions performed at the facility;

(5) Justification for continued DOD funding; and

(6) Funds received from organizations other than the Department to operate, maintain, and repair the museum.

The committee recognizes that museums provide and preserve important records, perspectives, and relics of military history. Due to the large number of museums supported with appropriated funds, however, the committee believes it is important for Congress to have greater visibility over the cost and mission of these museums. The committee notes that the Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard operate 122 museums; and the Army has requested $25.0 million to operate its museums in fiscal year 2005.

Section 342—Report on Department of Defense Programs for Prepositioning of Material and Equipment

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to evaluate and report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2005, the Department of Defense's strategic objectives for the military department's preposition programs. In recent operations, the United States dictated the time of the engagement and the tempo of operations, which allowed proper planning and measured decisions on how to deliver combat equipment, combat support and sustainment equipment. The committee believes if the timing of a future engagement is not within the control of U.S. forces, the

value of an effective prepositioned strategy could be the difference in dictating the initial stages of a conflict.

Presently, a majority of the prepositioned stocks are in use. The committee does not believe that restocking the existing preposition configuration will meet the Secretary's stated goal of deploying to a distant theatre in ten days, defeating an enemy within thirty days, and being ready for an additional conflict within another thirty days. The current strategy also fails to incorporate concepts of joint doctrine. The Department has a unique opportunity to reassess and reconfigure these programs in the context of the new deployment goals.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 351—Extension of the Arsenal Support Program Initiative

This section would amend Section 343 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to extend the Arsenal Support Initiative Program through fiscal year 2008. This section would also require the Secretary to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2007, the benefits of the program, the extent to which the program met its goals, and whether the program should be made permanent.

Section 352—Limitation on Preparation or Implementation of Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from obligating operation and maintenance funds to implement the Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan until the Secretary provides information to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services an explanation of how the operation and maintenance funds are to be utilized in fiscal year 2005 and the estimated cost for this plan in future fiscal years.

Section 353—Procurement of Follow-On Contracts for the Operation of Five Champion-Class T–5 Tank Vessels

This section would require the Secretary of Navy to limit the next competition for the operation and maintenance of the five champion class T–5 fuel tankers to a United States corporation, partnership, or association, as defined in section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (42 App. U.S.C. 802). The committee strongly supports the Secretary of the Navy's intent to receive the best value using negotiated competitions.

Section 354—Sense of Congress on America's National World War I Museum

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Liberty Memorial Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, is recognized as "America's National World War I Museum."

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Study of High Demand Low Density Military Units and Personnel

Both the active and reserve components are undergoing various transformation initiatives in order to provide lighter, more lethal forces to meet the national security challenges of the 21st century. The global war on terrorism has compelled the services to begin efforts to divest structure and forces from the Cold War era and to develop and establish forces that are more responsive to current requirements. In this new environment, the armed forces have found certain units and personnel are experiencing extraordinary levels of deployment and utilization. These so called high demand-low density units and personnel include, for example, military police, civil affairs, intelligence, psychological operations, and linguists. The committee directs the Comptroller General to determine the extent of the reliance on these active and reserve component high demand low density units and personnel to meet new national security requirements, and to identify the effectiveness of the efforts by the armed forces to reduce or eliminate reliance on high-demand-low density units and specialties. Furthermore, the Comptroller General will assess whether additional units and resources beyond current levels are necessary to meet current and future demands. The Comptroller General should report the findings and recommendations of the assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2005.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces

This section would authorize the following end strengths for active duty personnel of the armed forces as of September 30, 2005.

Service	FY 2004 authorized and floor	FY 2005		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation	FY 2005 request	FY 2004 authorized
Army	482,400	482,400	482,400	0	0
Navy	373,800	365,900	365,900	0	−7,900
USMC	175,000	175,000	175,000	0	0
Air Force	359,300	359,700	359,700	0	400
DOD	1,390,500	1,383,000	1,383,000	0	−7,500

In addition to the fiscal year 2005 end strengths authorized by this section for the Army and the Marine Corps, sections 1531 and 1532 increase Army and Marine Corps end strengths by 10,000 and 3,000 respectively.

Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would establish new minimum active duty end strengths for the Navy and the Air Force as of September 30, 2005. These changes in minimum strengths reflect the committee recommendations shown in section 401.

Section 403—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support

This section would authorize, as required by section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, the maximum number of reserve component personnel who may be on active duty or full-time national guard duty during fiscal year 2005 to provide operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by sections 401 or 412.

Service	FY 2005 committee recommendation
Army National Guard	10,300
Army Reserve	5,000
Naval Reserve	6,200
Marine Corps Reserve	2,500
Air National Guard	10,100
Air Force Reserve	3,600
DOD Total	37,700

Section 404—Accounting and Management of Reserve Component Personnel Performing Active Duty or Full-Time National Guard Duty for Operational Support

This section would establish the requirement for an annual congressional authorization of the maximum number of reserve component personnel to be on active duty or full-time national guard duty providing operational support. The committee makes this recommendation to provide a new, comprehensive approach for managing and accounting for reserve component members on active duty in support of operational missions. The section would eliminate the current 180-day strength accounting metric that requires all reservists on active duty beyond that limit to count against active component end strengths. In its place, the section would authorize reserve component members who are voluntarily on active duty to serve for up to three years, or a cumulative three years over a four-year period, before counting against active end strengths. The section would also exempt reserve component personnel authorized by this section from certain officer and enlisted grade limits. The committee believes that such flexibility will encourage the use of volunteers both during normal peacetime operations, as well as during times of national emergency. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to evaluate programs whose reserve component personnel are exempt from counting against any statutory manpower authorizations and report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by June 1, 2005, the Secretary's recommendations

for including these personnel within such statutory manpower authorizations.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the following end strengths for selected reserve personnel, including the end strength for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves, as of September 30, 2005:

Service	FY 2004 authorized	FY 2005		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation	FY 2005 request	FY 2004 authorized
Army National Guard	350,000	350,000	350,000	0	0
Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000	0	0
Naval Reserve	85,900	83,400	83,400	0	−2,500
Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600	0	0
Air National Guard	107,030	106,800	106,800	0	−230
Air Force Reserve	75,800	76,100	76,100	0	300
DOD Total	863,330	860,900	860,900	0	−2,430
Coast Guard Reserve	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	0

Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves as of September 30, 2005:

Service	FY 2004 authorized	FY 2005		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation	FY 2005 request	FY 2004 authorized
Army National Guard	25,599	26,476	26,476	0	877
Army Reserve	14,374	14,970	14,970	0	596
Naval Reserve	14,384	14,152	14,152	0	−232
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261	0	0
Air National Guard	12,191	12,225	12,225	0	34
Air Force Reserve	1,660	1,900	1,900	0	240
DOD Total	70,469	71,984	71,984	0	1,515

The committee's recommendation would provide for a 2.1 percent growth in the strength of these full-time reservists above the levels authorized in fiscal year 2004.

Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would authorize the following end strengths for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2005:

Service	FY 2004 authorized (floor)	FY 2005		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation (floor)	FY 2005 request	FY 2004 authorized
Army National Guard	24,589	25,076	25,076	0	487
Army Reserve	6,949	7,299	7,299	0	350
Air National Guard	22,806	22,956	22,956	0	150

Service	FY 2004 authorized (floor)	FY 2005		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation (floor)	FY 2005 request	FY 2004 authorized
Air Force Reserve	9,991	9,954	9,954	0	−37
DOD Total	64,335	65,285	65,285	0	950

The committee's recommendation would provide for a 1.5 percent growth in the strength of military technicians above the levels authorized in fiscal year 2004.

Section 414—Fiscal Year 2005 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians

This section would establish the maximum end strengths for the reserve components of the Army and Air Force for non-dual status technicians as of September 30, 2005.

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize $1,046.5 million to be appropriated for military personnel. This authorization of appropriations reflects both reductions and increases to the budget request for military personnel that are itemized below.

Military personnel	Amount (in dollars)
617: Reform Critical Skills Retention Bonuses	5,000,000
615: Reform Enlistment and Reenlistment Bonuses	15,000,000
616: Revised Foreign Language Proficiency Pay	2,000,000
619: Authorize Lateral Skills Training Bonus for Reserves	3,000,000
618: Authorize Officer Accession Bonus for Reserves	5,000,000
605: Reserve Income Replacement Plan	60,000,000
620: Hazardous Duty Incentive Pay Military Firefighters	9,630,000
631: Expansion of Travel for Survivors to Attend Burials	2,000,000
632: Enhanced Family Member Travel to Visit Wounded	3,000,000
551: College First Delayed Enlistment Program	5,000,000
526: Continue Loan Repayments Following Commissioning	1,000,000
525: Educational Assistance for Officers Commissioned from Military Junior Colleges	1,500,000
GAO estimate FY 2005 Active Component unexpended funds	−230,000,000
GAO Army Guard Underexecution due to Mobilization	−20,000,000
GAO Naval Reserve Underexecution due to Mobilization	−15,000,000
Army Rotational Travel	−1,500,000
Air Force General Officer Personal Money Allowance	−9,630,000

Section 422—Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $61,195.00 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2005.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

OVERVIEW

The committee recommends changes in this title to address not only matters of long-term military personnel policy reform, but also present near-term policy and process solutions to issues highlighted as a result of the global war on terrorism. For example, that war

has required the mobilization of hundreds of thousands of reserve component members using an inefficient Cold War-era system that imposed undue stress on reserve component personnel and their families. The committee's recommendations would take substantial steps toward reforming that mobilization process. The committee is also recommending a series of reforms in the management of general and flag officers to permit these highly qualified officers increased opportunity for service in critical positions. To better recognize the service by military personnel in Afghanistan and Iraq, the committee would recommend the establishment of separate service medals. To facilitate recruiting and participation in the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps, the committee recommends several measures to improve access to college and university campuses.

The committee recommendations also include reforms for both joint officer management and joint professional military education. The committee's Report of the Panel on Military Education of the One Hundredth Congress, dated April 21, 1989, laid the foundation for joint officer development. That report, commonly known as the Skelton Report after the panel chairman, Rep. Ike Skelton, was the product of extensive study, and provided the analytical and philosophical foundation upon which to base both joint officer management policies and joint professional military education requirements. Since that time, the results of that study have enabled the Department of Defense to progress from operations in which the effort was to simply deconflict the services in the execution of their separate missions to the point today where recent combat experience demonstrates that the services have generally achieved integration in the execution of joint operations.

Much of what the Skelton Report identified as requirements for joint officer management and joint professional military education clearly remains relevant today. However, the committee also understands that as the nature of warfare evolves so that future operations become more complex and joint at lower levels than before, the framework for developing persons skilled in joint matters must also evolve. Thus, while the committee's recommendations contained in this title are first steps in the construction of that evolving framework, much more analysis is required before any additional changes are enacted.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Civilianization or Contracting Out of Military Chaplain Positions

The committee is disturbed to learn that the military services are considering replacing military chaplains with civilian or contractor personnel. The committee believes that the implementation of such conversions would significantly undermine the ability of the military services to provide not only for the religious needs of uniformed personnel, but also for their families at home and overseas. The work of military chaplains is multifaceted. Regardless of the uniform they wear, chaplains share a common bond with their fellow soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and coast guardsman in the field. Regardless of their religion, they are brothers in arms. Military chaplains provide more than spiritual guidance. They are counselors and confidants to those who have witnessed first hand the horrors of war. Beyond this, military chaplains provide credible

support and guidance to the families enduring the stress of deployments, and they comfort those who mourn the loss of loved ones. For these reasons, the committee does not believe that civilian or contract chaplains could adequately or effectively replace military chaplains. Therefore, the committee urges each of the secretaries of the military services to abstain from implementing any recommendations to civilianize or contract out military chaplain positions.

Curricula for Post-conflict Resolution

The committee recognizes the important work that Department of Defense educational institutions have done in promoting interagency training for post-conflict operations. The committee recommends that curricula for joint training of military and civilian personnel continue to be developed and that the Department explore the utility of establishing a center for post-conflict reconstruction operations to pursue the following mission: (1) train key interagency personnel in assessment, strategy development, planning and coordination for post- conflict reconstruction; (2) develop and certify a cadre of post-conflict reconstruction experts who could be called to participate in future operations at both the headquarters and field levels; (3) provide pre-deployment training to interagency personnel tapped for specific operations; (4) develop a cadre of rapidly deployable training packages for use in the field; and, (5) conduct after-action reviews of real-world operations to capture lessons learned, best practices and tools and designing mechanisms to feed them back into training and education programs.

Federal Voting Assistance Program

The committee is very concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) is not fully committed to securing the right to vote for the men and women in uniform serving our nation around the globe. Following the many absentee voting problems experienced by military members during the national election in 2000, Congress included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) that expanded and improved the policies and procedures supporting the DOD-administered Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) and DOD mail systems that carry voting materials between state and local voting officials and the service members.

Reports from the United States General Accounting Office (GAO)(GAO–04–484) and the Inspector General of the Department of Defense (DOD IG)(D–2004–065, March 31, 2005) clearly demonstrate that the Department is not allocating the resources and management attention necessary to make the mail systems and the FVAP operate effectively. The GAO found that many of the problems from the Persian Gulf War of 1991 were repeated during Operation Iraqi Freedom because the United States Central Command's plan for postal service contained flawed assumptions, was not adequately resourced, and was not fully implemented. The DOD IG found that of the voting assistance programs at 10 installations visited, 3 were partially effective and 7 were ineffective. Additionally, 58 percent of the respondents to a questionnaire did not know who their unit voting officer was.

The committee believes that immediate command emphasis is required at all levels to ensure that mail systems are improved and the FVAP is fully implemented in time to protect the voting rights of service members during the national election in November 2004. Accordingly, the Secretary of Defense shall submit report's to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on August 1, 2004 and October 1, 2004 on his actions to ensure that DOD mail systems and the FVAP are operating effectively in support of absentee voting for service members and his perspective regarding the status of military voting on that date.

In addition to improving the military postal system for the purposes of supporting military absentee voters, the committee sees another, equally important, purpose in supporting the morale of our deployed troops and their families. Mail destined for deployed members of the armed forces that is delayed for long periods of time, or not delivered at all, negatively affects the morale of our deployed forces and their families at home. The Department of Defense should improve the military mail systems so that they comply with the Department's own wartime standards for 1st class mail delivery.

Joint Advertising and Market Research

The committee believes that the Department of Defense has an important corporate-level role to play in complementing the recruiting and advertising programs of the individual services. In that light, the committee believes that the Department's joint advertising and market research reinvention effort can have a direct, positive long-term impact on the ability of the Department and the military services to recruit quality personnel. The committee believes that such a capability is especially critical at a time when the recruiting efforts of the military services could soon be challenged by a range of factors. For that reason, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to the budget request for the Department's joint advertising and market research effort.

Meeting Department of Defense Requirements for Personnel with Foreign Language and Regional Expertise

The committee notes that recent operational requirements with Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, as well as the global war on terrorism, place more emphasis on the need for foreign language and regional expertise among military personnel. The committee is concerned that the education and training provided to officers both before commissioning and throughout their careers may not adequately prepare military leaders with the skills needed for these and similar future operations. The committee is also interested in the degree to which officers with regional expertise and language ability are promoted and utilized within the force. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of these matters, including current practices for education and training in language and regional studies, numbers who are so trained, types of languages and areas studied, and comparative promotion rates. The study should also provide recommendations for the enhancement of language and regional stud-

ies within the officer population. The committee directs the Secretary to submit this report by March 31, 2005 to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

The committee is also aware of the Department's efforts to transform its overall capability in foreign language and regional expertise. However, given the variety of required languages and extensive number of locations where DOD military and civilian personnel are operating and may operate, as well as the importance of these language and regional capabilities to overall defense strategy, this transformation will require a robust and sustained effort. The committee therefore directs the Secretary to establish a Defense Language Office within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to ensure a strategic focus on meeting present and future requirements for language and regional expertise among military personnel and civilian employees of the Department. This office should establish and oversee policy regarding the development, management, and utilization of civilian employees as well as members of the armed forces; monitor the promotion, accession and retention of individuals with these critical skills; explore innovative concepts to expand capabilities; and establish policies to identify, track, and maximize the use to meet requirements for language and regional expertise.

National Program for Citizen Soldier Support

The committee believes that the increasing reliance on the National Guard and reserves that has occurred during the global war on terrorism requires the Secretary of Defense to take extraordinary measures to ensure that there is an effective support structure for reserve component personnel, their families and employers. The committee commends the Secretary for the broad efforts already underway to provide such support. The committee believes that the effectiveness of these support efforts could be enhanced and refined by incorporating the capabilities of university and community based organizations. The committee understands that the North Carolina based National Program for Citizen-Soldier Support is developing a comprehensive program that could prove useful to the Department of Defense in extending the reach and effectiveness of existing military-sponsored support agencies. The committee directs the Secretary to closely examine the National Program for Citizen-Soldier Support and others like it to determine how they might be integrated into the Department's ongoing efforts.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER MATTERS

Section 501—Length of Service for Service Chiefs

This section would authorize the President to extend the term of an officer serving as the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or the Commandant of the Marine Corps for a period of up to two-years beyond the initial four-year appointment. In time of war or national emergency, the President would be able to extend the term of office for such additional periods as the President determines necessary.

However, the section would limit the total period of an officer's term as a service chief to eight years under any circumstance. Under current law, the chief of a military service is appointed for a four-year term and may only be reappointed during wartime or national emergency for up to four additional years.

Section 502—Repeal of Requirement that Deputy Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs of Naval Operations Be Selected from Officers in the Line of the Navy

This section would require that candidates for selection as deputy chiefs and assistant chiefs of naval operations be chosen from the officers of the Navy on active duty. Current law specifies that candidates for deputy chiefs and assistant chiefs of naval operations be chosen only from among officers in the line of the Navy on active duty.

Section 503—Increase in Age Limit for Deferral of Mandatory Retirement for Up to 10 Senior General and Flag Officers

This section would increase from 64 to 66 the mandatory retirement age for senior general and flag officers whom the President had previously retained on active duty beyond the statutory limits on either time in grade or age. Under current law, not more than ten deferments of the mandatory retirement of three- and four-star general and flag officers may be in effect at any one time.

Section 504—Increased Flexibility for Voluntary Retirement for Military Officers

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments greater flexibility in determining the grade in which active duty and reserve officers may be retired. Specifically, the section would:

(1) Require officers serving in grades above colonel, or captain in the Navy, to serve a minimum of one year time-in-grade before being allowed to retire in that grade;

(2) Replace the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to notify Congress that officers have performed satisfactorily in grades above major general, or rear admiral (upper half) in the Navy, before being allowed to retire in those grades with an authority for the secretary of the military department concerned to approve retirement of officers in those grades with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense.

Section 505—Repeal of Requirement that No More than 50 Percent of Active Duty General and Flag Officers be in Grades Above Brigadier General and Rear Admiral (Lower Half)

This section would repeal the limitation that no more than 50 percent of general and flag officers in a military service on active duty can be in grades above one-star, that is above brigadier general and rear admiral (lower half). There is no explicit statutory limitation on the numbers of two-star general and flag officers on active duty, and this section would not change either the total numbers of general or flag officers allowed on active duty or the statutory limits on the numbers of general and flag officers serving

on active duty in three- and four-star grades. Therefore, the effect of the proposed repeal would be to permit each of the military services some additional flexibility in managing the distribution of one- and two-star general and flag officers.

Section 506—Revision to Terms for Assistants to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for National Guard and Reserve Matters

The section would authorize the assistants to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for national guard and reserve matters to serve an initial term of four years. Under current law, the initial term is two years.

Section 507—Succession for Position of Chief, National Guard Bureau

This section would establish a chain of succession when there is a vacancy in the office of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or in the event that the chief is unable to perform the duties of the office. In such cases, the most senior ranking officer of the Army National Guard or of the Air National Guard on duty with the National Guard Bureau would serve as acting chief.

Section 508—Title of Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau Changed to Director of the Joint Staff of the National Guard Bureau

This section would change the title of the Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau to better reflect the duties of the position now that the staff of the National Guard Bureau has been reorganized as a joint organization.

Section 509—Two-Year Extension of Authority to Waive Requirement that Reserve Chiefs and National Guard Directors Have Significant Joint Duty Experience

This section would extend for two years, until December 31, 2006, the authority of the Secretary of Defense to waive the requirement that the chiefs of the reserves and the directors of the Army and Air National Guard must have significant joint duty experience to be eligible for appointment.

The requirement for officers to have significant joint duty experience as a condition of service in these most senior of reserve component general and flag officer positions was established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). In recognition of the challenge that reserve component officers face in getting joint duty experience, the public law provided the Secretary temporary three-year authority to waive the requirement. That waiver authority was extended in 2000, with the expectation that the Department and the military services would make a concerted effort to develop a system for ensuring reserve officers obtained the requisite joint experience. The committee, therefore, was disappointed when the budget request for fiscal year 2005 sought to make permanent the Secretary's waiver authority.

The committee believes that a concerted effort must be made to develop a system to provide significant joint duty experience to those officers who will be candidates for the senior military leader-

ship positions of the reserve components. For that reason, this section would also require that the Secretary develop a plan to ensure that officers selected after December 31, 2006, to be the chiefs of the reserves and the directors of the Army and Air National Guard, have significant joint duty experience.

Section 510—Repeal of Distribution Requirements for Naval Reserve Flag Officers

This section would repeal the prescribed distribution of the 48 flag officers authorized for the Naval Reserve, thereby permitting greater flexibility for the Department of the Navy to adapt its reserve flag officer inventory to meet current requirements. Current law mandates the allocation of these flag officers among the line, Medical Department Staff Corps, Chaplain Corps and Judge Advocate General's Corps.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY MATTERS

Section 511—Transition of the Active-Duty List Officer Force to All Regular Status

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to commission all new officer accessions as regular officers and transition all officers on the active-duty list to regular status.

Section 512—Mandatory Retention on Active duty to Qualify for Retired Pay

This section would clarify that section 12686 of title 10, United States Code, does not require that reservists serving on active duty with over 18 years of reserve service be retained on active duty for the purpose of qualifying the member for reserve retirement.

Section 513—Distribution in Grade of Marine Corps Reserve Officers in an Active Status in Grades Below Brigadier General

This section would correct a technical discrepancy in the grade table for the Marine Corps Reserve that has inappropriately limited the number of officers authorized in each grade below brigadier general.

Section 514—Tuition Assistance for Officers

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to waive for reserve component officers the two-year active duty service obligation required as a condition for receipt of tuition assistance while on active duty. This section would also repeal the limit on the amount of tuition assistance that the Secretary of the Army was authorized to pay officers of the selected reserve who are pursuing a baccalaureate degree. At present, the Secretary is limited to paying for such officers not more than 75 percent of the charges of an educational institution.

SUBTITLE C—RESERVE COMPONENT MATTERS

Section 521—Revision to Statutory Purpose of the Reserve Components

This section would clarify that the purpose of the reserve components is to provide trained units and qualified persons not just as the result of involuntary mobilizations but whenever more units and persons are needed than are in the active components. The revision recommended by this section more accurately reflects recent and future employment of the reserve components.

Section 522—Improved Access to Reserve Component Members for Enhanced Training

This section would authorize units and members of the reserve components to be involuntarily mobilized for the purposes of training. Current law prohibits mobilizations for training, reflecting a Cold War construct that assumed, in the face of predictable threats, that there would be an extended period available for training reserve units and individuals prior to deployment. The global war on terrorism has pointed out the need to repeal the prohibition in order to increase the readiness of the reserve component units, shorten time between mobilization and deployment and provide for a more orderly, predictable and effective mobilization process that reduces stress on individuals, families and employers. To that end, the section would authorize units and individuals to be ordered to active duty to conduct required training. However, the section would require that the time spent in such training be counted against the mobilization time limits that are established in law.

Section 523—Status Under Disability Retirement System for Reserve Members Released from Active Duty Due to Inability to Perform within 30 Days of Call to Active Duty

This section would clarify that mobilized reserve members may be separated when they are identified within 30 days as being unable to serve the full period for which they were mobilized due to preexisting medical conditions that were not aggravated while on active duty. Such member would be considered as serving under an order to active duty for a period of 30 days or less.

Section 524—Federal Civil Service Military Leave for Reserve and National Guard Civilian Technicians

This section would eliminate the restriction on the use of military leave specified in section 6323 of title 5, United States Code, during a war or national emergency declared by the President and would authorize reserve component members who are federal employees to participate in a leave status in operations outside the United States.

Section 525—Expanded Educational Assistance Authority for Officers Commissioned Through ROTC Program at Military Junior College

This section would allow commissioned officers who graduate from a military junior college to receive additional financial assist-

ance to complete their baccalaureate degree requirements. Individuals who participate in this program would be attached to a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit in order to ensure that they maintain their military training, bearing and education as they complete their post-secondary education.

Section 526—Effect of Appointment or Commission as Officer on Eligibility for Selected Reserve Education Loan Repayment Program for Enlisted Members

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to continue to repay educational loans for enlisted members in a reserve component after they are commissioned as officers if the members continue to serve the period specified in the original loan repayment agreement.

Section 527—Number of Starbase Academies in a State

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense, based on criteria he would prescribe, to permit a state to have more than two Starbase academies.

Section 528—Comptroller General Assessment of Integration of Active and Reserve Components of the Navy

This section would require the Comptroller General to review the Navy's implementation plans for the integration of the service's active and reserve components. The Comptroller General shall submit a report of the results of that assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2005.

Section 529—Operational Activities Conducted by the National Guard Under Authority of Title 32

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide funds to the governor of a state to employ national guard units and personnel to conduct operational activities that the Secretary determines to be in the national interest. This section would also establish a process by which the governor of a state may request funding from the Secretary for the operational activities of that state's national guard. The committee makes these recommendations in order to provide the Secretary with clear authority to more effectively incorporate national guard units and personnel into the planning and implementation of homeland security and other operational missions.

Section 530—Army Program for Assignment of Active Component Advisers to Units of the Selected Reserve

This section would reduce from 5,000 to 3,500 the minimum number of Army active component advisers that are required to be assigned to support the training and readiness of selected reserve units of the Army. The committee understands that the Chief of Staff of the Army requested this reduction in order to provide active component officers and non- commissioned officers as cadre for the new brigade units of action that the Army is creating. The committee supports that initiative. However, the committee is con-

cerned that such a reduction of active component support could have both short- and long-term negative effects on the training and readiness of combat and key support elements of the Army reserve components. The committee is also concerned that the Army has neither fully assessed those effects, nor developed a plan to address them. For that reason, this section would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from making any reductions in the numbers of active component advisors until the Secretary reports to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, by March 31, 2005, on the impact of the reduction and his plan to remediate any negative impact on training and readiness.

SUBTITLE D—JOINT OFFICER MANAGEMENT

Section 531—Strategic Plan to Link Joint Officer Development to Overall Missions and Goals of Department Of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, with the advice of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to develop a strategic plan linking future requirements for military personnel trained and educated in joint matters to the resources required to develop those persons, in terms of manpower, formal education and practical experience and other requirements. Additionally, the strategic plan would identify the method or methods the Secretary will use to fulfill those requirements.

Over the past several years, the committee has received multiple proposals from the Department of Defense to change significant aspects of joint officer management and joint military professional education enacted as a result of the Report of the Panel on Military Education from the One Hundredth Congress. The committee has consistently rejected these proposals because they were not offered in a coherent, comprehensive context—a context that presented the Department's overall vision for joint management and education. The strategic plan required by this section would provide the framework within which to consider what, if any, future changes to joint officer management and joint professional military education, are required.

The strategic plan would consist of two phases. Phase I would focus on what has been traditionally referred to as "joint officers." This section would require the Secretary to submit phase I of the strategic plan to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2006. However, the committee believes that the requirement for persons trained and educated in joint matters is not confined to just the active component officer ranks. Therefore, phase II would address the roles that reserve component officers, non-commissioned officers, and civilians play in future joint matters, identify the resources required to develop them, and clarify the methods used by the Department as they integrate and manage persons trained and educated in joint matters. The section would require the Secretary to submit a report of his proposal for phase II to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2007.

Section 532—Joint Requirements for Promotion to Flag or General Officer Grade

This section would extend from September 30, 2007, to September 30, 2008, the date after which an officer must be selected for the joint specialty before promotion to the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half). The committee is aware of the difficulties some services may have in meeting this requirement but believes with close management each service will be able to comply with the extended implementation date. Furthermore, the committee believes that secretaries of the military departments must be more proactive in properly managing officers early in their careers to ensure that they receive the opportunities for joint professional military education at points that align them properly for consideration for promotion, without the use of waivers, to grades that have a joint education or service requirement.

This section would also eliminate the requirement that an officer serve in a joint assignment at least 180 days prior to the convening of a promotion board for appointment to the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half).

Section 533—Clarification of Tours of Duty Qualifying as a Joint Duty Assignment

This section would modify the definition regarding the term "tour of duty" to allow officers to continue accumulating joint credit if they serve consecutive joint duty assignments, even if those assignments are not within the same organization.

Section 534—Reserve Joint Special Officer Qualifications

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to award the joint specialty officer designation to reserve officers who have met the prescribed requirements for such designation. The section would also require that reserve officers be included in Department of Defense management policies, procedures and practices for joint specialty officers.

This section would exclude reserve officers who have or have been nominated for the joint specialty from being counted for against the joint officer promotion policy objectives.

SUBTITLE E—PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION

Section 541—Improvement to Professional Military Education in the Department of Defense

This section would establish a chapter in title 10, United States Code, that combines new and existing sections of law related to professional military education. This new title contains eight sections, sections 2151 through 2158. Section 2151 would define the terms "joint professional military education," "intermediate level service schools," and "senior level service schools". Section 2152, 2153 and 2154 would modify slightly and codify the Statement of Congressional Policy related to professional military education contained in section 1123 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (P.L. 101–189; 103 Stat. 1556). The committee believes these provisions have a permanence and con-

tinuing importance that warrant codification. Section 2155 would require that the secretaries of the military departments use a written examination as a portion of the evaluation criteria in selecting officers for full-time attendance at intermediate level service colleges. This section would also provide that an officer selected by his service to attend an intermediate level service college would be eligible for attendance at all intermediate level service colleges. It is not the committee's intent to standardize school selection criteria across the services but to encourage the introduction of intellectual rigor in that selection process. Selection criteria based solely on a junior officer's record of duty performance at the tactical level in a single service environment or simply as a random result of the service assignment process is not a sufficient basis to identify those officers who have the best potential to grasp the complex intellectual concepts of joint matters and to ultimately excel in a joint operational environment. Additionally, the committee believes that one of the fundamental pillars of joint professional military education is an officer's personal continuing education program when not assigned to a formal school environment. The committee believes that a written entrance examination requirement for matriculation at the intermediate level service schools would provide a focus for such a continuing education program so that officers will prepare themselves for further formal education, well in advance of the actual school selection process. Section 2156 would require that after September 30, 2009, an officer must have completed joint professional military education phase I before attending phase II. This section would also prescribe phase II curriculum. Additionally, it would prescribe student and faculty ratios when phase II is taught at a senior level service school. It is the committee's intent to preserve the unique character of each of the senior level service schools while providing a mix of services represented in the student bodies and faculty that enables the cross-service acculturation that is such a key component of joint officer education. The committee understands that current Department of Defense policy sets the ratios of military department representation in the student bodies and faculty at the Joint Forces Staff College and the Colleges of the National Defense University at approximately 30 percent for each military department. The committee believes this ratio is appropriate at those institutions and should not change. Section 2157 would require that the length of the principal course of instruction at each intermediate and senior level service school be not less than 10 months, and provide the Secretary of Defense with a waiver for that requirement. The section would also require that the length of the principal course of instruction at the Joint Force Staff College, which is now required to be 12 weeks, can not be less than 10 weeks. Section 2158 would require that the Secretary include in his annual report to Congress the number of officers who have received joint professional military education phase II, but who were not selected for promotion. This section would also require the Secretary to report the number of officer students and faculty assigned from each service to a joint professional military educational institution. Finally, this would make conforming adjustments in the existing law.

Section 542—Ribbons to Recognize Completion of Joint Professional Military Education

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to award a military decoration to persons who have successfully completed joint professional military education phase I and to subsequently award a device to affix to that ribbon when a person has successfully completed joint professional military education phase II. These awards would be retroactive for any person who has completed either phase I or phase II since the sequenced approach to joint professional military education was enacted in 1989.

The committee considers joint professional military education to be a vital contributing aspect to the excellence the Department of Defense has historically demonstrated. This education becomes even more important as the nature of modern warfare becomes more complex. The committee believes that an officer becomes fully competent in joint matters when joint professional military education is appropriately combined with practical joint operational experience. Officers who complete certain routine operational assignments are awarded service ribbons to signify successful completion of that assignment. With the establishment of this decoration, the status of completion of joint professional military education would be elevated to a level on par with those operational assignments.

Section 543—Increase in Number of Private-Sector Civilians Who May Be Enrolled for Instruction at National Defense University

This section would increase the maximum number of eligible private sector employees who work in organizations relevant to national security to receive instruction at the National Defense University from 10 to 20.

Section 544—Requirement for Completion of Phase I Joint Professional Military Education before Promotion to Colonel or Navy Captain

This section would require, with certain exceptions, that after September 30, 2007, officers on the active duty list complete joint professional military education phase I or phase II prior to being appointed to the grade of colonel or Navy captain.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER EDUCATION AND TRAINING MATTERS

Section 551—College First Delayed Enlistment Program

This section would permanently authorize the College First demonstration project originally authorized for the Army in section 573 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) and would extend the authority to implement the program to all the secretaries of the military departments. Under the College First program, entry on active duty for new recruits would be delayed for up to 30 months to allow the recruits the opportunity to pursue higher education, vocational, or technical training courses. During the delayed entry period, the recruits would be paid a subsistence allowance and the secretaries would have the option to pay an additional stipend that may not exceed $225.

Section 552—Standardization of Authority to Confer Degrees on Graduates of Community College of the Air Force with Authority for Other Schools of Air University

This section would shift the authority for conferring associate degrees on graduates of the Community College of the Air Force from the commander of the Air Education and Training Command to the commander of Air University. Such a shift would ensure that only the commander of Air University is responsible for conferring all degrees, thus addressing a concern that arose during the accreditation of Air University programs.

Section 553—Change in Titles of Heads of the Naval Postgraduate School

This section would change the title of the head of the Naval Postgraduate School from Superintendent of the Naval Postgraduate School to President of the Naval Postgraduate School. The section would also establish a new civilian position of Provost and Academic Dean, and revise the procedures to fill the position.

Section 554—Increase from Two Years to Three Years in Period for which Educational Leave of Absence May Be Authorized

This section would expand the authority for service members to take educational leave from two years to three years.

Section 555—Correction to Disparate Treatment of Disabilities Sustained During Accession Training

This section would provide the capability to effectively respond to injury and illness sustained during accession training by authorizing military academy cadets and midshipmen to be disability retired and Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets and midshipmen to receive medical and dental care appropriate for the treatment of the injury, illness, or disease incurred until the disability cannot be materially improved.

Section 556—Prayer at Military Service Academy Activities

This section would authorize the superintendent of a service academy to establish a policy with respect to the offering of a voluntary, nondenominational prayer at an authorized activity of the academy.

Section 557—Revision to Conditions on Service of Officers as Service Academy Superintendents

This section would repeal the requirement that the superintendents of the military service academies retire upon completion of their assignments. The committee makes this recommendation to permit the secretaries of the military departments flexibility with regard to future utilization of talented senior officers. However, the committee is concerned that tenure of officers assigned as superintendents be of sufficient length to permit those officers to make significant contributions in the oversight and management of these premier educational institutions. Therefore, this section would require that an officer serve at least a three-year tour as super-

intendent, and that if the officer is reassigned before that period, then the secretary of the military department concerned would be required to notify the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services of the reasons for the curtailed assignment.

Section 558—Codification of Prohibition on Imposition of Certain Charges and Fees at Service Academies

This section would add to title 10 of the United States Code, a provision of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337). That provision prohibited the imposition of charges for tuition, room or board at the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, the United States Coast Guard Academy, and the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

Section 559—Qualifications of the Dean of the Faculty of United States Air Force Academy

This section would require that a person selected to be the dean of faculty at the Air Force Academy, who is not an officer on active duty, must be either a retired or former officer of the armed forces. Furthermore, the section would prohibit the appointment or assignment of a person to be the dean of faculty unless that person held the highest academic degree in that person's academic field.

SUBTITLE G—MEDALS AND DECORATIONS AND SPECIAL PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

Section 561—Separate Military Campaign Medals to Recognize Service in Operation Enduring Freedom and Service in Operation Iraqi Freedom

This section would require the President to establish separate campaign medals to recognize the service of members during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Section 562—Eligibility of All Uniformed Services Personnel for National Defense Service Medal

This section would require the President to authorize the award of the National Defense Service Medal to members of the uniformed services.

Section 563—Authority to Appoint Brigadier General Charles E. Yeager, United States Air Force (retired), to the Grade of Major General on the Retired List

This section would authorize the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Brigadier General Charles E. Yeager to the grade of major general on the retired list of the Air Force.

Section 564—Posthumous Commission of William Mitchell in the Grade of Major General in the Army

This section would authorize the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to issue a posthumous commission

as major general, United States Army, in the name of the late William Mitchell, formerly a colonel, United States Army, who resigned his commission on February 1, 1925.

SUBTITLE H—MILITARY JUSTICE MATTERS

Section 571—Review on How Sexual Offenses Are Covered by Uniformed Code of Military Justice

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a proposal for changes regarding sexual offenses in the Uniformed Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) and the rationale for the changes to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2005. Recent congressional and Department of Defense focus on the problem of sexual assault in the military services suggest that it is necessary to examine how sexual offenses are treated in the UCMJ, primarily Article 120. Congress strongly encourages the Department to closely align the statutory language of sexual assault law under the UCMJ with federal law under sections 2241 through 2247 of title 18, United States Code.

Section 572—Service Time Not Lost When Confined in Connection with Trial if Confinement Excused as Unavoidable

This section would require the military departments to waive lost time when a service member is acquitted or released without trial, or has his conviction set-aside on legal grounds (as distinguished from clemency) or reversed based upon appeal. Existing law does not give the military departments any discretion to consider a service member's confinement if the member is acquitted or if there is another resolution of the case favorable to the member qualifying for service credit. Existing law requires service members to make up time lost for any period of confinement by civilian or military authorities.

Section 573—Clarification of Authority of Military Legal Assistance Counsel to Provide Military Legal Assistance without Regard to Licensing Requirements

This section would clarify section 1044 of title 10, United States Code, so that licensed Department of Defense military legal assistance officers would have the authority to practice law in connection with their official duties independent of state regulations for those states where they are unlicensed.

SUBTITLE I—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT MATTERS

Section 581—Three-Year Extension of Limitation on Reductions of Personnel of Agencies Responsible for Review and Correction of Military Records

This section would extend through September 30, 2008, the prohibition precluding the secretaries of the military departments from reducing the number of military and civilian personnel assigned to duty within the boards until 90 days after the secretary of the military department concerned submits a report that describes the proposed reduction, provides the rationale for the reduc-

tion, and specifies the number of personnel that will be assigned to the board after the reduction is complete.

Section 582—Staffing and Funding for Defense Prisoner of War/ Missing Personnel Office

This section would establish specific permanent minimum levels of military and civil personnel assigned to the Defense Prisoner of War Missing Personnel Office (DPMO). It would also require, should the actual assigned strength drop below the minimum levels, that the Secretary of Defense report publicly to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services his plan to restore the manning levels to at least the required minimums. The committee believes such action is necessary because the DPMO, which performs a critical range of missions for the nation and the missing personnel of past and future wars, has not had the full support of the Department of Defense with regard to the adequacy of DPMO manning or funding. For example, the September 2001 committee report on H.R. 2586 (H. Rept. 107–194), noting that DPMO manning had been reduced by 40 percent since its creation, directed the Secretary to increase DPMO resources in the fiscal year 2003 budget request. When the Secretary did not heed that direction and the committee learned that the Department was considering a further personnel reduction of 15 percent, committee action in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) led to the enactment of a prohibition any reduction of DPMO funding and personnel below the levels requested in the 2003 budget. Notwithstanding this statutory prohibition, the department's fiscal year 2005 budget request for DPMO proposed a 59 percent reduction in military spaces (from 46 to 19) and the repeal of the minimum funding requirement. The committee urges the Secretary to end any further efforts to reduce manning and resources in DPMO and to commit the department to ensuring that the DPMO is fully able to carry out the entire range of missions assigned to it.

Section 583—Permanent ID Cards for Retiree Dependents Age 70 and Older

This section would require the service secretaries concerned to issue permanent identification cards to dependents of military retirees and survivors of military retirees eligible for benefits for periods after the dependent or survivor attains age 70.

Section 584—Authority to Provide Civilian Clothing to Members Traveling in Connection with Medical Evacuation

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to furnish members who have been medically evacuated civilian clothing at a cost not exceed $250 or to reimburse the member for the purchase of civilian clothing in an amount not to exceed $250.

Section 585—Authority to Accept Donation of Frequent Flyer Miles, Credits, and Tickets to Facilitate Rest and Recuperation Travel of Deployed Members of the Armed Forces and Their Families

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to accept the donation of frequent flyer miles, credits, and tickets for the purpose of facilitating the travel of members of the armed forces who are deployed away from their permanent duty station and are granted, during such deployment, rest and recuperation leave and certain other forms of leave and the travel of family members to be reunited with such a member.

Section 586—Limitation on Amendment or Cancellation of Department of Defense Directive Relating to Reasonable Access to Military Installations for Certain Personal Commercial Solicitation

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from canceling or amending Department of Defense (DOD) directive 1344.7, Personal Commercial Solicitation on DOD Installations, for a period of one year after the United States General Accounting Office reports to Congress on the findings of an ongoing review of the financial allotment system and the treatment of insurance agents by military finance offices and local managers and commanders on DOD installations.

Section 587—Annual Identification of Reasons for Discharges from the Armed Services During Preceding Fiscal Years

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to report annually to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services detailed information regarding of the numbers of persons discharged from each of the military services in the preceding fiscal year. Information required to be included in the report would include the numbers and types of discharges, as well as the identification of the occupational specialties and reenlistment eligibility of discharged service members.

Section 588—Authority for Federal Recognition of National Guard Commissioned Officers Appointed from Former Coast Guard Personnel

This section would make current and former officers and enlisted members of the Coast Guard, as well graduates of the United States Coast Guard Academy, eligible for federal recognition after becoming commissioned officers of the national guard.

Section 589—Study of Blended Wing Concept for the Air Force

This section would required the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report on matters related to that service's current implementation of and future plans for blended wings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2005. Blended wings are operational units whose membership is comprised of personnel from more than one component—active, national guard, or reserve. The report would also require the Secretary to provide the criteria used to determine what units become blended units.

Section 590—Continuation of Impact Aid Assistance on Behalf of Dependents of Certain Members Despite Change in Status of Member

This section would temporarily adjust the process for computing the amount of funding provided by Department of Education to certain local educational agencies heavily impacted by dependents of military personnel. The adjustment, limited to school year 2004–2005, would require that certain children continue be counted as a child enrolled in school when computing the average daily attendance, which is a key component of the amount of aid the school might receive. Such children include those who attend the school but who no longer live on a military base because both parents are deployed, or are children who temporarily reside in military base housing following the death on active duty of a military parent.

SUBTITLE J—OTHER MATTERS

Section 591—Employment Preferences for Spouses of Certain Department of Defense Civilian Employees Subject to Relocation Agreements

This section would expand the employment preference for spouses of Department of Defense (DOD) civilian employees who have been assigned under a mandatory mobility agreement or similar mandatory mobility program. The employment preference would include DOD appropriated and nonappropriated fund civilian positions. This authority would place spouses of civilian employees in an equivalent position to spouses of military members who already receive employment preferences.

Section 592—Repeal of Requirement to Conduct Electronic Voting Demonstration Project for the Federal Election to be Held in November 2004

This section would repeal the requirement in section 1604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) for the Secretary of Defense to conduct a demonstration project to permit absentee uniformed service voters to cast their ballots through an electronic voting system. The committee regrets that the Deputy Secretary of Defense believed he had no option but to terminate the electronic voting demonstration project, but the committee understands that the decision was necessary to avoid any risk that the demonstration project would threaten the integrity of the election process.

Section 593—Examination of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces by the Defense Task Force Established to Examine Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to expand the mission of the Task Force on Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies that was established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). Under the name of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services, the task force would examine matters related to sexual assault in the military. This section would re-

quire that the task force report findings and recommendations to the Secretary of Defense, and the secretaries of the military departments within 12 months of the initial meeting of the task force. Within 90 days of receiving the task force report, the Secretary of Defense would be required to provide the report, together with his evaluation of the report, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. At the same time, the Secretary of Defense would also be required to provide to those committees an assessment of the effectiveness of the corrective actions being taken by the Department of Defense and military services as a result of various investigations and reviews into matters involving sexual assault.

Section 594—Renewal of Pilot Program for Treating GED and Home School Diploma Recipients as High School Graduates for Determinations of Eligibility for Enlistment

This section would reestablish the pilot program originally authorized by section 571 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261). The program would permit participants in a National Guard Youth Challenge Program who receive a general education development certificate and those who complete their high school requirements through a home schooling program to enlist in the armed forces as if they had received a high school diploma.

Section 595—Assistance to Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would provide $50.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies. The committee makes this recommendation in connection with it continuing strong support of the need to help local school districts with significant concentrations of military students.

Section 596—Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Recruiter Access at Institutions of Higher Education

This section would require that military recruiters be given access to campuses and students at institutions of higher education that is at least equal in quality and scope to the access provided to any other employer. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to obtain an annual verification from colleges and universities who already support the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program that they will continue to do so in the upcoming academic year. The section would also add two additional defense-related funding sources, the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Nuclear Security Administration of the Department of Energy, and would restore the funds of the Department of Transportation to the list of covered funds that potentially could be terminated if an institution is determined to prevent recruiter access or maintains anti-ROTC policies.

Section 597—Reports on Transformation Milestones

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a number of reports to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on different aspects of transformational efforts underway in the Department. One report would provide information on the efforts to convert military to civilian positions, and a series of annual reports in fiscal years 2005 through 2007 would provide information on the conversion of military positions to other higher priority military positions. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to examine the feasibility of implementing: (1) a system to embed within the military on a temporary basis persons with civilian skills that are of high value to the military, and (2) a personnel system that expands the capability of the armed forces to rapidly access, from other than the reserve components, civilian volunteers with skills needed by the armed forces. Finally, the section would also require the Secretary of the Army to report annually on the status of efforts to transform the Army from a division-oriented system to a brigade oriented one.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATIONS AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to support the strong and flexible compensation and benefit programs needed to recruit and retain a quality force in a wartime environment. Accordingly, the committee recommends authorization of an enhanced across-the-board pay raise of 3.5 percent, restructured compensation programs for reserve forces to ensure equity with active duty members, and continued emphasis on pay and allowances for the warfighters.

The committee remains committed to protecting military exchange and commissary benefits. Accordingly, the committee would include a series of provisions to define and expand the commissary benefit and protect military communities from unnecessary store closures.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Combat-Related Special Compensation

The committee continues to receive complaints from combat-disabled retirees and the organizations representing them that the processing time for Combat-Related Special Compensation applications is excessive. The committee is aware that the expanded criteria enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) are now generating thousands of additional applicants that will increase demands on the processing systems.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to examine the processing systems used by the military departments and consider methods for expediting the time required to review applications. The committee suggests that the Secretary consider consolidating the organizations currently evaluating applications into a

more efficient central processing organization with increased personnel and fiscal resources.

Commissary Funding After Closure of a Store

The committee remains committed to preserving the commissary benefit for military members and their families and improving services whenever possible. Accordingly, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to ensure that funding made available as a result of the closure of a commissary, whether closed as a result of a base realignment or closure action or other cause, be reallocated to the Defense Commissary Agency to support improved commissary operations at other locations.

Consolidation of the Military Exchanges

The committee remains concerned that the ongoing effort to evaluate the utility of consolidating the military exchanges is ill-advised and, if not managed carefully, will cause an erosion of the exchange benefit. The committee considers the military exchanges an important quality of life benefit that is pivotal to the welfare of military communities around the world. The committee understands that the cost of consolidation will likely exceed $300.0 million and that prior consolidation studies have concluded that such costs present too great a risk to the dividend paid by the exchanges to morale, welfare and recreation programs.

Accordingly, the committee insists that any proposal to consolidate military exchanges include a strong business case that resolves all concerns about the fiscal implications of consolidation. The committee intends to reject any proposal that does not include a strong business case.

The committee is also concerned about reports that the perspectives of all the stakeholders are not being fully considered during the evaluation process. The committee would view the failure of the Unified Exchange Task Force to consider the views and concerns of all participants as a major flaw that will taint any proposal.

Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida, Combined Commissary and Exchange Store

The committee is concerned that the Secretary of Defense continues to consider the closure of the combined commissary and exchange store at Homestead Air Reserve Base (ARB), Florida. The committee believes that closing the store would be a significant loss to the service members, retirees, and their families that reside in the Homestead ARB military community and throughout southern Florida. The committee is aware that there are force structure changes being considered for Homestead ARB that would significantly change the patron population that would use the store. The committee strongly encourages the Secretary to delay the decision to close the store until such time as any potential increase in the military population at Homestead ARB can be confirmed and measured. Assuming that current force projections are fulfilled, the committee also recommends that the Secretary consider opening a full service commissary at Homestead ARB as soon as the active duty population at the base increases beyond the minimum standard required under Department of Defense policy.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 2005

This section would increase basic pay for members of the armed forces by 3.5 percent.

This raise would continue to fulfill Congress' commitment to enhanced pay raises for the armed forces and would reduce the pay gap between military and private sector pay increases from 5.5 percent to 5.1 percent.

Section 602—Authority to Provide Family Separation Basic Allowance for Housing

The section would authorize the service secretary concerned the discretion to decline to pay family separation housing allowances when the member's circumstances do not justify such payments.

Section 603—Geographic Basis for Basic Allowance for Housing during Short Changes of Station for Professional Military Education or Training

This section would authorize service members who attend professional military education or training lasting 12 months or less to elect to leave their families at their previous duty station and receive basic allowance for housing based on the area where their dependents reside.

Section 604——Immediate Lump-Sum Reimbursement for Unusual Nonrecurring Expenses Incurred by Members Serving Outside Continental United States

This section would authorize the service secretary concerned to pay service members serving outside the continental United States for certain unusual nonrecurring expenses.

Section 605—Income Replacement Payments for Reserves Experiencing Extended and Frequent Mobilization for Active Duty Service

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to pay involuntarily mobilized reserve members on a monthly basis the amount necessary to replace the income differential between their regular military compensation (RMC) plus any special or incentive pays and allowances paid to the member on a monthly basis and the average monthly income received by the member during the twelve months preceding the month during which the member was mobilized. This section would define the income differential as the amount by which the member's average monthly income prior to mobilization exceeds the member's RMC plus any special or incentive pays and allowances paid to the member on a monthly basis. Reserve members with private sector income that exceeds their active duty income would be eligible for the income replacement payment for any full month following the date that the member completes 12 continuous months of service on active duty or 18 months on active duty during the previous 60 months, or for any month

during a mobilization that occurs within 6 months of the member's last active duty tour. Payments would be limited to a minimum of $50 each month and a maximum of $3,000 each month.

Section 606—Authority for Certain Members Deployed in Combat Zones to Receive Limited Advances on Their Future Base Pay

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to pay service members assigned to locations where they would receive imminent danger pay for 12 or more months up to 3 months of basic pay in advance upon the request of the member.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611—One-Year Extension of Bonus and Special Pay Authorities

This section would extend the authority for the following bonus and special pay authorities to December 31, 2005:

(1) Nurse officer candidate accession program;

(2) Aviation officer retention bonus;

(3) Accession bonus for registered nurses;

(4) Incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists;

(5) Accession bonus for dental officers;

(6) Accession bonus for pharmacy officers;

(7) Reenlistment bonus for active and reserve members;

(8) Enlistment bonus for active and reserve members;

(9) Special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending the period of active service;

(10) Nuclear career accession bonus;

(11) Nuclear career annual incentive bonus;

(12) Retention bonus for members with critical skills or other criteria; and

(13) Accession or affiliation bonus for new officers in critical skills.

The provision would also extend the authority for repayment of educational loans for certain health professionals who serve in the selected reserve until January 1, 2006.

Section 612—Reduction in Required Service Commitment to Receive Accession Bonus for Registered Nurses

This section would reduce the service commitment required for the nurse accession bonus from four to three years of service.

Section 613—Increase in Maximum Monthly Rate Authorized for Hardship Duty Pay

This section would increase the maximum amount of hardship duty pay payable from $300 to $750 per month. The committee believes this increase provides the Secretary of Defense needed flexibility to ensure that service members receive appropriate compensation regardless of where they are required to serve during the global war on terrorism.

Section 614—Termination of Assignment Incentive Pay for Members Placed on Terminal Leave

This section would require termination of assignment incentive pay when the member is placed on terminal leave and will not be returning to the assignment location.

Section 615—Consolidation of Reenlistment and Enlistment Bonus Authorities for Regular and Reserve Components

This section would allow reserve component members to be paid enlistment and reenlistment bonuses using the same authority used to pay active duty members. The provision would also extend eligibility for the reenlistment bonus through 17 years of service and grant the flexibility to use the reenlistment bonus during war and national emergency to address unit specific retention problems without regard to critical skill eligibility requirements. The committee intends that this authority be used to pay a bonus to former members of the armed forces to reenlist for service in a reserve component.

Section 616—Revision of Authority to Provide Foreign Language Proficiency Pay

This section would authorize the service secretary concerned to pay an annual bonus of up to $12,000 to members of the uniformed services who maintain proficiency in a foreign language.

Section 617—Eligibility of Reserve Component Members for Critical Skills Retention Bonus and Expansion of Authority to Provide Bonus

This section would allow reserve component members to be paid retention bonuses using the same authority used to pay active duty members. The provision would also clarify that enlisted personnel on indefinite enlistments are eligible to receive bonuses and that bonuses may be paid based on criteria other than service in a critical skill as determined by the Secretary of Defense. The committee intends that this authority be used to pay bonuses, if required, to service members who agree to serve in an active status in any category of the ready reserve, affiliate with reserve component units, accept assignments to high priority reserve units, and continue to serve in critically short wartime health specialties.

Section 618—Eligibility of New Reserve Component Officers for Accession or Affiliation Bonus for Officers in Critical Skills

This section would allow reserve component officers to be paid an accession or affiliation bonus using the same authority used to pay active duty officers.

Section 619–Eligibility of Reserve Component Members for Incentive Bonus for Conversion to Military Occupational Specialty to Ease Personnel Shortage

This section would allow reserve component members to be paid bonuses for converting to critical occupational specialties using the same authority used to pay active duty members.

Section 620—Availability of Hazardous Duty Incentive Pay for Military Firefighters

This section would establish a new hazardous duty incentive pay of $150 per month for members of the uniformed services who regularly perform duty as a member of a firefighting crew.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Section 631—Expansion of Travel and Transportation Allowances to Assist Survivors of a Deceased Member to Attend Burial Ceremony of the Member

This section would clarify that family members are authorized to travel at government expense to the burial site of a member who dies while on active duty or inactive duty and that the member's parents are always eligible to travel at government expense to attend the burial ceremony.

Section 632—Transportation of Family Members Incident to the Serious Illness or Injury of Members of the Uniformed Services

This section would expand the number and categories of family members and other people that would be entitled to transportation at government expense and would authorize such persons to receive a per diem or be reimbursed for travel expenses.

Section 633—Reimbursement of Members for Certain Lodging Costs Incurred in Connection with Student Dependent Travel

This section would authorize the service secretary concerned to reimburse a service member for lodging costs incurred by a dependent child traveling between the child's school and the member's overseas duty station when the lodging expenses are incurred for reasons beyond the control of the dependent child.

SUBTITLE D—SURVIVORS BENEFITS

Section 641—Computation of Benefits Under Survivor Benefit Plan for Surviving Spouses Over Age 62

This section would eliminate the social security offset under the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) and increase the annuities paid to survivors of military retirees who are 62 or older from 35 percent of retired pay to the percentages indicated for the following fiscal years:

(1) For months after September 2005 and before April 2006, 40 percent;

(2) For months after March 2006 and before April 2007, 45 percent;

(3) For months after March 2007 and before April 2008, 50 percent; and

(4) For months after March 2008, 55 percent.

This section would also make corresponding adjustments to the SBP supplemental annuity program and would require SBP annuities to be recalculated during October 2005, April 2006, April 2007, and April 2008 to ensure that beneficiaries receive the appropriate amount of annuity.

Section 642—Open Enrollment Period for Survivor Benefit Plan Commencing October 1, 2005

This section would authorize an open season for retired members to participate in the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) or increase the level of their participation if they were previously participating below the maximum allowed level. The open season would begin October 1, 2005 and continue for two years.

Section 643—Source of Funds for Survivor Benefit Plan Annuities for Department of Defense Beneficiaries Over Age 62

This section would clarify that the payments into the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund in support of the changes made in section 642 would be calculated by the Secretary of Defense and paid by the Secretary of the Treasury.

SUBTITLE E—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS

Section 651—Consolidation and Reorganization of Legislative Provisions Regarding Defense Commissary System and Exchanges and other Morale, Welfare, and Recreational Activities

This section would consolidate a wide range of sections from title 10, United States Code and other laws concerning commissaries, exchanges, and other morale, welfare, and recreation activities. The provision would also:

(1) Define the commissary benefit and require the Secretary of Defense to operate a commissary system;

(2) Specify the criteria for establishment of commissaries, determination of the size of commissaries, and the closure of commissaries, to include direction to consider the welfare of reserve patrons in the same manner as active duty patrons are considered when assessing the need to close a commissary;

(3) Require the Secretary to submit to Congress written notice of the reasons supporting the closure of a commissary, to include the impact of the proposed closure on the quality of life of the patrons and the welfare of the military community, and wait 90 days before taking action to close the store;

(4) Clarify the categories of the merchandize that shall be sold in commissaries, to include the addition of telephone cards, greeting cards, and film and one-time use cameras and a list of general merchandise items that shall continue to be sold in commissaries on a limited basis unless space or other considerations prevent the sale of the items;

(5) Establish a moratorium on studies to compare the cost effectiveness of commissary operations employing federal civilian employees and such operations employing private sector employees through December 31, 2009; and

(6) Specify that the priority in selecting Commissary Operating Board members should be given to people with skills and experience useful to the operating of commissaries and that the board chairman shall be a career military officer or career member of the Senior Executive Service.

Section 652—Consistent State Treatment of Department of Defense Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefits Program

This section would clarify that the Department of Defense Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefit Program is a federal health benefit program not subject to state, local, and territorial or other laws taxes, and health plan mandates. The provision would provide the same status to this single, uniform program that had existed previously for the separate programs that had been operated by the military departments prior to consolidation.

Section 653—Cooperation and Assistance for Qualified Scouting Organizations Serving Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Civilian Employees Overseas

This section would require that professional staff supporting both the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in overseas areas be made nonappropriated fund employees of the United States and would clarify that appropriated funds may be used to pay the costs of the employees. The committee believes that this action is required to confirm the status of scouting professionals in overseas areas and resolve any uncertainty regarding their treatment and access to support services in foreign countries.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 661—Repeal of Requirement that Members Entitled to Basic Allowance for Subsistence Pay Subsistence Charges while Hospitalized

This section would repeal the requirement for officers and certain enlisted members to pay subsistence charges when they are hospitalized.

Section 662—Clarification of Education Loans Qualifying for Education Loan Repayment Program for Reserve Component Health Professions Officers

This section would clarify that college loans involving both a basic professional qualifying degree and graduate education would qualify for repayment under section 16302 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 663—Survey and Analysis of Effect of Extended and Frequent Mobilization of Reservists for Active Duty Service on Reservist Income

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a detailed study of the loss of income by mobilized reservists who have served on active duty in support of a contingency operation following September 11, 2001. The provision would require the Secretary to survey a minimum of 50 percent of such reservists, collect demographic data on the surveyed members, identify members in critical skills, identify members who believe that replacing lost income would affect their retention decision, identify members who experience reduced income levels while on active duty, determine the amount of lost income in each case, and analyze the data. The

provision would require the Secretary to report his findings and recommendations to address the problem of reduced income for mobilized reservists to Congress and the Comptroller General by January 31, 2006. The provision would require the Comptroller General to review the report of the Secretary and report his findings to Congress by March 31, 2006.

The committee believes that accurate information regarding the loss of income by mobilized reservists is an important prerequisite to establishing a lasting solution to the problem. The committee is particularly interested in the data as it relates to military occupational specialty because that analysis is expected to reveal important insight regarding high demand skills that would benefit from specific financial incentives and force balancing initiatives.

TITLE VII—HEALTHCARE MATTERS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to be concerned about growing stress on the Defense Health Program which partly results from the strain faced by the civilian health care systems in the nation. In the face of the growing cost of health care in general, the military health system must provide for medical readiness and force health protection for our men and women in uniform and ensure health care services to all other beneficiaries. As the nation fights the global war on terrorism, the Department of Defense will transition from complex existing TRICARE contracts to challenging new and very different TRICARE contracts. No other healthcare system has ever faced a similar experience. In light of the many challenges faced by the military health system, the committee continues to believe that the Defense Health Program must be fully funded.

The committee remains strongly committed to ensuring that the force health protection and the medical readiness of our service members have the highest priority. Accordingly, the committee recommends legislation to ensure the deployability of active and reserve component service members and their protection from health threats during military operations. In addition, several provisions would assist family members of activated reservists to transition in and out of the military health system.

Finally, the committee is steadfast in its view that the transition to the new TRICARE contracts must not disrupt beneficiary health care, and that it optimizes military treatment facilities while preserving access to high quality health care. The committee is pleased by the TRICARE transformation efforts and spirit of cooperation by the various military and private sector health care entities. However, the committee remains concerned that some of the contracts carved out from the major managed care support contracts, such as those for patient appointment services, nurse triage and health information line, and resource sharing, may leave the transition process at risk for disruption of health care delivery and increased beneficiary dissatisfaction. The committee expects to be kept informed by the Department of Defense and the military services on the ongoing efforts to develop and implement the carved out contracts.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Collection of Perinatal Information

The committee strongly supports the goal of the TRICARE Family-Centered Care program, which the Department of Defense established in August 2003, to improve and enhance family-friendly care in the military health system. One aspect of the Family-Centered Care program was the importance of providing high quality perinatal care to pregnant service members and dependents. In order to ensure high quality care the committee supports the use of the National Perinatal Information Center that specializes in the collection of obstetric and neonatal data necessary to determine quality measures. The committee urges the Department to continue its efforts to measure quality perinatal care so that pregnant service members and dependents continue to receive high quality perinatal care in the military health care system.

Coordination of TRICARE and Medicare Benefits and Provider Payments

Recent changes to the Medicare program enacted by Congress may have created administrative and benefit disparities between Medicare and TRICARE for Medicare-eligible military beneficiaries. Such disparities cause complex problems for beneficiaries and may result in complications and inconsistencies that may deter health care providers from participation and acceptance of military beneficiaries. They also pose added costs to TRICARE contractors as a result of having to administer multiple sets of adjudication rules and respond to increased complaints and appeals from providers and beneficiaries. The committee believes that elimination of such disparities wherever possible is important to promoting provider participation and improving access to a consistent benefit for TRICARE beneficiaries.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study to identify disparities between benefits and administration methodologies within the Medicare and TRICARE programs. The study should also include an assessment of the impact of such disparities on program effectiveness, provider participation, and beneficiary understanding; a summary of actions taken to reduce those disparities; identification of the rationale for any differences that the Secretary deems necessary; and recommendations for legislative or other action needed to reduce such disparities. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report by March 31, 2005, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Test Review

The Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) required the Comptroller General to evaluate the efforts of the Secretary of Defense to disclose to the Department of Veterans Affairs all Department of Defense (DOD) records and information on Project 112. Such disclosure was to facilitate the provision of benefits by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to members of the armed forces who participated in that

project. The Comptroller General's review of DOD efforts recommends that the Department:

(1) Determine the feasibility of addressing unresolved issues associated with Project 112, and the appropriateness of and responsibility for reporting new information;

(2) Finalize and implement a plan for identifying DOD projects and tests conducted outside Project 112;

(3) Designate a single point of contact for providing information related to tests and potential exposures in and outside Project 112.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to implement these recommendations and submit a report on the status of the implementation by March 1, 2005, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Landstuhl Regional Medical Center Alteration

The committee notes that Landstuhl Regional Medical Center (LRMC) serves as the primary medical treatment center for casualties of United States operations within Europe, Southwest Asia and the Middle East. With the increased need to accommodate casualties from the global war on terrorism, LRMC requires climate control in certain patient facilities. The committee recommends $10.0 million for the purpose of providing an air conditioning system in patient care areas at LRMC.

Military-Civilian Education Programs Related to Sexual Health Decision-Making

The committee is aware of collaborative military-civilian education programs related to sexual health decision-making that demonstrates benefits through the reduction of unintended pregnancies and sexually transmitted infections among military personnel. The committee's support for such collaborative programs was demonstrated in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–772), which directed the Secretary of Defense to examine such programs and consider their use by the services. A military-civilian demonstration project was set up in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as a collaborative effort to encourage sexual integrity and reduce sexually transmitted infections and unplanned pregnancies in the military. As a continued measure of support for those efforts and to further encourage the Secretary to examine the progress of the military-civilian demonstration project, the committee recommends $0.2 million for the purposes of continuing the demonstration project and to encourage program expansion of sexual integrity training to other military installations.

Nurse Triage and Health Information Line Services

The committee is deeply committed to ensuring a smooth transition from the current TRICARE contracts to the new TRICARE contracts. In particular, the committee is concerned that there are no transition plans for nurse triage and health care information line services that were eliminated from the new TRICARE contracts. The committee believes that the elimination of this service from the regional contracts may have a significant impact on bene-

ficiary access to quality health care services. While the elimination of the nurse triage and health information line from the managed care support contracts may be prudent, the committee questions whether a return to an ad hoc, localized approach to providing triage and delivering health information will degrade uniformity and beneficiary satisfaction, and reduce the economies of scale and efficiencies across the military health system. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services with a comprehensive plan for ensuring a smooth transition for nurse triage and health information line services by December 31, 2004. The plan shall include a detailed explanation of the Department of Defense proposal to fulfill nurse triage and health information line services, specifically addressing: (1) the elements of the plan; (2) the timeline and current status for implementation; (3) an assessment of the military services' abilities to perform the services; (4) any gaps in fulfilling these services; (5) how the Department will ensure uniformity within and across regions; and (6) the estimated cost of providing these services, taking into consideration not only the direct cost of providing the service, but also the cost in terms of health outcomes, provision of needed care, avoidance of unnecessary care, and redirection of care to a more appropriate level.

Reserve Component Requirement for Medical and Dental Readiness Accountability

The committee continues to be concerned about the medical and dental readiness of the reserve component. The number of reserve component soldiers activated for deployment with disqualifying medical and dental conditions highlights the greater need for medical personnel and operational commanders to strictly monitor the individual medical readiness of these personnel. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure the military departments have systematic processes for providing appropriate health examinations and assessments and a means for capturing health information. The Department of Defense and the military services should consider the recommendations of the Armed Forces Epidemiological Board in its report of September 17, 2003, and consider modeling their programs after the Air Force Preventive Health Assessment and Individual Medical Readiness Program. Equally important, the Department should incentivize commanders and hold them accountable for enforcing and monitoring medical and dental requirements to ensure the medical readiness.

Resource Sharing Agreements

The committee is highly concerned about potential disruptions to providing quality patient care during the transition from the current TRICARE contracts to the new TRICARE contracts, especially as the carved out resource sharing programs evolve to new contractual agreements. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to take into account the use of all existing authorities to guarantee a smooth transition and to ensure that the new contracts: (1) are as cost effective as the current agreements, (2) provide for similar flexibility in staffing, and (3) provide uninterrupted

care for beneficiaries during the transition from existing to new contracts.

State-of-the-Art Mobility Equipment

The committee is strongly committed to ensuring that those who are injured or become ill serving the nation receive the finest rehabilitation efforts to maximize independence and accessibility. To that end, the committee supports efforts to provide service members, especially those individuals with orthopedic and neurologic disorders, with the finest mobility equipment. This equipment would allow users to walk on all surfaces and would be all-terrain in nature, providing maximum mobility. Equipment should (1) minimize any additional damage to the body as found in many instances with standard equipment, (2) be lightweight, and (3) require minimal energy expenditure.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ENHANCED HEALTH CARE BENEFITS FOR RESERVES

Section 701—Demonstration Project for TRICARE Coverage for Ready Reserve Members

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a three-year demonstration project to provide TRICARE coverage for Ready Reserve members not on active duty who are ineligible for employer-sponsored health benefits. The purpose of the demonstration would be to determine whether such coverage enhances medical readiness, recruiting, and retention of reserve component members. The Secretary would be required to report by April 1, 2007 on the results of the demonstration project to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. The section would require the Comptroller General to provide both periodic and final independent evaluations and reports of the demonstration project to the same committees.

Section 702—Comptroller General Report on the Cost and Feasibility of Providing Private Health Insurance Stipends for Members of the Ready Reserve

This section would require the Comptroller General to conduct a study of the cost and feasibility of providing a stipend to offset the cost of private health insurance to members of the reserves and their dependents, and to maintain continuity of health care for dependents when members are mobilized. The purpose of the study would be to examine recommendations for benefit amount; cost to the Department; potential effects on medical readiness, recruitment, and retention; participation rates; continuity of care; administrative and management considerations; and implications for employers.

Section 703—Improvement of Medical Services for Activated Members of the Ready Reserve and Their Families

This section would make permanent the now temporary eligibility of dependents of reserve component members to obtain TRICARE health care benefits up to 90 days before the date on

which the member's period of active duty is to begin. The section would allow the Secretary of Defense to provide health care benefits to service members up to 90 days before the date on which the period of active duty is to begin. The current temporary authority for this health care benefit expires on December 31, 2004.

Section 704—Modification of Waiver of Certain Deductibles Under TRICARE Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive deductible payments required by certain TRICARE programs for dependents of certain reserve component members who are called or ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days. This section would mitigate the financial hardship on activated reservists by allowing the TRICARE deductibles to be waived in cases where mobilized reservists had already paid deductibles for their civilian health care coverage.

Section 705—Authority for Payment by United States of Additional Amounts Billed by Health Care Providers to Activated Reserve Members

This section would protect a dependent of a member of a reserve component who is ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days in support of a contingency operation from paying a health care provider any amount above the TRICARE maximum allowable cost, known as balance billing. In such cases, the Secretary of Defense would have authority to pay the balance billing amount.

Section 706—Extension of Transitional Health Care Benefits After Separation from Active Duty

This section would make permanent the authority to provide Transition Assistance Medical Program (TAMP) benefits to service members and their dependents for up to 180 days following separation from active duty. Under current law, the authority to provide the 180-day TAMP benefits expires on December 31, 2004. The section also would require that the TAMP eligibility would cease prior to the 180–day limit if the beneficiaries acquire employer-provided health insurance. The section would limit the outlays associated with the TAMP benefits provided after January 1, 2005 to not more than $170.0 million.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER BENEFITS IMPROVEMENTS

Section 711—Coverage of Certain Young Children Under TRICARE Dental Program

This section would permit certain dependents of service members who die while serving on active duty or who die as a member of the Ready Reserve to enroll in the TRICARE Dental Program regardless of the dependent's dental plan enrollment status on the date of the service member's death. Many dependents, due to their young age, are not enrolled in the TRICARE Dental Plan. In cases where the service member dies, the child's nonparticipation due to their young age disadvantages them from future eligibility. This section would authorize these dependents to participate in the den-

tal plan in the same manner as other dependents of service members who die while on active duty.

Section 712—Comptroller General Report on Provision of Health and Support Services for Exceptional Family Member Program Enrollees

This section would require the Comptroller General to evaluate the effect of the Exceptional Family Member Program (EFMP) on health and support services in select civilian communities near military communities with a high concentration of EFMP enrollees that use federal, state and local health and support services. The study mandated under this section would pay special attention to:

(1) Identifying communities that have high concentrations of EFMP enrollees that use local health and support services;

(2) Evaluating the needs, if any, that are not met by federal, state and local health and support service for EFMP enrollees;

(3) Determining the burden, if any, placed on federal, state and local health and support services that provide care to EFMP enrollees;

(4) Evaluating TRICARE's ability to meet the needs of EFMP enrollees;

(5) Examining the reason for any limitations of TRICARE, the EFMP, and state and local health and support services in providing assistance to military families with EFMP members; and

(6) Providing recommendations for more effectively meeting the needs of EFMP enrollees.

The study would examine no less than four major communities where EFMP enrollees live and in which several major military installations exist, including installations from multiple military services. The Comptroller General shall submit his report of findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2005.

Section 713—Exceptional Eligibility for TRICARE Prime Remote

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive all restrictions with regard to TRICARE Prime Remote medical care coverage for active duty family members that reside at a remote location without regard to their sponsor's current or past assignment. Such a waiver would occur if the Secretary determines that there are extenuating circumstances such that waiving the restrictions is consistent with the intent of the law.

Section 714—Transition to Home Health Care Benefit Under Subacute Care Program

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to extend previous benefits for part-time or intermittent home health care after the transition to new managed care support contracts that result in a change in benefits.

Section 715—Requirement Relating to Prescription Drug Benefits for Medicare-Eligible Enrollees Under Defense Health Care Plans

This section would prohibit the prescription drug cost-sharing requirements for Medicare-eligible beneficiaries from being in excess of the cost-sharing requirements applicable to non-Medicare-eligible beneficiaries.

Section 716—Professional Accreditation of Military Dentists

This section would allow the secretaries of the military departments to authorize the treatment of no more than 2,000 children, under the age of 13 per year at certain military facilities offering residency programs in oral and maxillofacial surgery and orthodontics. This authority would maintain the viability of military dental training programs by allowing treatment of a pediatric population, as required by the American Dental Association for the accreditation of such programs.

Section 717—Addition of Certain Unremarried Former Spouses to Persons Eligible for Dental Insurance Plan of Retirees of the Uniformed Services

This section would permit certain unremarried former spouses of a member or former member to participate in the TRICARE Retiree Dental Program if they do not have dental coverage under an employer-sponsored health plan.

Section 718—Waiver of Collection of Payments Due from Certain Persons Unaware of Loss of CHAMPUS Eligibility

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the collection of certain payments for health care services provided during a period of ineligibility between July 1, 1999 and December 31, 2004 for beneficiaries under age 65 entitled to Medicare on the basis of disability or end stage renal disease. The waiver would apply to those beneficiaries who were unaware of their loss of eligibility to receive health benefits at the time they were received. The amendment would also require the Department of Defense to report quarterly to Congress regarding DOD efforts to identify the eligibility status of individuals for such benefits and the actions taken when individuals are determined to be ineligible.

SUBTITLE C—PLANNING, PROGRAMMING, AND MANAGEMENT

Section 721—Pilot Program for Transformation of Health Care Delivery

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a three-year pilot program to test a model for future health care delivery systems at one or more military installations where the military population is expected to expand. The model to be tested would focus on coordinating and leveraging the use of existing health care resources, to include federal, state, local, and contractor assets to meet increased health care requirements. Historically, the approach to providing military health care to military beneficiaries has centered on building a military treatment facility on the installation. With increasing requirements to repair or replace aging

military treatment facilities it may be more feasible and cost effective to leverage non- military health care resources. The Secretary would be required to submit an interim report by July 1, 2005 on the implementation plan for the pilot program and a final report by July 1, 2007 on the results of the pilot program to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Section 722—Study of Provision of Travel Reimbursement to Hospitals for Certain Military Disability Retirees

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of the feasibility and desirability of providing disability retirees travel and transportation benefits to receive medical treatment at military hospitals for two years after their retirement. The provision would direct the Secretary to report the results of the study to the congressional defense subcommittees by March 1, 2005.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 801—Rapid Acquisition Authority to Respond to Combat Emergencies

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a streamlined acquisition process for use when combat fatalities have occurred, the combatant commander has an urgent need of equipment, and delay would cause a continuation of combat fatalities. This process is to be used as a "quick start" bridge to the normal acquisition process.

The committee finds that the current Department of Defense acquisition system cannot respond in a timely manner to the combatant commander's urgent need of combat equipment. A rapid response to emergency combat situations would minimize combat fatalities when reacting to changes in the opponent's battlefield tactics.

Section 802—Defense Acquisition Workforce Changes

This section would amend various sections in chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code. First, it would align the provisions in chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code, relating to defense acquisition workforce with similar provisions contained in chapter 99 of title 5, United States Code. Second, it would authorize the Secretary of Defense to designate critical acquisition positions. Third, it would require the Secretary and scholarship participants to enter written agreements that identify obligations and consequences for breach of contract.

Section 803—Limitation on Task and Delivery Order Contracts

This section would amend section 2304a of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the Secretary of Defense has authority to enter into task and delivery contracts for a base period of up to five years, and that the contract may include additional options for a period of time as is deemed appropriate.

Section 804—Funding for Contract Cancellation Ceilings for Certain Multiyear Procurement Contracts

This section would amend section 2306b(g) and section 2306c(d) of title 10, United States Code, to require the head of the agency concerned to provide written notification, to the congressional defense committees, in those instances when cancellation costs that are above $100 million are not fully funded. The written notification would include a financial risk assessment for not fully funding the cancellation ceiling.

Section 805—Increased Threshold for Requiring Contractors to Provide Specified Employee Information to Cooperative Agreement Holders

This section would amend section 2416(d) of title 10, United States Code, by raising the $0.5 million reporting requirement to $1.0 million. Currently, the Secretary of Defense is required to provide some basic contractor information to certain organizations on contracts that have a value of $0.5 million or more.

Section 806—Extension of Authority for Use of Simplified Acquisition Procedures

This section would amend section 4202(e) of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–106) by extending until October 1, 2009, the time frame in which the secretary of an executive agency may use simplified procedures to purchase commercial items that have a value of $5.0 million or less.

Section 807—Authority to Adjust Acquisition-Related Dollar Thresholds for Inflation

This section would authorize the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council to amend the dollar threshold of procurement statutes in accordance with inflationary rates in order to maintain the constant dollar value of the threshold. In those instances where a procurement statute applies to a single agency, the secretary of that agency has authority to amend the dollar threshold. This section would require any proposed change to be coordinated with the Director of Office of Management and Budget and to be published in the Federal Register for public comment. This section would not authorize adjustments to the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. 276(a)), the Service Contract Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 351 et. seq), or title III of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2511 et seq).

SUBTITLE B—UNITED STATES DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE PROVISIONS

Section 811—Defense Trade Reciprocity

This section would establish a defense trade policy based upon the principle of fair trade and reciprocity. Further, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the offset regulations or policies of a foreign country are reduced to the same level as the domestic content requirements of the United States before the Secretary acquires defense products from a foreign firm operating in that country.

Offsets are defined as compensation required as a condition of purchase in government-. to-government or commercial sales of defense products or services. Therefore, in order to sell defense products to many of our foreign security partners, the majority of the manufacturing jobs and technology must be transferred to the purchasing country. In many cases, the value of the offset compensation of U.S. manufacturing jobs or technology exceeds the value of the product sold. The U.S. has no offset requirements for its foreign trading partners.

The committee is concerned that the cost of offsets in foreign export defense sales is the loss of U.S. subcontractor jobs and the loss of U.S. technology paid for by the U.S. taxpayer.

Section 812—Amendments to Domestic Source Requirements

This section would amend section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, also known as the Berry Amendment, to require the Secretary of Defense to notify Congress and the public when the Secretary exercises a waiver.

This section would also amend section 2533a to clarify the covered item described as clothing.

Section 813—Three-Year Extension of Restriction on Acquisition of Polyacrylonitrile (PAN) Carbon Fiber from Foreign Sources

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to delay for three years, phasing out of the restriction of acquisition of Polyacrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fiber from foreign sources.

The committee is aware of the January 2001 report that recommended phasing out of restriction on the acquisition of PAN carbon fiber form foreign sources.

The committee finds that the aerospace market conditions have significantly declined since September 11, 2001, and the rationale for phasing out of the restriction is no longer valid.

Section 814—Grant Program for Defense Contractors to Implement Strategies to Avoid Outsourcing of Jobs

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to award grants to qualified defense contractors in order to assist the contractor in avoiding the outsourcing of jobs. Grant funds would be used to implement strategies that would enable defense contractors to retain domestic employees. Examples of such strategies include retraining employees or plant upgrades. This provision would limit the grant to fifty percent of the cost of the strategy and require

that the proposed strategy would retain at least ten domestic jobs dedicated to the performance of a defense contract.

Section 815—Preference for Domestic Freight Forwarding Services

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to grant preferences to freight forwarder companies owned and controlled by U.S. citizens that offer fair and reasonable rates in the award of transportation service contracts for transportation services to, from, or within Iraq or Afghanistan.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER ACQUISITION MATTERS

Section 821—Sustainment and Modernization Plans for Existing Systems while Replacement Systems are Under Development

This section would require the Department of Defense to plan and budget for the sustainment and modernization of current military systems until such time that the replacement system under development is fielded and assumes responsibility for the mission.

The committee is aware of the fiscal realities that make it difficult to fund simultaneously the development of transformational future military systems and the maintenance and sustainment of current military systems. In general, the military services map out program strategies for sustainment and modernization. However, significant gaps exist. In 2003, the General Accounting Office reported that 15 of the 25 systems reviewed had insufficient funding requested by the Department of Defense or projected in the Future Years Defense Program to execute the military services' program strategies to sustain or replace their equipment.

It is the responsibility of the Department of Defense to develop military systems that provide the armed forces with superiority over potential adversaries. However, funding for transformational future systems that are decades from field operational capability must not preclude the funding required to sustain and modernize the current force.

The committee is concerned that escalating cost growth in development programs and accelerating transformation is funded by underinvestment in the current force which may undermine the readiness and capabilities of the forces that we must rely upon for the foreseeable future.

Section 822—Review and Demonstration Project Relating to Contractor Employees

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of Department of Defense policies, procedures, and practices relating to employees of defense contractors and their subcontractors. Specifically, it would require the Secretary to review DOD policies, procedures, and practices of ensuring compliance with Executive Order 12989, as amended by Executive Order 13286, which prohibits the secretaries of executive agencies from contracting with employers who hire or recruit unauthorized aliens. The committee is aware of numerous instances in which the Department contracted with vendors who employed unauthorized aliens for work on military installations. The review should identify problems with existing security policies, procedures, and practices, as well as

develop and implement reforms to strengthen, upgrade, and improve the overall DOD contracting process. This section would require the Secretary to conduct the review within 180 days of enactment of this Act.

This section would also require the Secretary to conduct a demonstration program for the procurement of military construction, renovation, maintenance or repair service on military installations, under which significant weight would be given to bidding contractors offering effective, reliable staffing plans that ensure all employees are properly authorized to be employed in the United States and properly qualified to perform the services required under the contract. The Secretary shall report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2005, the benefits of the demonstration program and the extent to which lessons learned from the program should be incorporated throughout DOD procurements.

Section 823—Defense Acquisition Workforce Limitation and Reports

This section would require the Department of Defense to reduce the defense acquisition workforce personnel by five percent on or before October 1, 2005. This provision would also require the General Accounting Office and Defense Acquisition University to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the current status of the Defense Acquisition Workforce by March 1, 2005.

Section 824—Provision of Information to Congress to Enhance Transparency in Contracting

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide information on contract or task or delivery orders to the chairman or ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee or the House Armed Services Committee, within 14 days of the request.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

National Defense University

The committee commends the National Defense University (NDU) for its work in scenario modeling and simulation methodologies. The committee encourages the NDU to continue its work by employing advanced technologies that will increase the effectiveness, realism and creativity of these scenarios. The committee notes that the immersive technologies being developed by the Department of Defense are similar to some advanced technologies that the entertainment industry employs and encourages contact between the Department and entertainment industry technologists as a means of fully exploiting such technologies to the benefit of the armed forces.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 901—Change in Title of Secretary of the Navy to Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would redesignate the title of the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. This provision would formally recognize the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy over both the Navy and Marine Corps.

Section 902—Transfer of Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs from National Defense University to United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission

This section would transfer the Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs at the National Defense University, established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission, established in the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398).

Section 903—Transfer to the Secretary of the Army of Responsibility for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program

This section would transfer oversight of the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) program (formerly the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment program) from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to the Secretary of the Army not later than January 1, 2005. Additionally, this section would provide for management of the program as a part of the Department of the Army organization for management of the chemical weapons demilitarization program as specified in section 1521(e) of title 50, United States Code. Finally, this section would require the Army to fully implement the alternative technologies previously selected for the destruction of lethal chemical munitions at Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado, and Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky.

Section 142 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) provides that the Program Manager, ACWA shall manage the development and testing (including demonstration and pilot-scale testing) of technologies for the destruction of lethal chemical munitions that are potential or demonstrated alternatives to the baseline program, which uses incineration for destruction of the stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions. This provision would further require that the program manager shall act independently of the Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization (PMCD) and shall report to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology.

Numerous General Accounting Office (GAO) reports and testimony to Congress state that effective management of the chemical demilitarization program has been hindered by its complex management structure. GAO specifically cites the division of program responsibility between the PMCD, who reports to the Secretary of the Army as executive agent for the program and is responsible for destruction of all elements of the chemical weapons stockpile ex-

cept that stored at the Blue Grass Army Depot and the Pueblo Chemical Army Depot; and the Project Manager(PM), ACWA, who reports directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and has responsibility only for destruction of those parts of the stockpile stored at Blue Grass and Pueblo. In 2003 the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) (USD (AT&L)), established the Chemical Material Agency, which is responsible for management of the chemical weapons destruction program and operation of the chemical weapons destruction plant facilities and stockpile storage sites. With the concurrence of the USD (AT&L), the Secretary of the Army assigned the PM, ACWA, as the Director of the Chemical Materiel Agency. The committee believes that the establishment of the new management structure, which brings together all elements of the chemical weapons demilitarization program under a single activity, will eliminate many of the management complexities cited by the GAO, contribute to the elimination of duplicative management overhead and support, and ensure more efficient management of the total program, while at the same time addressing the equities and concerns of those sites using assembled chemical weapons alternatives for destruction of the stockpile

Section 904—Modification of Obligated Service Requirements under National Security Education Program

This section would modify the service requirements to ensure that recipients of scholarships and fellowships obtain employment in a federal national security position that utilizes the unique language and region expertise acquired by the recipient. This section would also set 12 months as the minimum length of federal service for all recipients. This section would also require the recipient to gain employment in an approved position within three years of completion of the scholarship, or within two years in the case of a recipient of a fellowship.

Section 905—Change of Membership of Certain Councils

This section would make the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy a statutory member of the Nuclear Weapons Council and implement the corresponding technical changes in law. Current law (10 U.S.C. 179) establishes the Nuclear Weapons Council to, among other things, coordinate programming and budget matters pertaining to nuclear weapons programs between the Department of Defense and Department of Energy and to provide broad guidance on nuclear research and development priorities. By statute, the council comprises the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics; the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and the Undersecretary of Energy for Nuclear Security. As a result of the congressionally-. mandated Nuclear Posture Review, which set out a new course in strategic policy, the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy has come to play an increasing role in coordinating nuclear weapons policy and making recommendations to the President.

Section 906—Actions to Prevent the Abuse of Detainees

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe policies regarding procedures for the Armed Forces, other elements of the Department of Defense, and Department of Defense contractor personnel in order to prevent the abuse of prisoners held by the United States as part of the Global War on Terrorism. The Secretary would be required to issue such policies within 120 days of the enactment of this Act, provide those policies to Congress immediately, and report to Congress on their implementation one year after their issuance.

Section 907—Responses to Congressional Inquiries

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, or any other official of the Department of Defense, to respond to written requests for information made by the respective Chairmen of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services in writing within 21 days of the transmission of such a request.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained $852.7 million for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to $160.2 million, for operational tempo which is included within the operating budgets of the military services. The budget is organized in fiscal year 2005 to address three broad national priorities: (1) demand reduction; (2) domestic support; and (3) international support, intelligence and technology.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2005 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows:

FY05 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request	$852,697
Demand Reduction	122.209
Domestic Support	207,998
International Support, Intelligence and Technology	522,590
Recommended Decreases:	
Intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance and tanker support	2,000
Tethered Aerostat Radar System	5,000
Recommended Increases:	
Southwest Border Fence	5,000
Northern Command Counter-Narcotics Support	2,000
Recommendation	852,697

Items of Special Interest

Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and tanker support

The budget request contained $2.7 million for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and tanker support. The budget re-

quest for this activity in fiscal year 2004 was 0.4 million. Reductions in support activities are planned in light of other worldwide commitments and performance of depot-level maintenance on related assets.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $2.0 million for this activity.

Northern Command counter-narcotics support

The budget request contained $9.1 million to support the United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) counter-narcotics missions, including those which are performed through Joint Task Force-6 located at Fort Bliss, Texas.

The committee is concerned that the current funding levels will diminish the ability to provide additional mobile training teams. The mobile training teams help train federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies across the country on a wide variety of subjects related to narcotics interdiction. Without the proper funding, the committee is concerned that law enforcement agencies will not be able to develop the critical skills necessary for effective counter-narcotics law enforcement, and in assisting in war against terrorism in the homeland.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $2 million for additional mobile training teams along with the attendant headquarters' support for this enhanced mission.

The committee recognizes that, in order to utilize these funds, Joint Task Force-6 will need to be able to utilize authority provided by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). Section 1022 of that bill provided authority to joint task forces of the Department of Defense that provide support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-drug activities to also provide support to those agencies conducting counter-. terrorism activities. The committee understands that the Department of Defense has not yet issued policy guidance that would allow combatant commands and military services to use this authority. The committee urges the Department to issue such guidance immediately to permit intended missions to go forward.

Southwest Border Fence

As part of the San Diego 14-Mile Border Infrastructure System, the Southwest Border Fence has served as an invaluable counter-narcotics resource for United States Border Patrol agents since the project's inception in 1997. However, the border fence construction project is still under construction, and the area remains one of the nation's most heavily utilized drug smuggling corridors. Since 1998, the California National Guard and other military personnel have been responsible for fence construction and general support of the border infrastructure system. Completion of the border fence would constitute a cohesive barrier against vehicle and pedestrian narcotics trafficking and allow counter-drug assets to be redeployed in other areas.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for this purpose.

Tethered Aerostat Radar System

The budget request contained $32.3 million for the operation of the Tethered Aerostat Radar System at multiple locations in the United States. Of the $32.3 million requested, $6.7 million was included for the procurement of additional spare parts.

The committee recommends a decrease of $5.0 million dollars in the procurement component of this request. The committee notes that the Congress has not received the detailed analysis it has requested to justify the continued increases in this program.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Airlift Support for Homeland Defense Missions

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) has not adequately considered the need for airlift support to speed uniquely capable DOD assets to wherever needed to perform urgent homeland defense missions. The Department has developed considerable expertise across a range of disparate skills that may be needed in a homeland defense mission, but this expertise is scattered in various locations across the country. The committee is aware of a proposal to provide such support through the use of C–130 equipped Air National Guard units and believes that the proposal has merit. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report by March 31, 2005, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, his views on whether the Commander, Northern Command should have dedicated Air National Guard C–130 units at his disposal for the purpose of responding to attacks or incidents involving weapons of mass destruction.

Civil Reserve Air Fleet

The committee understands that the Secretary of Defense requires that commercial air lines participating in the civil reserve air fleet receive at least 60 percent of its air transportation revenues from sources other than the Department of Defense. The committee is concerned that the Secretary is not enforcing this requirement. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary to enforce this requirement, and directs the Secretary to report to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee when this business practice is not followed, with an explanation as to why it was not followed.

Defense Transformation

The committee supports the efforts of the Department of Defense to transform the armed forces into capabilities based, networked joint forces that are rapidly deployable and more lethal than today's highly capable military. Despite the Department's success in recent combat operations, the committee recognizes that the Department's transformation goals are long term, evolving objectives that will be very difficult to achieve without a joint strategy to guide it.

The committee is encouraged that the Army has embarked on an aggressive transformation program that encompasses all aspects of the Army, including personnel policies, unit structure, doctrine,

and equipment. While the committee has concerns about the development strategy for the Future Combat System, addressed elsewhere in this report, the committee believes the Army's plan to create more combat power by fielding at least 45 active maneuver brigades is the correct approach.

Similarly, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force have embraced transformation as an objective, and have proposed several specific concepts as transformational. The committee is concerned that each military service has embarked on its own transformational campaign, without an enforceable, integrated joint forces roadmap to ensure the services' plans are mutually supportive and overlap only when necessary. For that reason, the committee questions the services' plans to sustain excessive headquarters structure despite the services' increasing requests for information technology funding purportedly designed to flatten combat organizations.

Accordingly, the committee believes that the Joint Forces Command should continue to evolve as the principal coordinator of service transformation efforts.

Global War on Terrorism

The committee applauds and supports the valiant efforts of the men and women of America's armed forces who are prosecuting the global war on terrorism in increasingly hostile areas overseas. The committee believes that the war should be fought on the enemy's home ground, and does not believe that a more passive strategy of disengagement would be a prudent policy for the safety of the United States and its citizens. In that regard, the committee supports a number of initiatives intended to enhance the ability of the armed forces to respond to the demands of the global war on terror. These initiatives range from measures intended to speed the development and fielding of force protection measures urgently needed by our forces in Iraq, to measures that will enhance the Special Operations Command's ability to work in a variety of settings. The committee understands the prominent roles played by other agencies in this fight, particularly the Departments of State and Homeland Security, but the committee continues to believe that the Department of Defense has performed and will continue to perform the most critical missions in the global war on terror.

Homeland Defense Forces

In hearings over the past two years, the committee has reviewed the Department of Defense's plans for use of the National Guard in homeland defense missions and encouraged the Department to include the Department of Homeland Security in this review. Since the National Guard is a strategic national force that is frequently deployed, the committee is concerned that homeland defense and homeland security plans, which are dependent on National Guard units, must consider the need for contingency assets.

The committee is pleased to note the testimony of the Director, National Guard Bureau, describing his efforts to ensure that National Guard assets are continuously available for homeland defense missions. The committee is also heartened by the concept of the National Guard chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear

(CBRNE) enhanced response force packages, which would augment existing civil support teams in each of the 12 Federal Emergency Management Agency regions.

The committee is interested to learn whether the ongoing force rebalancing measures will yield sufficient available assets, given recent overseas deployments, and whether the Department should consider augmenting the capabilities of state defense forces authorized by title 32, United States Code, with available training opportunities and surplus equipment.

In that regard, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director, National Guard Bureau, to report any measures necessary to enhance the capabilities of the National Guard to perform homeland defense and homeland security missions. This report should address any unmet requirements related to CBRNE enhanced response teams and any necessary measures to augment the capabilities of state defense forces, and be provided to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee by December 31, 2004.

Wisconsin Project's International Export Control Center

The committee notes that Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control began a public-. private initiative to improve export controls in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. This initiative was supported by the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Customs Service. The committee further notes that the Wisconsin Project is the leading source of unclassified information on world entities suspected of building weapons of mass destruction or have links to terrorism. The Wisconsin Project's database lists the activities of more than 3,700 suspected individuals and organizations.

Recognizing the importance of tracking and updating information related to entities which are attempting to build weapons of mass destruction, the committee believes the Wisconsin Project should expand its efforts to help foreign governments improve their export control mechanisms.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an additional $1.3 million to the Defense Threat Reduction Agency for the expansion of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control's International Export Control Center.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1001—Transfer Authority

This section would provide fiscal year 2005 transfer authority to the Department of Defense for amounts up to $3.0 billion. This would include $500 million of specific transfer authority between the services' active component and reserve component accounts.

Section 1002—Budget Justification Documents for Operation and Maintenance

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to include in congressional justification materials for the operation and maintenance budget request the baseline costs for programs in which there is an identified program increase or decrease. The Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) failed to identify these baseline costs, despite the direction to do so in the committee report on the H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106).

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to include in the operation and maintenance justification documents the amount of funds requested for personal service contracts and the number of personal service contractors expected to be compensated at an annual rate in excess of the annual rate of pay for the Vice President.

This section would also require the Secretary of the Navy to distinguish the cost of ship depot-level maintenance and repair and ship intermediate maintenance when presenting justification material to support the budget request for operation and maintenance funds. Specifically, the Secretary would be required to present to Congress separate sub-activity groups for ship depot operations and ship intermediate operations. The Secretary failed to maintain separate sub-activity groups when presenting the justification of estimates for fiscal year 2005 despite the direction to do so in the committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106).

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to include, in the justification materials for the operations and maintenance budget request, the average civilian salary cost by sub-activity group as a component of the personnel summary. The Secretary of Defense Comptroller) failed to identify such costs, despite the direction to do so in the committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106).

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2006, that catalogues the elements of "other costs" and "other contracts", which are currently used in justification materials for the budget request. Although the committee directed in the committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) to provide this report by October 21, 2003, the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) failed to do so.

Section 1003—Retention of Fees from Intellectual Property Licenses

The section would allow the Department of Defense to establish programs to license trademarks and insignias, and to retain associated fees. Fees received from the trademark licenses would be used to cover the costs incurred in securing trademark registrations. Any funds in excess of such costs would be available for military personnel recruiting and retention activities, as well as morale, welfare, and recreation activities.

Section 1004—Authority to Waive Claims of the United States when Amounts Recoverable are Less than Costs of Collection

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense or his designee to waive indebtedness when the cost of processing the transaction exceeds the amounts recoverable. The maximum amount that may be waived under this statue would be the micro-purchase threshold, currently $2,500.

Section 1005—Repeal of Funding Restrictions Concerning Development of Medical Countermeasures against Biological Warfare Threats

This section would repeal section 2370a of title 10, United States Code, which requires that, of the funds allocated for the medical component of the biological defense research program within the Department of Defense, no more than 80 percent may be obligated or expended for product development or research, development, test, and evaluation of medical countermeasures against near-term validated biowarfare threat agents. Additionally, no more than 20 percent may be obligated or expended for product development or research, development, test, and evaluation, of medical countermeasures against mid-term or far-term validated biowarfare agents.

The current law defines biological warfare threats primarily in intelligence terms. The committee believes that this is overly restrictive because intelligence on biological warfare threats is inherently limited due to the ease with which biological warfare programs can be concealed and dangerous pathogens and toxins can be acquired. The situation is further exacerbated by the rapid advancements in bio-technology that are widely available throughout the world. Additionally, the current law categorizes biological warfare agents by the time period in which they may become threats: near-, mid-, and far-term. For the same reasons that make it difficult to define biological warfare agents in terms of available intelligence, the committee believes that it is difficult to project the time periods during which such agents might become threats.

In responding to such threats, the committee believes that more flexibility is needed in the medical components of the biological defense research program.

Section 1006—Report on Budgeting for Exchange Rates for Foreign Currency Fluctuations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2004, on the foreign currency exchange rate projection used in the annual Department of Defense budget.

SUBTITLE B—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1011—Authority for Award of Contracts for Ship Dismantling on Net-Cost Basis

This section would allow the Secretary of the Navy to accept bids for domestic warship dismantling contracts based on the estimated

cost of performance as well as the estimated value of scrap and reusable equipment. This section would also allow contractors to retain proceeds from the sale of such scrap and reusable equipment. With the price of steel at very high levels, this provision is intended to allow for greater efficiencies in the disposal of obsolete former naval vessels. Nothing in the provision alters any environmental requirements pertaining to disposals.

Section 1012—Independent Study to Assess Cost Effectiveness of the Navy Ship Construction Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an entity independent of the Department of Defense to conduct a study of the cost-effectiveness of the ship construction program of the Navy. The study would look at near-term improvements to make shipbuilding more efficient, and long-term improvement to make the United States shipbuilding industry commercially competitive in the global market. This provision would require the Secretary to submit the report to the congressional defense committees by June 1, 2005.

Section 1013—Authority to Transfer Specified Former Naval Vessels to Certain Foreign Countries

This section would authorize the transfer of three obsolete former naval vessels to Chile, Portugal, and to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States.

Section 1014—Limitation on Leasing of Foreign-Built Vessels

This section would prohibit the secretary of a military department from entering into a contract for a lease or charter of a vessel for a term of more than 12 months (including all options to renew or extend the contract) if the hull, or superstructure of the vessel is constructed in a foreign shipyard. The President may waive this prohibition if he determines it is in the national security interests of the United States.

SUBTITLE C—SUNKEN MILITARY CRAFT

Sections 1021–28—Protection of Sunken Military Craft

This section would protect sunken United States military vessels, aircraft, and spacecraft, as well as the remains and personal effects of their crews, from salvage, recovery, or other disturbance without proper authorization from the secretary of the military department concerned.

Thousands of U.S. and foreign sunken military craft now lie within and beyond U.S. internal waters, the U.S. territorial sea, and the U.S. contiguous zone. Because of recent advances in science and technology, many of these sunken state craft have become accessible to scientists, researchers, salvors, treasure-hunters, and others. The unauthorized disturbance or recovery of these sunken state craft and any remains of their crews and passengers is a growing concern both within the United States and internationally. In addition to deserving respect as gravesites, theses sunken craft may contain objects of a sensitive, archaeological, or historical nature. They often also contain unexploded ordnance or

other substances, including fuel oil and other hazardous liquids, which could pose a danger to human health and the marine environment if disturbed. This section would clarify the circumstances under which sunken military craft, entitled to sovereign immunity when they sank, remain the property of the flag state until officially abandoned. This section would also encourage and authorize the negotiation of international agreements with other nations to protect sunken military state craft and, through reciprocal treatment, to protect sunken U.S. warships.

Finally, this section would allow the secretary of the military department concerned to issue and enforce permits for activities directed at sunken U.S. military craft, including contract salvage. It would not invalidate any permitting system currently in place nor would it affect any prior lawful transfer or express abandonment of title to any sunken military craft.

SUBTITLE D—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1031—Continuation of Authority to Use Department of Defense Funds for Unified Counter-Drug and Counter-Terrorism Campaign in Colombia

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use funds available for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities to provide assistance to the government of Colombia to support not only a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking, but to also support a unified campaign against activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations.

Section 1032—Limitation on Number of United States Military Personnel in Colombia

This section would limit the number of United States military personnel in the Republic of Colombia to 500 at any given time. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to exclude certain military personnel from the limitation, including those personnel engaged in rescue efforts, members of the armed forces assigned to the U.S. Embassy in Colombia, members of the armed forces participating in relief efforts, non-operational transient military personnel, and members of the armed forces making a port call from a military vessel in Colombia.

SUBTITLE E—REPORTS

Section 1041—Study of Continued Requirement for Two-Crew Manning for Ballistic Missile Submarines

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the current status of the requirement for two-man crewing of fleet ballistic missile submarines.

Section 1042—Study of Effect on Defense Industrial Base of Elimination of United States Domestic Firearms Manufacturing Base

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, within 60 days of enactment, a report detailing the impact on military readiness and the defense

industrial infrastructure of the elimination of the United States domestic firearms manufacturing base as a result of ongoing civil litigation.

Section 1043—Study of Extent and Quality of Training Provided to Members of the Armed Services to Prepare for Post-Conflict Operations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to identify and assess the training that members of the armed forces assigned to support contingency operations receive in post-conflict operations. The Secretary would further be required to submit a report on his findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services no later than March 15, 2005.

SUBTITLE F—SECURITY MATTERS

Section 1051—Use of National Driver Register for Personnel Security Investigations and Determinations

This section would authorize federal agencies to access the National Driver Register for use in personnel security investigations with regard to federal employment. The Secretary of Transportation and the chief driver licensing official in each state, who provides driver licensing records to the National Driver Register, cooperatively manage the system. Access to the information is currently provided to multiple federal agencies.

Section 1052—Standards for Disqualification from Eligibility for Department of Defense Security Clearances

This section would amend section 986 of title 10, United States Code, to allow decisions on granting meritorious waivers related to the granting of a security clearance to be delegated by the Secretary of Defense or the secretary of a military department to appropriate subordinates. This change is intended to improve the operation of the current program and decrease the time required to adjudicate security clearance eligibility without creating any additional risk to national security.

SUBTITLE G—TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

Section 1061—Use of Military Aircraft to Transport Mail to and from Overseas Locations

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense authority to use military aircraft to transport mail and parcels to, from, and between overseas locations. This authority, however, would be limited to the following circumstances:

(1) There is excess space on a scheduled military flight;

(2) There is no overall cost increase to the Department of Defense or the United States Postal Service;

(3) The United States Transportation Command would pay the cost of transporting mail from United States Postal Service, to customs clearance facilities, and military debarkation locations at rates not to exceed Department of Transportation rates for commercial airlines;

(4) There is no degradation of mail service; and

(5) There is no diversion of such military aircraft during contingencies or other events.

Section 1062—Reorganization and Clarification of Certain Provisions Relating to Control and Supervision of Transportation within the Department of Defense

This section would amend sections 4744 through 4747 of title 10, United States Code, by moving these sections from chapter 47 to chapter 26. This section would also repeal sections 9741, 9743, and 9746 of title 10, United States Code. These changes reflect the Secretary of Defense's role in transportation versus the individual role of the service secretaries.

Section 1063—Determination of Whether Private Air Carriers are Controlled by United States Citizens for Purposes of Eligibility for Government Contract for Transportation of Passengers or Supplies

This section would amend section 2710 of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–11), to clarify that the Secretary of Transportation is responsible for certifying whether an air carrier is effectively controlled by citizens of the United States.

Section 1064—Evaluation of Whether to Prohibit Certain Offers for Transportation of Security-Sensitive Cargo

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to evaluate whether, and under what circumstances, it would be appropriate to limit competition for domestic freight transportation of security-sensitive cargo to motor carriers that are not part of a group of motor carriers under common financial or administrative control. The Secretary would be required to submit the evaluation to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee by January 1, 2005.

SUBTITLE H—OTHER MATTERS DEFENSE TO ENGAGE IN COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES AS SECURITY FOR INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES ABROAD

This section would provide for a two year extension of the authority of the Secretary of Defense to engage in commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities.

Section 1072—Assistance for Study of Feasibility of Biennial International Air Trade Show in the United States and for Initial Implementation

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to select and provide assistance to a community in conducting a joint study to determine the feasibility of establishing an international air trade show in that community. The committee believes that international air trade shows are an important component of efforts to demonstrate the effectiveness of United States military equipment to other nations and seeks to increase the importance of U.S. based air trade shows in the conduct of international aerospace trade.

This provision would also require that the Secretary make his selection through competitive procedures, while giving preference to communities that already host an air show and have demonstrated a history of supporting air shows with local resources.

Section 1073—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments to existing law of a non-substantive basis.

Section 1074—Commission on the Long-Term Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States

This section would establish a new commission to review the long-term implementation of the Nuclear Posture Review.

Section 1075—Liability Protection for Certain Department of Defense Volunteers Working in the Maritime Environment

This section would remedy an inadvertent oversight in existing law by extending to volunteers working in the maritime training environment the same status and legal protections presently available to volunteers working on land-based assignments.

Section 1076—Transfer of Historic F3A–1 Brewster Corsair Aircraft

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer ownership of a historic F3A–1 Brewster Corsair aircraft to a private citizen. The aircraft would be transferred in its current unflyable, "as is" condition, and at no cost to the United States.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

OVERVIEW

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), Congress enacted the Department of Defense National Security Personnel System (NSPS), as chapter 99 of title 5, United States Code. In doing so, Congress created a more flexible and rewarding personnel system for the Department. The Secretary of Defense tasked the Secretary of the Navy with responsibility for designing and implementing a human resources management system in accordance with NSPS. The committee strongly supports the Secretary of the Navy's outreach to unions, executive agencies, and Congress, as he fulfills this task. The Secretary of the Navy has, thus far, promoted a thorough and thoughtful plan, with continued communication and collaboration with the employees and their representatives to ensure a responsible human resources management system.

In light of the Department's current effort to implement NSPS, the committee recommends only minor changes to civilian personnel policy. These changes, however, exemplify the committee's continued respect for the civilian workforce and the need to reward properly individual accomplishments.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1101—Payment of Federal Employee Health Benefit Premiums for Mobilized Federal Employees

This section would provide a federal government employee, who is a member of a reserve component ordered to active duty in support of a contingency and placed on leave without pay, to continue to receive coverage under the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program for 24 months. This section would also authorize the executive agency authority to pay both the employee's share and the agency's share of the premiums for continued coverage up to 24 months.

Section 1102—Foreign Language Proficiency Pay

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to offer special pay to a Department of Defense employee who is certified to be proficient in a language deemed necessary for national security interests and whose duties require such language proficiency. This section would repeal the requirement that the individual be assigned duties during a contingency operation in section 1596a of title 10, United States Code.

Section 1103—Pay Parity for Civilian Intelligence Personnel

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use a performance appraisal system for personnel in the defense intelligence senior executive service to ensure pay parity for all personnel in the defense senior executive service.

Section 1104—Pay Parity for Senior Executives in Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to adjust the pay cap for Department of Defense nonappropriated fund executives to ensure that the compensation paid to such employees remains consistent with the Senior Executive Service employees.

Section 1105——Prohibition of Unauthorized Wearing or Use of Civilian Medals or Decorations

This section would prohibit any person from merchandising or wearing a Department of Defense civilian medal or decoration without the written permission of the Secretary of Defense. This section would also authorize the Attorney General to initiate a civil proceeding in a United States district court to enjoin the prohibited practice.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

Section 1201—Documentation of Conditions in Iraq under Former Dictatorial Government as Part of Transition to Post-Dictatorial Government

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to expedite, where practical, the review of documents seized from the Iraqi government and Ba'ath Socialist Party of Iraq relating to the functioning, crimes, and atrocities of those entities against the Iraqi people during the regime of Saddam Hussein. The Secretary would be further directed to transfer those documents, as appropriate, to Iraqi entities in Iraq dedicated to documenting the crimes and nature of the Hussein regime, to serve as a reminder of the dangers of tolerating dictatorship in Iraq. Analysts have found that such efforts in other post-dictatorial countries can contribute to the reconstruction and reconciliation process. The committee believes Iraqi democracy would benefit from a similar effort.

Section 1202—Support of Military Operations to Combat Terrorism

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense, during fiscal year 2005, to expend up to $25.0 million in operation and maintenance funds authorized by Title XV of this Act to provide support to foreign forces, irregular forces, or individuals who actively support United States special operations forces engaged in military operations against terrorists. The section would not authorize U.S. special operations forces to engage in covert actions, as defined by the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413b(e)). Thus, the intent is to provide additional resources to special operations forces engaged in clandestine operations, during which they often operate without the support of larger military units, but not to allow U.S. special operations forces to engage in activities traditionally performed by the intelligence community under title 50, United States Code. This section would require quarterly reports on how this authority is used.

Section 1203—Commander's Emergency Response Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to $300.0 million in operations and maintenance funding available to the Secretary from funds made available by Title XV of the Act for the Commander's Emergency Response Program, under which commanders in Iraq and Afghanistan receive funds for use in small humanitarian and reconstruction projects in the areas in which they are deployed. The section requires quarterly reports on the source and use of funds under this section.

Section 1204—Status of Iraqi Security Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act, to submit to Congress a strategic plan setting forth the manner and timeline under which the United States will achieve the goal of establishing viable and professional Iraqi security forces. The Secretary would further be required to submit updates on progress implementing the strategic plan every 90 days thereafter.

Section 1205—Guidance and Report Required on Contractors Supporting Deployed Forces in Iraq

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 90 days of the date of the enactment of this Act, to issue guidance on the management of contractors that support deployed military forces and to direct the secretaries of the military departments to develop procedures to implement that guidance. The Secretary of Defense would further be required to report to Congress within 30 days of issuing the aforementioned guidance on how it addressed certain issues and to establish and implement a process for collecting information on contractors providing certain security services in Iraq.

Section 1206—Findings and Sense of Congress Concerning Army Specialist Joseph Darby

This section would make a series of findings regarding the importance of Specialist Joseph Darby's actions in reporting abuses at the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq and expresses the sense of Congress that Specialist Darby should be commended for his actions.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1211—Assignment of Allied Naval Personnel to Submarine Safety Programs

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to assign military personnel from NATO countries and other countries, including Australia, Sweden, South Korea, and Japan, to United States commands for the purpose of working on the standardization, development, and interoperability of submarine safety and rescue systems and procedures. The Department of Defense requested authority to assign foreign naval personnel to the International Submarine Escape and Rescue Liaison Office within Allied Submarine Command.

Section 1212—Expansion of Entities of the People's Republic of China Subject to Certain Presidential Authorities when Operating in the United States

This section would expand the definition of a "Communist Chinese military company" as defined in the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261), to include Chinese firms owned or operated by a ministry of the People's Republic of China or an entity affiliated with the defense industrial base of the People's Republic of China, such as the China State Shipbuilding Corporation or the China Overseas Ship-

ping Corporation. Existing law only applies the definition to entities owned or operated by the People's Liberation Army, thereby excluding a class of firms engaged in Chinese military modernization.

Section 1213—Report by President on Global Peace Operations Initiative

This section would require the President to report to Congress on the Global Peace Operations Initiative, a new program announced by the administration after the submission of the budget request.

On April 29, 2004, administration officials briefed committee staff on the Global Peace Operations Initiative. In general, the initiative is a joint venture between the Department of Defense and the Department of State to train and equip roughly 75,000 foreign military personnel in peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations over five years. The administration further proposed legislative authority for the Department of Defense to spend up to $100 million in operations and maintenance funding on training foreign military forces, either by transferring those funds to the Department of State or conducting the training itself. Over the next five years, the administration estimated that the total cost of the initiative would be $606 million and that the Department of Defense would be responsible for roughly eighty percent of the total. However, the administration did not request those funds for the Department of Defense in the fiscal year 2005 budget request and that they are not currently programmed in the five-year defense plan.

In general, the committee supports the goals of the Global Peace Operations Initiative. However, it is concerned about the process by which the administration seeks to fund the program and move it forward. Historically, the Department of State has trained and equipped foreign military forces for the United States under title 22 of the U.S. Code, which restricts the kinds of training that can be provided and the countries to which it can be provided in order to ensure that such activities are consistent with U.S. human rights practices and foreign policy. In this case, however, the administration proposed exempting the Global Peace Operations Initiative from those legal constraints and requested authority to use Department of Defense funding intended to pay for the operations and maintenance of U.S. forces. As a result, any use of the authority could mean depriving U.S. forces of the resources that the administration had requested, and which Congress had authorized and appropriated, for their operations and maintenance. Therefore, the committee recommends against granting the authority requested. Instead, it recommends a provision that would seek additional information on the Global Peace Operations Initiative.

Section 1214—Procurement Sanctions against Foreign Persons that Transfer Certain Defense Articles and Services to the People's Republic of China

This section would make it the policy of the United States to prevent destabilizing arms transfers to the People's Republic of China by denying Department of Defense procurement contracts to foreign companies that sell China items similar to those found on the

U.S. Munitions List. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to publish a list of such companies in the Federal Register.

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

OVERVIEW

The budget request included $409.2 million for Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs with the states of the former Soviet Union for fiscal year 2005. This is $41.6 million less than requested for fiscal year 2004 and $39.4 million less than was appropriated for fiscal year 2004. The funding request breaks out as follows: $58.5 million for strategic offensive arms elimination in Russia; $48.7 million for nuclear weapons storage security in Russia; $26.2 million for nuclear weapons transportation security in Russia; $158.4 million for chemical weapons destruction in Russia; $55.0 million for biological weapons proliferation prevention in the states of the former Soviet Union; $40.0 million for weapons of mass destruction proliferation prevention in the states of the former Soviet Union; $8.0 million for defense and military contacts; and, $14.3 million for activities designated as Other Assessments/Administrative Support. Programmatic funding levels are generally consistent with those requested in fiscal year 2004 with one notable exception. The request for chemical weapons destruction in Russia is $41.9 million less than requested and appropriated for fiscal year 2004. According to the Department of Defense, the decrease in funding reflects the state of construction at the Russian chemical weapons dismantlement facility in Shchuch'ye.

The committee continues to support the goals of the Cooperative Threat Reduction program and recommends funding at the levels requested. In particular, it notes the positive steps being taken to improve oversight of the program within the Department, such as beginning the process of identifying and deploying on-site managers to improve project oversight within states of the former Soviet Union and increased reporting as required in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). The Department took the additional step of making officials within the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (OUSD/AT&L) responsible for oversight of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs. As a result, OUSD/AT&L established cost, schedule, and performance baselines, a milestone decision authority process, and a phased approach to project implementation that have long been lacking in CTR programs, and to which most acquisition programs are routinely subjected. Together, these efforts address many of the shortcomings that the committee identified and worked to address during the 1990s.

The committee further applauds the steps that Cooperative Threat Reduction partners have taken to increase their commitment of resources to the goals of the program. In particular, the committee notes increases in Russian funding for chemical weapons destruction from 2001 to 2002 and the President's December 6, 2003, certification that Russia would spend at least $33.0 million on the Shchuch'ye project in 2003. Additionally, during 2003, Rus-

sia took proactive steps to improve chemical weapons destruction by concluding in March 2003 a legally binding agreement to destroy all nerve agents at a single site, which it reaffirmed in a September 2003 amendment to the agreement. Together, these steps mark significant progress in meeting the conditions upon which Congress made continued assistance for the Shchuch'ye facility dependent. They also validate the committee's approach to funding CTR programs, in which the United States commitment is carefully matched to significant, concrete, and concurrent demonstrations of commitment by the respective CTR partner.

Despite the improvements discussed above, some Russian behavior continues to suggest that the Russian government does not place as high a priority on the goals of the Cooperative Threat Reduction program as the United States. First, Russia continues to modernize its strategic nuclear forces, suggesting it views modernizing its strategic arsenal as more important than securing and dismantling excess weapons of mass destruction inherited from the Soviet Union. At the end of 2003, for example, it deployed several new Topol-M intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). In contrast, the United States has not deployed a new ICBM in almost two decades. Second, questions remain about the completeness and accuracy of Russia's declarations regarding the size of the chemical weapons stockpile in Russia. While U.S. and Russian negotiators continue to discuss the problem, Russian officials have consistently rejected U.S. proposals intended to increase visibility into Russian chemical weapons stockpiles. Third, Russia has not developed a comprehensive and credible plan for destroying its stockpile of nerve agents. Such a plan is necessary to ensure that the value of U.S. expenditures on the Shchuch'ye chemical weapons dismantlement facility is fully realized.

As a result of these last two factors, the President cannot certify that Russia is in compliance with the preconditions for continuing U.S. CTR assistance in section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) as amended. Consequently, the President has again requested authority to waive those conditions.

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Visa Requirements

The committee is aware of concerns that efforts to tighten visa requirements after September 11, 2001 may have had the unintended consequence of hampering the effectiveness of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy nonproliferation programs by imposing delays in collaborative programs and complicating the international cooperation and coordination required. Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy submit a report no later than six months after the enactment of this Act, identifying the causes of any new delays and assessing the costs and benefits of various means by which those delays might be remedied.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would specify the kinds of programs to be funded under this title and authorize them at the level of the budget request. It would also make fiscal year 2005 Cooperative Threat Reduction funds available for three years.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate fiscal year 2004 funding for various Cooperative Threat Reduction purposes and activities at the levels requested by the President.

Section 1303—Temporary Authority to Waive Limitation on Funding for Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Russia

This section would extend for one year the President's authority to waive preconditions established in section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) for continuing certain Cooperative Threat Reduction programs. The President's current authority expires at the end of fiscal year 2004. The committee notes that Russia has made progress in meeting several of the aforementioned conditions and believes that the existence of those conditions serves as an incentive for further progress.

TITLE XIV—EXPORT CONTROLS AND COUNTERPROLIFERATION MATTERS

OVERVIEW

The committee agrees with the President that the nexus of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism is a critical threat facing the United States in the 21st century. The committee also agrees with the President's call on February 11, 2004 to strengthen export controls, both domestic and international, as a means of ensuring that terrorist groups and their state supporters are not able to acquire capabilities to design, develop, or employ weapons of mass destruction. In particular, it notes that proliferation networks have grown increasingly sophisticated at exploiting legitimate international trade to spread such capabilities. The network of Pakistani weapons scientist A.Q. Khan, for example, has been widely implicated in spreading nuclear technology to a number of countries of concern. At the same time, the committee notes the growing role of international consortia in producing advanced military capabilities. In general, certain exceptions in existing export control regimes were designed to govern state-to-state transactions, but are now being employed to facilitate international transactions among nonstate actors. The committee is concerned that these two trends are beginning to intersect and that proliferation networks will begin to exploit loopholes in existing export control regimes to acquire dangerous capabilities. Therefore, the committee, in close cooperation with the Committee on International Relations, developed a series

of provisions intended to rationalize and harmonize export controls with the new international security environment.

Recognizing the importance of a multilateral approach, the committee also recommends provisions intended to assist other countries in improving their capacity to prevent proliferation networks from acquiring sensitive technology through illicit activities disguised as legitimate defense trade. These include domestic counterproliferation fellowships for foreign military and defense ministry personnel in order to improve their understanding and application of counterproliferation tools and an expansion of the Secretary of Defense's authority to provide assistance to existing programs by the U.S. Customs Bureau and Federal Bureau of Investigations to train foreign customs and law enforcement officials in the skills needed to stem the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Technology Security Administration

The budget request included $20.5 million for the Defense Technology Security Administration (DTSA), which seeks to safeguard the United States and its allies by controlling and monitoring international technology transfers and preventing inappropriate technology transfers. The committee recommends $21.5 million in order to bolster the Administration's ability to prevent U.S. high technology from falling into the hands of potential adversaries.

Defense Threat Reduction Agency

The budget request included $325.5 million for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) which seeks to reduce the threat of future weapons of mass destruction being employed against the United States and its allies. The committee supports the work of DTRA and recommends an increase of an additional $1.4 million to the Defense Threat Reduction Agency in order to strengthen and expand the existing federal effort to help foreign governments improve their export control performance through an export control data base currently used by some 18 countries in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. The committee recommends the funds be used to continue existing subscriptions of the export control database for foreign countries, supply the database to additional countries around the globe, provide education and training for its use worldwide, enhance the quality and utility of the database by expanding its coverage of weapons of mass destruction information, and perform related research and public education initiatives on export control policy.

Nonproliferation Education

The committee notes that the next Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) review conference will be held in 2005, and will come at a time of heightened concern over the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The committee welcomes the important steps taken by the Administration to enhance current U.S. counter and non-proliferation efforts, including the four proposals offered by the President on February 11, 2004:

(1) Expansion of the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) to go beyond shipments and transfers, to increase collaboration between intelligence, law enforcement, and military agencies to target and shut down weapons traffickers, WMD suppliers, their labs, and buyers;

(2) Strengthened laws and international controls governing proliferation, including a new Security Council resolution requiring all states to criminalize proliferation, enact strict export controls, and secure all sensitive materials within their borders;

(3) Expansion of U.S. Nunn-Lugar efforts, where the President noted great success since 1991 but also added, "We have more work to do there;" and

(4) Elimination of a Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty loophole that has been exploited by nations such as North Korea and Iran, which have been allowed to produce nuclear material that can be used to build bombs under the cover of civilian nuclear programs.

The committee believes that increased attention to proliferation concerns provides an opportunity to stimulate and encourage new entrants into nonproliferation and international security careers, and a chance to increase public understanding of the national and international security ramifications of the NPT and other efforts to stem WMD proliferation. The committee commends efforts by universities and other non-government organizations to broaden awareness of these critical issues, and believes that efforts to encourage the study of nonproliferation and international security issues are a welcome addition to postsecondary educational curricula.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—EXPORT CONTROLS

Section 1401—Definitions under Arms Export Control Act

This section would clarify the definitions of "license," "agent," and "exporting agent" as they are applied under the Arms Export Control Act (Public Law 90–629). Currently, such terms are not defined. The definition of "license" would require it to be in written form. While current regulations require licenses to be in writing, the Department of State recently unilaterally issued a "verbal" license to approve the export of military guidance and sensor chips to the People's Republic of China (PRC), at a time when such items are normally prohibited for sale to the PRC. The chips were embedded in a commercial aircraft sale, but can be used in missile guidance systems. The Department of State's explanation for this significant departure from normal practice—that weather conditions in Washington, DC precluded the timely issuance of a written license—is not acceptable given the sensitivity of the technology involved.

The definition of "agent" would ensure that persons covered by the definition are in fact empowered by their governments to act as emissaries of those governments in some capacity. Restrictions on the transfer of exported goods generally limit such transfers among those governments or their agents. However, several Euro-

pean states have begun to re-interpret "agents" to mean representatives of a commercial firm within their borders. This looser definition effectively creates a loophole in which exports to certain countries could be approved with the expectation that the only individuals who have access to those exports are government officials, but in which access is considerably broader. The committee believes this change is necessary to ensure that advanced technology entrusted to foreign governments continues to be controlled with the care that has historically been afforded to it.

The definition of "exporting agent" means the freight forwarder or consignee as designated on a license application and authorized to act on behalf of the license applicant.

Section 1402—Exemption from Licensing Requirements for Export of Significant Military Equipment

This section would prohibit the President from creating regulatory exemptions for significant military equipment that would otherwise require an export license. Section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794) defines "significant military equipment" as articles for which special export controls are warranted and are identified on the United States Munitions List. As a practical matter, this limitation would result in little change from current practice. However, the Department of State recently proposed exempting a class of significant military equipment from the requirement to obtain a license, raising concerns about setting precedents for the license-free export of major combat systems. This section would inoculate the U.S. Government from pressures to export those systems without first giving such exports the added scrutiny and safeguards inherent in the licensing process.

Section 1403—Cooperative Projects with Friendly Foreign Countries

This section would create a process by which Congress has an opportunity to reject a cooperative project proposal it currently receives under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2767). Similar procedures already exist for commercial and military exports undertaken under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776). This section would also ensure that commercial exports embedded in an international cooperative project will require a license under Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act governing commercial arms exports. Historically, cooperative projects with friendly foreign countries were conducted as government-to-government activities. However, in recent years, such projects have increasingly included corporate entities and accorded them growing authority in making project decisions, outside of the normal licensing process. As the United States makes increasing use of such projects in the research, development, and acquisition process, the committee is concerned that controls on the exports of sensitive military technologies are being inadvertently loosened in order streamline the project's execution. It is concerned that this process may take place without regard to the need to ensure sensitive military capabilities do not fall into the hands of potential adversaries or terrorist groups. By aligning the Congressional review process on cooperative projects with the review process on commercial arms exports

and requiring a license for commercial entities embedded in a cooperative project, this section would ensure that security interests continue to predominate in such projects.

Section 1404—Licensing Requirement for Export of Militarily Critical Technologies

This section would require the President to require exporters of militarily critical technologies to obtain an export license for the export or re-export of any item on the Militarily Critical Technologies List published by the Department of Defense (DOD). The Export Administration Act of 1979 established process for licensing import or export of dual-use technologies. It also required the Department of Defense to prepare a Militarily Critical Technologies List (MCTL). The Departments of Defense and Commerce are expected to integrate the MCTL into the list of dual-use goods and technologies that require a license to export under the Export Administration Act.

However, in recent years, concerns have been raised that MCTL goods were not being appropriately controlled. Section 1211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) requires DOD to prepare a report on technologies needed to ensure U.S. military superiority and identify whether those items were controlled under any export control regime. That report was delivered on March 5, 2004 and identified several technologies that are not controlled under the Export Administration Regulations or the Arms Export Control Act, including, among others,: (1) Amorphous Silicon Focal Plane Arrays used in Night Vision Devices; (2) UAV kits to convert civil aircraft; (3) Precision Approach Radars containing electronically scanned arrays (useful in EW); (4) Surveillance Direction Finders; (5) GPS receivers with interference protection; and, (6) High-Precision, Multi-Axis Job Grinders, a machine tool used to make missile guidance components. These systems fall into categories identified on the MCTL, confirming that such technologies are not adequately controlled. This section would continue to allow exports of such militarily critical technologies, but would ensure that the exports remain consistent with national security.

Section 1405—Control of Exports of United States Weapons Technology to the People's Republic of China

This section would prohibit the export of certain technologies to individuals or countries engaged in the sale of such items to the security services of the People's Republic of China unless certain conditions are met. Such conditions would require that a license was approved for that export, the Secretary of Defense concurs in the export, and the foreign person or country agrees in writing not to transfer title, possession of, or otherwise provide access to that item without prior, written, consent by the President.

The committee is concerned by reports that military trade embargos imposed on the People's Republic of China after the Tiananmen Square massacre might be weakened or discontinued. The committee is also concerned that the weakening of such restrictions would send the wrong message about the importance of respecting human rights, undermine international controls in-

tended to prevent the proliferation of sensitive dual-use and military technology, and exacerbate a serious military imbalance in Asia.

Section 1406—Strengthening International Export Controls

This section would make it the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiations to strengthen the international export control system for arms and militarily-sensitive goods and technologies to countries of concern. It requires a Presidential report on progress made in strengthening international controls 180 days after enactment and every six months thereafter.

SUBTITLE B—COUNTERPROLIFERATION MATTERS

Section 1411—Defense International Counterproliferation Programs

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to expand existing programs to train foreign border and law enforcement officials in preventing the illicit transfer of weapons of mass destruction in the states of the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and the Baltic states, by granting the Secretary authority to conduct those programs in any other country in which the Secretary determines a significant threat exists. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337) established a joint program between the Department of Defense and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to conduct training of law enforcement officials in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to deter, interdict, and counter any organized crime involvement in the illegal acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) established a joint program between the Department of Defense and the United States Customs Service to assist customs and border guard entities in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to prevent the unauthorized transfer and transportation of weapons of mass destruction and related material.

Section 1412—Defense Counterproliferation Fellowship Program

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a fellowship program to train and educate foreign defense policymakers and military officers in identifying and using counterproliferation tools to combat the spread of weapons of mass destruction. It would further direct the Secretary to establish a domestic fellowship program for the purposes of improving the Department of Defense's ability to exploit non-government expertise in combating the spread of weapons of mass destruction. The President has identified the nexus among terrorists, weapons of mass destruction, and rogue states as a critical threat to United States national security. Nonproliferation and counterproliferation tools, such as export controls and the Proliferation Security Initiative, can play a vital role in containing that threat worldwide.

SUBTITLE C—INITIATIVES RELATING TO COUNTRIES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

Section 1421—Silk Road Initiative

This section would make it the policy of the United States to establish and promote programs to prevent the proliferation from former Soviet scientists, engineers, and technicians of the expertise useful to the development of weapons of mass destruction. It further authorizes the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program known as the Silk Road Initiative to promote employment in the former Soviet republics in the Caucasus and Central Asia. It encourages the Secretary to begin a pilot program in the Republic of Georgia and authorizes the Secretary to spend up to $10.0 million on the program from within funds available for nonproliferation and international security in fiscal year 2005.

Section 1422—Teller-Kurchatov Nonproliferation Fellowships

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to conduct a fellowship program in which an American scientist serves as a fellow at the Kurchatov Institute in Russia and a Russian scientist to serve as a fellow in the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. It authorizes the Secretary to spend up to $10.0 million on the program from within funds available for nonproliferation and international security in fiscal year 2005.

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

This section finds that certain limitations of the Russian nuclear command and control system raise concerns about the prospects for an accidental or unauthorized launch of Russian strategic ballistic missiles. It directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress no later than November 1, 2005 on steps that might be taken to reduce that danger, including an assessment of the risks and opportunities associated with taking those steps.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION FOR INCREASED COSTS DUE TO OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

OVERVIEW

The committee recommends authorization of $25 billion in funds to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 to support the defense activities principally associated with Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom and the global war on terrorism. These funds are designated for emergency contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to H. Con. Res. 393, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2004 and 2006 though 2009, as passed by the House of Representatives on March 25, 2004.

The increase in insurgent and terrorist action during the period preceding the return of sovereignty to the Iraqi government has increased the cost of operations. The committee believes that it is es-

sential to recognize the change in operational level and ensure full funding is available to support U.S. troops and their needs.

SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATION

The following table provides a summary of the committee's authorization of funds for this purpose by appropriations account.

Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Recommendation
PROCUREMENT		
Aircraft Procurement, Army		
Aviation Combat Loss Replacement	498,300	498,300
Total Aircraft Procurement, Army	498,300	498,300
Missile Procurement, Army		
Javelin, Modularity	42,800	42,800
Total Missile Procurement, Army	42,800	42,800
Weapons and Tracked Vehicles Procurement, Army		
XM-8 Assault Weapon, Modularity	25,900	25,900
Rapid Fielding Initiative	166,600	166,600
Weapons and Tracked Vehicles Procurement, Modularity	9,400	9,400
Total Weapons and Tracked Vehicles Procurement, Army	201,900	201,900
Ammunition Procurement, Army		
Small Arms Ammunition, Modularity	78,750	78,750
Total Ammunition Procurement, Army	78,750	78,750
National Guard and Reserve Equipment, Army		
Equipment for Deployment to OIF/OEF	50,000	50,000
Total for National Guard and Reserve Equipment, Army	50,000	50,000
Other Procurement, Army		
Shadow TUAV, Force Protection	125,200	125,200
M1114 Up-Armor HMMWV, Force Protection	704,700	704,700
Vehicle Bolt-on Armor and Emerging Requirements	332,400	332,400
Rapid Fielding Initiative	130,800	130,800
Other Procurement, Modularity	249,200	249,200
Trucks Combat Loss Replacement	25,110	25,110
Total Other Procurement, Army	1,567,410	1,567,410
Ammunition Procurement, Marine Corps		
Unfunded Requirements	38,402	38,402
Total Ammunition Procurement, Marine Corps	38,402	38,402
General Procurement, Marine Corps		
Shadow TUAV	46,680	46,680
Silver Fox UAV	6,110	6,110
Unfunded Requirements	45,400	45,400
Total General Procurement, Marine Corps	98,190	98,190
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force		
Predator A, Force Protection	99,000	99,000
Total Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	99,000	99,000
Procurement, Defense-wide		
SOCOM Unfunded Requirements	60,000	60,000
Other Programs	660,000	660,000
Total Procurement, Defense-wide	720,000	720,000
Total Procurement	3,394,752	3,394,752

Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2005 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Recommendation
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE		
Operation and Maintenance, Army		
Incremental wartime costs	8,505,763	8,505,763
Costs associated with active end strength increase	260,000	260,000
Depot Maintenance	205,250	205,250
Rapid Fielding Initiative	219,700	219,700
Interceptor Body Armor	295,000	295,000
Interceptor Body Armor Deltoid & Auxiliary Protection	90,000	90,000
Modularity (OPTEMPO)	31,400	31,400
Total Operations and Maintenance, Army	9,607,113	9,607,113
Operation and Maintenance, Navy		
Incremental wartime costs	180,500	180,500
Depot maintenance	76,000	76,000
Total Operations and Maintenance, Navy	256,500	256,500
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps		
Incremental wartime costs	2,301,860	2,301,860
Costs associated with active end strength increase	30,000	30,000
Depot Maintenance	26,875	26,875
Initial Issue	40,000	40,000
Total Operations and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,398,735	2,398,735
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force		
Incremental wartime costs	1,515,000	1,515,000
Depot Maintenance	76,000	76,000
Interceptor Body Armor	44,000	44,000
Total Operations and Maintenance, Air Force	1,635,000	1,635,000
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide		
Incremental wartime costs	663,900	663,900
Army active end strength increase	44,000	44,000
Marine Corps active end strength increase	5,000	5,000
Technical Support Working Group	75,000	75,000
Other Programs	1,540,000	1,540,000
Total Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide	2,327,900	2,327,900
Total Operations and Maintenance	16,225,248	16,225,248
Defense Health Program		
Army active end strength increase	59,000	59,000
Marine Corps active end strength increase	16,000	16,000
Total Defense Health Program	75,000	75,000
MILITARY PERSONNEL		
Military Personnel		
Incremental wartime costs	4,400,000	4,400,000
Army active end strength increase	605,000	605,000
Marine Corps active end strength increase	159,000	159,000
Extension of Imminent Danger Pay	86,000	86,000
Extension of Family Separation Allowance	55,000	55,000
Total Military Personnel	5,305,000	5,305,000
Total Department of Defense (051)	25,000,000	25,000,000

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Procurement

It is the highest priority of the committee that our troops be supported with the equipment necessary to successfully accomplish their missions in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom and the global war on terrorism. The committee recommends authorization for procurement to support force protection, the rapid fielding initiative for basic infantry combat equipment, combat losses of essential equipment, the Army's modularity initiative, and essential combat related unfunded requirements of our armed forces.

The committee's recommendations for procurement in this title include full support of the force protection needs of our units. Included in the force protection recommendation is full funding for the Up Armor High Mobilility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV); bolt-on ballistic armor for HMMWVs and trucks; and Interceptor Body Armor (IBA), including funding for add-on protection for the shoulder and side body areas. Intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) are important elements of force protection and are critical to interdict, disrupt, and defeat the insurgent and terrorist threat. Therefore, this title also includes authorization to procure unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) that are currently in production to provide these UAV assets to the units in theater in sufficient quantity to meet both their operational and ISR requirements.

The committee fully supports the Army's efforts to transform the structure of its divisions into smaller organizations to create additional combat relevant units. This reorganization known as "modularity" will contribute to the reduction of stress on our troops due to the high operational tempo of operations in southwest Asia. This title authorizes an aggressive down payment for the equipment costs of both modularity and the rapid fielding initiative as displayed in the Army unfunded requirements list so that every infantry soldier has the equipment necessary to perform their mission.

This title also provides authorization for the combat related, unfunded equipment requirements of the Marine Corp and Army as submitted by the service chiefs in February and March 2004 and to replace combat losses in aviation and other equipment.

Operations and Maintenance

The military departments and defense agencies need operations and maintenance (O&M) funds to pay for food, fuel, spare parts, maintenance, transportation, camp, post, and base expenses that have risen dramatically as a result of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). Much of these expenses are captured in the O&M funding for operating tempo. This cost is significant. Without additional funding at the start of fiscal year 2005, the military departments will be forced to use third and fourth quarter O&M funds in the initial months of fiscal year 2005 to pay for OIF and OEF costs. This presents significant accounting and budgetary hurdles and alters the ability to plan properly for the entire year. The committee, therefore, believes that O&M war-

related costs should be funded prior to the start of the fiscal year. In addition, the committee is funding critical equipment for the Iraq and Afghanistan theater that will improve our troops' welfare and combat effectiveness. The committee believes that these items should be funded immediately.

Military Personnel

The committee long has advocated for increases in active component manpower to sustain the full range of capabilities required of and missions assigned to the Armed Forces. Thus the committee recommended in the National Defense Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 2003 and 2004 increases of 10,350 and 6,240 respectively in active component manpower above the budget requests.

More recently, the Army Chief of Staff announced a plan for a temporary increase of 30,000 in the Army's active component end strength, not only to improve its ability to meet the full range of its worldwide missions, but also to increase its current active combat capability from 33 brigades to 43–48 brigades. To support the Army's need, the committee recommends in this title a cumulative active component increase of 30,000 (to an end strength of 512,400), in increments of 10,000 each in fiscal years 2005 through 2007. The committee would also temporarily adjust the minimum end strength floors to reflect the increases in authorized end strength.

To ensure the Marine Corps can continue to provide and sustain the force levels required of it by the national security strategy, the committee recommends in this title a cumulative active component Marine Corps increase of 9,000 (to and end strength of 184,000), in increments of 3,000 each in fiscal years 2005 through 2007. The committee would also adjust the minimum end strength floors to reflect the increases in authorized end strength.

The committee recommends an additional $1,179 million for military personnel, operations and maintenance to fund the additional Army and Marine Corps active component manpower in fiscal year 2005. To fund increased Army and Marine Corps manpower in fiscal years 2006 and beyond, the committee recommends that starting in fiscal year 2006 the Secretary of the Treasury would assume the requirement for the annual payment to the Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund that is now made by the Secretary of Defense. The committee expects that the Secretary of Defense will use the resulting funding flexibility to fully fund the costs of the Army transformation efforts and Marine Corps end strength growth in fiscal year 2006 and beyond.

To address the concerns of the Secretary of Defense and the Chief of Staff of the Army that end strength increases should not be made permanent, the committee's recommendation provides for only temporary end strength growth through the end of fiscal year 2007—the point at which Army leadership has indicated it will be in a better position to assess future manning levels. Furthermore, this committee recommendation would require that if the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army, or the Secretary of the Navy, believes changes should be made to the strength levels authorized by this title, then those changes must be provided to the committee prior to the submission of the budget request for any fiscal year.

Finally, to provide for the active component and reserve component military manpower deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan for the first quarter of fiscal year 2005, the committee would authorize $4.4 billion. In addition, the committee would also authorize $141 million to extend the authority of the Department of Defense to continue paying higher levels of family separation allowance and imminent danger pay.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1501—Purpose

This section would establish this title as an authorization of appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide funds for additional costs due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 1511—Army Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $2,439.2 million for fiscal year 2005 Army procurement.

Section 1512—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $136.6 million for fiscal year 2005 Navy and Marine Corps procurement.

Section 1513—Air Force Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $99.0 million for fiscal year 2005 Air Force procurement.

Section 1514—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $720.0 million for fiscal year 2005 Defense-Wide Activities procurement.

Section 1515—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize an additional $16,225.2 million for fiscal year 2005 operation and maintenance programs.

Section 1516—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize $75.0 million to be appropriated to the Defense Health Program (DHP) for operations and maintenance for fiscal year 2005.

Section 1517—Military Personnel

This section would authorize $5,305.0 million to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for military personnel for fiscal year 2005.

Section 1518—Treatment as Additional Authorization

This section would authorize an additional $25 billion for emergency contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism to the amounts otherwise authorized in this Act.

Section 1519—Transfer Authority

This section would provide fiscal year 2005 transfer authority of $2.5 billion to the Department of Defense for the authorizations contained in this title.

Section 1520—Designation of Emergency Authorization

This section would authorize $25 billion for fiscal year 2005 to support emergency contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism.

SUBTITLE B—PERSONNEL PROVISIONS

Section 1531—Three Year Increase in Active Army Strength Levels

This section would increase the active Army end strength authorized for fiscal year 2005 by 10,000 above the authorization contained in section 401. This section would also authorize active Army end strengths for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 of 502,400 and 512,400 respectively. This section would establish temporary new minimum active duty end strengths for the Army as of September 30, 2005, 2006 and 2007 respectively. These changes in minimum strengths reflect the committee's recommendations for Army end strength provided by this section. The section would also direct that if the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, determines that adjustments are necessary to the minimum end strength levels, then the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report of his recommendations and rationale for change to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services prior to the submission of the budget request for the fiscal year in which the change would be effective.

Section 1532—Three Year Increase in Active Marine Corps Strength Levels

This section would increase the United States Marine Corps active end strength authorized for fiscal year 2005 by 3,000 above the authorization contained in section 401. This section would also authorize U.S. Marine Corps active end strengths for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 of 181,000 and 184,000 respectively. This section would establish temporary new minimum active duty end strengths for the Marine Corps as of September 30, 2005, 2006 and 2007 respectively. These changes in minimum strengths reflect the committee's recommendations for Marine Corps active end strength provided by this section. The section would also direct that if the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, determines that adjustments are necessary to the minimum end strength levels, then the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report of his recommendations and rationale for change to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on

Armed Services prior to the submission of the budget request for the fiscal year in which the change would be effective.

Section 1533—Extension of Increased Rates for Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance

This section would make permanent the increase in the rate of imminent danger pay from $150 per month to $225 per month and the increase in the rate of family separation allowance from $100 per month to $250 per month.

Subtitle C—Financial Management Matters

Section 1541—Revised Funding Methodology for Military Retiree Health Care Benefits

This section would revise the process for funding the annual payments that are required to be paid into the Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund. Beginning in fiscal year 2006, the Secretary of the Treasury would make the annual payments from the general fund of the Treasury. Under current law the Secretary of Defense, as well as the secretaries of the other departments whose beneficiaries participate in the TRICARE for Life program, make these annual payments.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

PURPOSE

Division B provides military construction and related authorities in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2005. As recommended by the committee, Division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $9,930,475,000 for construction in support of the active forces, reserve components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2005.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense (DOD) requested $5,308,879,000 for military construction and $4,171,596,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $5,778,709,000 for military construction and $4,151,766,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2005. The committee's recommendations are consistent with a total budget authority level of $9,930,475,000 for military construction and family housing in fiscal year 2005.

The committee's recommendation to increase the budget request for military construction and family housing reflects continued concern about the state of DOD infrastructure. Every Congress for the past decade has acted on similar concerns by adding funds to military construction and family housing budgets. This historic trend is a clear indication that the annual budget requests for DOD infrastructure and facilities are routinely inadequate.

Of additional concern is the fact that the fiscal year 2005 budget request for military construction and family housing includes less

funding than the fiscal year 2004 program, as enacted. Furthermore, the fiscal year 2005 request for these programs is nearly $1,400,000,000 smaller than was forecast in the fiscal year 2004 budget. Finally, the forecasted total for military construction over the fiscal year 2005 Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) is $6,000,000,000 less than the amounts forecasted in the fiscal year 2004 FYDP.

Unless these forecasted increases become reality, the Department will not be able to meet its current facilities needs, nor will it be able to meet the substantial facilities requirements associated with Army transformation, increased Army force structure, and the Global Posture Review. Considering the importance of facilities and infrastructure to military readiness, quality of life, retention, and operational capabilities, the committee urges the Department to ensure that future military construction and family housing budget requests are properly resourced.

With regard to maintenance, repair, and sustainment of facilities, the committee applauds the Department for implementing a legitimate model for determining sustainment budgets. However, the Department does not have an effective model for base operations, repair, and modernization budgets. As a result, these accounts continue to be funded at levels that do not support "must pay" bills for utilities and critical base services. While operations, maintenance, and repair budgets are primarily funded in title III of this Act, funding shortfalls in these areas directly affect the condition, usability, and lifespan of military facilities and family housing projects funded in Division B. Therefore, the committee urges the Department to fully fund facilities-related budgets, including military construction, family housing, base operations, sustainment, restoration, and maintenance programs.

Finally, the Department continues to develop the Global Posture Review, a comprehensive review and restructuring of the Department's overseas basing strategy. While the Department has provided Congress glimpses of parts of the review, it has not yet finalized its overseas basing decisions, nor has it provided Congress with a complete picture of its plans.

While this would be troubling in any year, the committee is particularly concerned that the review, which is expected to return significant numbers of overseas-based military personnel to the United States, will not be finalized until the base closure process is well under way. As a result, Congress will not have the opportunity to review and validate the Department's overseas basing decisions before they are implemented through the base closure process. Furthermore, the Department is in the midst of several additional evolving efforts that are likely to have significant effects on the infrastructure requirements of the military services, including force transformation and changes in endstrength related to the active and reserve personnel mix of the services. Therefore, the committee has included provisions in Division B to ensure that the Department presents Congress with a complete plan of future infrastructure requirements before proceeding with the base closure process.

A tabular summary of the authorizations provided in Division B for fiscal year 2005 follows:

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVIII - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	House Change	House Authorized
Military Construction			
Military Construction, Army	1,771,285	94,924	1,866,209
Military Construction, Navy	1,060,455	17,407	1,077,862
Military Construction, Air Force	663,964	128,090	792,054
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	699,437	9,500	708,937
Chemical Demilitarization Construction	81,886	0	81,886
NATO Security Investment Program	165,800	0	165,800
BRAC IV	246,116	0	246,116
Military Construction, Army National Guard	295,657	97,568	393,225
Military Construction, Air National Guard	127,368	57,252	184,620
Military Construction, Army Reserve	87,070	29,885	116,955
Military Construction, Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	25,285	5,670	30,955
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	84,556	29,534	114,090
Total Military Construction	**5,308,879**	**469,830**	**5,778,709**
Family Housing			
Family Housing Construction, Army	636,099	0	636,099
Family Housing Support, Army	928,907	(2,400)	926,507
Family Housing Construction, Navy	139,107	0	139,107
Family Housing Support, Navy	704,504	(8,200)	696,304
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	846,959	0	846,959
Family Housing Support, Air Force	863,896	(9,230)	854,666
Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide	49	0	49
Family Housing Support, Defense-Wide	49,575	0	49,575
Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,500	0	2,500
Total Family Housing	**4,171,596**	**(19,830)**	**4,151,766**
Total Military Construction and Family Housing	**9,480,475**	**450,000**	**9,930,475**

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
1	Alabama	Army	Anniston AD	Powertrain Component Rebuilding Facility	23,690		23,690
2	Alabama	MDA	Huntsville	MDA Center, Von Braun Complex, Phase 2	19,560		19,560
3	Alabama	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Centreville	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	5,537		5,537
4	Alabama	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Clanton	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	3,649		3,649
5	Alabama	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Oneonta	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	4,527		4,527
6	Alabama	Army National Guard	Haleyville	Joint Armed Forces Reserve Center		13,849	13,849
7	Alaska	Army	Ft Richardson	Barracks Complex	7,600		7,600
8	Alaska	Army	Ft Richardson	Digital Multipurpose Training Range	13,600		13,600
9	Alaska	Army	Ft Richardson	Sniper Field Fire Range	3,100		3,100
10	Alaska	Army	Ft Wainwright	Barracks Complex - Lorraine Road	39,815		39,815
11	Alaska	Army	Ft Wainwright	Barracks Complex Renewal-Santiago Road	30,912		30,912
12	Alaska	Army	Ft Wainwright	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	21,732		21,732
13	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	C-17 Flight Simulator Facility	7,700		7,700
14	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	C-17 Support Utilities	6,400		6,400
15	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Fitness Center	11,957		11,957
16	Alaska	TMA	Ft Wainwright	Hospital Replacement, Phase 6	-		-
17	Arizona	Navy	MCAS Yuma	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	18,740		18,740
18	Arizona	Navy	MCAS Yuma	Station Ordnance Area	7,930		7,930
19	Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Airfield Obstruction-Hazardous Cargo Pad	4,243		4,243
20	Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	CSAR C-130 Squadron Operations	5,786		5,786
21	Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	EC-130 Squadron Operations Facility		7,000	7,000
22	Arizona	Air Force	Luke AFB	ATFP Litchfield Road Underpass and Entry Point Replacement		7,900	7,900
23	Arizona	Air Force	Luke AFB	Dorm (120 Rm)	10,000		10,000
24	Arizona	Army National Guard	ARNG Camp Navajo	Qualification Training Range	3,000		3,000
25	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	C-130J ADAL Simulator Facility	5,031		5,031
26	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Child Development Center		3,900	3,900
27	Arkansas	Army National Guard	Camp Robinson	Army Aviation Support Facility	33,020		33,020
28	Arkansas	Army National Guard	Ft Chaffee	Ammunition Supply Point	13,798		13,798
29	California	Army	Ft Irwin	CIDC Field Operations Building	2,600		2,600
30	California	Army	Ft Irwin	Command and Control Facility	21,000		21,000
31	California	Army	Ft Irwin	Land Acquisition, Phase 2	14,500		14,500
32	California	Navy	MAGTFTC Twentynine Palms	Operational Training Center		15,700	15,700
33	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters,	19,975		19,975

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
34	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Close Combat Battle Course	6,940		6,940
35	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Consolidated Operations Center	4,910		4,910
36	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Tertiary Sewage Treatment Plant, Increment 2	25,690		25,690
37	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Weight Handling Shop	6,630		6,630
38	California	Navy	MLB Barstow	Blasting Facility		4,930	4,930
39	California	Navy	NAF El Centro	Apron & Hangar Recapitalization, Increment 1	33,331		33,331
40	California	Navy	NAS North Island	Base Main Gate and Entrance Street		10,180	10,180
41	California	Navy	NSWC Division Corona	Warfare Assessment Laboratory Addition		9,850	9,850
42	California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Global Hawk Add to Age Facility	1,866		1,866
43	California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Global Hawk Upgrade Dock 2	8,320		8,320
44	California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Addition/Renovate JSF Complex, Phase 2	9,965		9,965
45	California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Add C-17 Engine Storage Facility	2,400		2,400
46	California	Air Force	Travis AFB	C-17 Utilities/Road	12,844		12,844
47	California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Security Forces Armory/Combat Arms Campus		3,650	3,650
48	California	DLA	Travis AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	15,100		15,100
49	California	Spec Ops	Corona	SOF MOUT Training Complex	13,600		13,600
50	California	Spec Ops	NAS North Island	SOF Ground Mobility Support Building	1,000		1,000
51	California	TMA	DLI (Presidio)	Dental Clinic		6,700	6,700
52	California	Army National Guard	Camp Parks	Readiness Center (ADRS)	11,318		11,318
53	California	Air Force Reserve	March ARB	Alter C-17 Hangar Tower	2,089		2,089
54	California	Air Force Reserve	March ARB	C-17 Maintenance Hangar, Phase 2	7,400		7,400
55	Colorado	Army	Ft Carson	Arrival Departure Area Group Complex Ph 1a		12,400	12,400
56	Colorado	Army	Ft Carson	Barracks Complex - Hospital Area	14,108		14,108
57	Colorado	Army	Ft Carson	Digital Multipurpose Training Range	33,000		33,000
58	Colorado	Air Force	Buckley AFB	Chapel Center	6,147		6,147
59	Colorado	Air Force	Buckley AFB	Child Development Center	6,100		6,100
60	Colorado	Army National Guard	ARNG Denver	Add/Alter Army Aviation Support Facility	34,000		34,000
61	Colorado	Army National Guard	Ft Carson	Automated Qualification/Training Range	3,205		3,205
62	Colorado	Army Reserve	Aurora	Add/Alter Military Equipment Parking	1,758		1,758
63	Colorado	Chem DeMil	Pueblo AD	Ammunitions Demilitarization Facility, Phase 5	44,792		44,792
64	Colorado	TMA	Buckley AFB	Add/Alter Aeromedical Clinic	2,100		2,100
65	Connecticut	Navy	NSB New London	Gates 3 and 5 Security Improvements		4,420	4,420
66	Connecticut	Navy	NSB New London	MK-10 Submarine Escape Trainer	17,100		17,100

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
67	Connecticut	Navy	NSB New London	Pier 6 Replacement	28,782		28,782
68	Connecticut	Army National Guard	Southington	Readiness Center		4,087	4,087
69	District of Columbia	Navy	Naval Observatory	Atomic Clock Vault	3,239		3,239
70	District of Columbia	DIA	Bolling AFB	HVAC Upgrade to DIAC	6,000		6,000
71	Florida	Navy	Eglin AFB	Eglin Air Force Base Road Construction	2,060		2,060
72	Florida	Navy	NS Mayport	Airfield Control Tower	6,200		6,200
73	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	1 AF Headquarters / AFFOR Center Ph 1		10,200	10,200
74	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Addition F-22 Operations Facility	1,548		1,548
75	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	F-22 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit/Hangar	17,414		17,414
76	Florida	Spec Ops	Hurlburt Field	SOF Operations Training Facility		2,500	2,500
77	Florida	TMA	Jacksonville	Add/Alter Hospital	28,438		28,438
78	Florida	Army National Guard	Camp Blanding	Regional Training Institute, Phase 1		12,000	12,000
79	Florida	Air National Guard	Jacksonville Int Airport	F-15 Corrosion Control Facility		4,000	4,000
80	Florida	Navy Reserve	Jacksonville	New Reserve Training Center	9,300		9,300
81	Florida	Air Force Reserve	Homestead ARB	Visitor's Quarters, Ph 1		6,570	6,570
82	Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Barracks Complex - Kelly Hill/Main Post	49,565		49,565
83	Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Hazardous Cargo Loading Apron	3,850		3,850
84	Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Physical Fitness Training Center	18,362		18,362
85	Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Revitalize Ranger Barracks 6012		1,850	1,850
86	Georgia	Army	Ft Gillem	Recruiting Brigade Operations Building	5,800		5,800
87	Georgia	Army	Ft McPherson	Child Development Center	4,900		4,900
88	Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Aircraft Maintenance Hanger (SOF)	21,100		21,100
89	Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Barracks Complex-5th & 16th St, Phase 2	32,950		32,950
90	Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Chapel	9,500		9,500
91	Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Command and Control Facility	24,695		24,695
92	Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Tactical Equipment Complex	10,200		10,200
93	Georgia	Navy	SWFLANT Kings Bay	Enclave Fencing and Parking	16,000		16,000
94	Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Consolidated Base Support Center		9,600	9,600
95	Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Aircraft Ramp	15,000		15,000
96	Georgia	Spec Ops	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	SOF Battalion Operations Complex	17,600		17,600
97	Georgia	TMA	Ft Benning	Consolidated Health Clinic	7,100		7,100
98	Georgia	Army National Guard	Savannah	Army Aviation Support Facility	16,554		16,554
99	Georgia	Air Force Reserve	Dobbins ARB	Upgrade Maintenance Bays		10,000	10,000

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
100	Hawaii	Army	Helemano Mil. Res.	Drum Road Upgrade, Phase 1	27,000		27,000
101	Hawaii	Army	Helemano Mil. Res	Tank Trails - Helemano	7,300		7,300
102	Hawaii	Army	Hickam AFB	Hot Cargo Pad Expansion	11,200		11,200
103	Hawaii	Army	Pohakuloa	West PTA Modifications	30,000		30,000
104	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Barracks Complex Renewal - Quad E, Phase 2	36,000		36,000
105	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Barracks Complex Renewal-Capron Ave, Phase 3	48,000		48,000
106	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Battle Area Live Fire Complex	32,000		32,000
107	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	32,542		32,542
108	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Fire Station	4,800		4,800
109	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Qualification Training Range	4,950		4,950
110	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Tactical Vehicle Wash Facility	3,500		3,500
111	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Phase 1	49,000		49,000
112	Hawaii	Army	Wheeler AAF	Deployment Facility	24,000		24,000
113	Hawaii	Navy	NSY Pearl Harbor	Drydock 4 Shorepower Improvements		5,100	5,100
114	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Alter C-17 Maintenance/Supply Areas	9,000		9,000
115	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	C-17 Clear Water Rinse	4,300		4,300
116	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	C-17 Maintenance Shop Facility	8,200		8,200
117	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	C-17 Munitions Storage	1,950		1,950
118	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	C-17 Support Utilities, Phase 2	2,450		2,450
119	Hawaii	DLA	NS Pearl Harbor	Multi-Product Interface Tank	3,500		3,500
120	Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Battle Stations Training Facility, Increment 2	58,200		58,200
121	Illinois	Navy	RTC Great Lakes	RTC Barracks	38,851		38,851
122	Illinois	Navy	RTC Great Lakes	RTC Barracks	35,920		35,920
123	Illinois	Army National Guard	Galesburg	Readiness Center (ADRS) Phase 2		4,400	4,400
124	Illinois	Army National Guard	Springfield	Total Army School System (Multifunctional Facility)	13,596		13,596
125	Indiana	Navy	NSWC Crane	COTS Product Assurance and Test Management Facility		10,580	10,580
126	Indiana	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Remington	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,458		1,458
127	Iowa	Army National Guard	Camp Dodge	Company Grade BOQ		3,485	3,485
128	Kansas	Army	Ft Leavenworth	Lewis & Clark Instructional Facility, Phase 2	44,000		44,000
129	Kansas	Army	Ft Riley	Barracks Complex Renewal	41,000		41,000
130	Kansas	Army	Ft Riley	Communications Center	3,050		3,050
131	Kansas	Army National Guard	Topeka	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	3,086		3,086
132	Kansas	Air National Guard	Forbes Field	Replace Operations and Training Complex		9,800	9,800

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
133	Kansas	Army Reserve	ARC Hays	Army Reserve Center/Organization Maintenance Support	7,451		7,451
134	Kansas	Army Reserve	New Century	AR Ctr / OMS / AMSA / Unh Storage		8,723	8,723
135	Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Barracks Complex-42nd St/Indiana Ave, Phase 1	30,000		30,000
136	Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Command and Control Facility	33,000		33,000
137	Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Shoot House	1,600		1,600
138	Kentucky	Army	Ft Knox	Shoot House		1,850	1,850
139	Kentucky	Army	Ft Knox	Trainee Barracks Basic Training Complex 1, Phase 1	50,000		50,000
140	Kentucky	Chem DeMil	Blue Grass AD	Ammunitions Demilitarization Facility, Phase 5	37,094		37,094
141	Louisiana	Army	Ft Polk	Ammunition Supply Point Upgrade	7,500		7,500
142	Louisiana	Army	Ft Polk	Fixed Wing Aircraft Parking Apron	25,000		25,000
143	Louisiana	Army	Ft Polk	Hazard Cargo Loading Apron	14,503		14,503
144	Louisiana	Army	Ft Polk	Pallet Processing Facility	8,800		8,800
145	Louisiana	Army	Ft Polk	Passenger Processing Facility	11,700		11,700
146	Louisiana	Army	Ft Polk	Urban Assault Course	3,450		3,450
147	Louisiana	Navy	JRB/NAS New Orleans	Child Development Center		3,450	3,450
148	Louisiana	Navy	JRB/NAS New Orleans	Indoor Small Arms Range		2,580	2,580
149	Louisiana	Air Force	Barksdale AFB	Dormitory (168 Rm)	13,800		13,800
150	Louisiana	Army National Guard	Camp Beauregard	Army Aviation Support Facility	15,738		15,738
151	Maryland	Army	Fort Detrick	Remote Truck Inspection Station		4,000	4,000
152	Maryland	Navy	NSWC Indian Head	AGILE Chemical Facility	13,900		13,900
153	Maryland	Navy	NSWC Indian Head	Joint Aircrew Escape Component Center		9,100	9,100
154	Maryland	Air Force	Andrews AFB	ASA-Alter Aircraft Support Facilities	5,000		5,000
155	Maryland	Air Force	Andrews AFB	ASA-Fighter Aircraft Alert Complex	11,000		11,000
156	Maryland	Air Force	Andrews AFB	ASA-Munitions Storage Igloo	1,100		1,100
157	Maryland	NSA	Ft Meade	Critical Communication Path	3,450		3,450
158	Maryland	NSA	Ft Meade	NSA Deep Wells	8,140		8,140
159	Maryland	NSA	Ft Meade	Reconfigured Chilled Water, Phase 2	3,417		3,417
160	Maryland	Army Reserve	Ft Meade	Army Reserve Center / OMS / Unheated Storage, Ph 2	14,642		14,642
161	Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Otis ANG Base	Eliminate Airfield Obstructions	4,000		4,000
162	Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Otis ANG Base	Replace Control Tower		7,000	7,000
163	Michigan	Army National Guard	ARNG Grandledge	Army Aviation Support Facility	27,600		27,600
164	Michigan	Air National Guard	Selfridge ANG Base	Visitors Center and ID Complex		4,000	4,000
165	Michigan	Air National Guard	W.K. Kellogg	Fire Crash/Rescue Station		5,100	5,100

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
166	Minnesota	Air National Guard	Duluth IAP (ANG)	ASA - Alert Crew Quarters	3,000		3,000
167	Minnesota	Air National Guard	Duluth IAP (ANG)	ASA- Arm, Dearm Apron and Taxiway	4,000		4,000
168	Minnesota	Air National Guard	Duluth IAP (ANG)	ASA- Relocate Base Entrance Road	3,500		3,500
169	Minnesota	Air National Guard	Minneapolis - St Paul IAP ARS	Add/Alter Joint Use Physical Fitness Center		4,400	4,400
170	Mississippi	Air Force	Columbus AFB	Fire Crash Rescue Station		7,700	7,700
171	Mississippi	Army National Guard	Camp Shelby	MOUT Collective Training Facility (Small)		5,300	5,300
172	Missouri	Army	Ft Leonard Wood	Mine Detection Dog Kennel		3,700	3,700
173	Missouri	Army	Ft Leonard Wood	Range	2,750		2,750
174	Missouri	Army	Ft Leonard Wood	WMD Respond Training Facility	15,000		15,000
175	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	Child Development Center		7,600	7,600
176	Montana	Army National Guard	Havre	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	2,398		2,398
177	Montana	Army National Guard	Helena	Army Aviation Support Facility Add/Alt, Phase 1	7,600		7,600
178	Nebraska	Army National Guard	Hastings Train Range	Modified Record Fire Range (Remoted Target System)	1,487		1,487
179	Nevada	Navy	NAS Fallon	High Explosives Magazine		4,980	4,980
180	New Hampshire	Air National Guard	Pease International Tradeport	Upgrade Aircraft Parking Apron Ph 2		4,900	4,900
181	New Jersey	Army	Picatinny Arsenal	Pyrotechnics Facility		9,900	9,900
182	New Jersey	Navy	NWS Earle	General Purpose Berthing Pier, Increment 2	49,200		49,200
183	New Jersey	Air National Guard	Atlantic City IAP (ANG)	ASA - Replace Alert Complex	10,400		10,400
184	New Jersey	Air National Guard	Atlantic City IAP (ANG)	Replace Alert 2 Shelters		2,300	2,300
185	New Jersey	Army Reserve	Ft Dix	Controlled Humidity Storage, Ph 1		9,502	9,502
186	New Mexico	Army	White Sands Missile Range	Electromagnetic Vulnerability Assessment	33,000		33,000
187	New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Corrosion Control Facility		9,200	9,200
188	New York	Army	Ft Drum	Airfield Arrival/Departure Facility	4,950		4,950
189	New York	Army	Ft Drum	Barracks Complex-Wheeler Sack AAF, Phase 2	48,000		48,000
190	New York	Army	Ft Drum	Defensive Live Fire Range		3,000	3,000
191	New York	Army	Ft Drum	Upgrade Educational Transitional Facilities		5,700	5,700
192	New York	Army	Ft Hamilton	Military Police Station	7,600		7,600
193	New York	Army	Hancock Field	Military Entrance Processing Station		6,000	6,000
194	New York	Army	MEPS Buffalo	Military Entrance Processing Station	6,200		6,200
195	New York	Army	USMA West Point	Library & Learning Center, Phase 1	34,500		34,500
196	New York	Army National Guard	ARNG Utica	Addition Readiness Center (ADRS)	5,704		5,704
197	New York	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Auburn	Addition Readiness Center (ADRS)	4,406		4,406
198	New York	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Auburn	Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS)	2,472		2,472

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
199	New York	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Kingston	Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS)	3,827		3,827
200	New York	Army National Guard	Ft Drum	Readiness Center (ADRS)	6,489		6,489
201	New York	Air National Guard	Hancock Field	Replace Mobility Processing Center		2,300	2,300
202	New York	Air Force Reserve	Niagara ARS	Fire & Crash Rescue Station		7,800	7,800
203	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Air Traffic Control Tower	2,500		2,500
204	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Barracks Complex - Armistead St. Ph 2		10,000	10,000
205	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Barracks Complex - Donovan Street, Phase 5	15,500		15,500
206	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Barracks Complex Renewal Blackjack St, Phase 1	49,000		49,000
207	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Barracks Complex-Bastogene Dr, Phase 2	48,000		48,000
208	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Shoot House	1,650		1,650
209	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Shoot House	2,037		2,037
210	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Aircraft Maintenance Training Facility	12,090		12,090
211	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	20,780		20,780
212	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Simulator Building Addition	2,270		2,270
213	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp Lejeune	Armory, Camp Geiger	4,010		4,010
214	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp Lejeune	Combat Training Pool	2,410		2,410
215	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp Lejeune	Explosive Ordnance Disposal Operations Facility		4,610	4,610
216	North Carolina	Navy	Washington County	Outlying Landing Field (OLF) Facilities, Increment 2	33,900	(33,900)	-
217	North Carolina	Navy	Washington County	Outlying Landing Field (OLF) Land Acquisition, Increment 1	61,750	(61,750)	-
218	North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	Combat Control School Expansion	12,950		12,950
219	North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	Indoor Firing Range for Combat Controlled School	2,200		2,200
220	North Carolina	DLA	MCAS Cherry Point	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	22,700		22,700
221	North Carolina	Spec Ops	Ft Bragg	Kennedy Hall Renovation	11,988		11,988
222	North Carolina	Spec Ops	Ft Bragg	SOF Company Operations Building	4,600		4,600
223	North Carolina	Spec Ops	Ft Bragg	SOF Company Operations Complex	12,000		12,000
224	North Carolina	Spec Ops	Ft Bragg	SOF Company Operations Facility	4,500		4,500
225	North Carolina	Spec Ops	Ft Bragg	SOF Isolation Unit Training Facility	8,300		8,300
226	North Carolina	Spec Ops	Ft Bragg	SOF Resistance Training Facility	1,500		1,500
227	North Carolina	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Burlington	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,360		1,360
228	North Carolina	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Windsor	Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS)	2,409		2,409
229	North Carolina	Army National Guard	Ft Bragg	Regional Training Institute, Phase 3	6,319		6,319
230	North Carolina	Navy Reserve	NRC Asheville	Reserve Center	3,492		3,492
231	North Carolina	Air Force Reserve	Seymour Johnson AFB	Reserve Security Forces Operations	2,300		2,300

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
232	Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Replace Steam Lines/Tunnels, Area B, Ph 1A		9,200	9,200
233	Ohio	DLA	Columbus	Replace Physical Fitness Facility	5,500		5,500
234	Ohio	Army National Guard	Columbus	Combined Support Maintenance Shop Phase 1		9,980	9,980
235	Ohio	Army National Guard	Columbus	Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS)	2,225		2,225
236	Ohio	Air National Guard	Toledo Express Airport	Replace Logistics Complex		6,900	6,900
237	Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Airfield Pavements, Phase 1	4,300		4,300
238	Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Multi-Purpose Hangar	16,821		16,821
239	Oklahoma	Army	Ft Sill	CIDC Field Operations Building		3,400	3,400
240	Oklahoma	Army	Ft Sill	Consolidated Maintenance Complex, Phase 3	13,100		13,100
241	Oklahoma	Army	Ft Sill	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	14,400		14,400
242	Oklahoma	DLA	Tinker AFB	Add/Alter Hydrant Fuel System	5,400		5,400
243	Oklahoma	Army National Guard	Camp Gruber Training Center	Multi-purpose Machine Gun Range		3,201	3,201
244	Oregon	Army National Guard	AFRC Eugene	Armed Forces Reserve Center, Phase 2	12,635		12,635
245	Oregon	Army National Guard	Salem	Army Aviation Support Facility		4,917	4,917
246	Oregon	Air Force Reserve	Portland IAP	Add/Alter Building 315 For PJ Squadron Operations	1,640		1,640
247	Oregon	Air Force Reserve	Portland IAP	Consolidated Training, Phase 2	3,800		3,800
248	Oregon	Air Force Reserve	Portland IAP	Maintenance Hangar & Pavements	12,400		12,400
249	Pennsylvania	DLA	DDSP New Cumberland	Consolidated Maintenance Facility	22,300		22,300
250	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Fort Indiantown Gap	Unit Equipment Training Site		20,387	20,387
251	Pennsylvania	Army Reserve	Ft Indiantown Gap	Army Reserve Center/Organizational Maintenance Support	13,156		13,156
252	Pennsylvania	Navy Reserve	NAS JRB Willow Grove	Fitness Center	7,700		7,700
253	South Carolina	Navy	MCAS Beaufort	Aircraft Fire and Rescue Facility		5,480	5,480
254	South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Base Library		3,700	3,700
255	South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Sewer Outfall Line to Wateree River	3,300		3,300
256	South Carolina	TMA	MCRD Parris Island	Replace Medical/Dental Clinic	25,000		25,000
257	South Dakota	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Mobridge	Readiness Center	2,944		2,944
258	Tennessee	Air Force	Arnold AFB	Add/Alter Wingo Inn Visiting Quarters		2,500	2,500
259	Tennessee	Air Force	Arnold AFB	Upgrade Jet Engine Induction System, Phase 5	22,000		22,000
260	Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	C-5 Aircraft Parking Apron & Hydrant Refuel Station	15,500		15,500
261	Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	C-5 Corrosion Control Hangar	26,000		26,000
262	Texas	Army	Camp Bullis	Vehicle Maintenance Facility		5,300	5,300
263	Texas	Army	Ft Bliss	Missile Defense Instruction Facility	16,500		16,500
264	Texas	Army	Ft Bliss	Tac Equip Shop-AAMDC		2,900	2,900

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
265	Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Barracks Complex	49,888		49,888
266	Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Command & Control Facility Ph 2		7,100	7,100
267	Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Digital Multipurpose Range	28,200		28,200
268	Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Training Area Tank Trails		3,700	3,700
269	Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Refueling Vehicle Maintenance Shop		3,300	3,300
270	Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Security Forces Training Expansion	2,596		2,596
271	Texas	Air Force	Laughlin AFB	T-1 Squadron Operations Facility		6,900	6,900
272	Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	F-22 Technical Training Facility	21,284		21,284
273	Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	Student Dormitory (300 Rm)	29,000		29,000
274	Texas	DLA	NAS Kingsville	Replace Jet Fuel Storage Tank	3,900		3,900
275	Texas	Army Reserve	Corpus Christi Storage Complex	Controlled Humidity Storage Ph 1		9,038	9,038
276	Texas	Navy Reserve	NAS JRB Fort Worth	Combined Reserve Training Admin Building		5,520	5,520
277	Texas	Air Force Reserve	Lackland AFB	Add/Alter C-5 Aircraft Generation Facility	1,200		1,200
278	Texas	Air Force Reserve	Lackland AFB	C-5 Training Schoolhouse Complex	20,000		20,000
279	Texas	Air Force Reserve	Lackland AFB	C-5 Training Load Assembly Facility	1,850		1,850
280	Texas	Air Force Reserve	NAS JRB Fort Worth	Aircraft Parts Store		1,850	1,850
281	Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	729th ACS Operations / Maintenance Facility		4,900	4,900
282	Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Fitness Center	13,113		13,113
283	Utah	Army Reserve	ARC Ogden	Add/Alter Army Reserve Center	7,932		7,932
284	Virginia	Army	Ft A.P. Hill	Shoot House	3,975		3,975
285	Virginia	Army	Ft Lee	Fire and Emergency Services Center Ph 3		4,250	4,250
286	Virginia	Army	Ft Myer	Barracks Complex-Sheridan Ave, Phase 1	49,526		49,526
287	Virginia	Navy	Camp Elmore USMC Det	Command Operations Facility	13,500		13,500
288	Virginia	Navy	MCB Quantico	Armory (The Basic School)	4,580		4,580
289	Virginia	Navy	MCB Quantico	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	15,090		15,090
290	Virginia	Navy	MCB Quantico	Green Side Hangar Complex	21,180		21,180
291	Virginia	Navy	MCB Quantico	Heritage Center Road Improvements	950	(950)	-
292	Virginia	Navy	MCCDC Quantico	HQ and Service BN / TBS		4,470	4,470
293	Virginia	Navy	NAB Little Creek	Gate 5 Security Improvements	2,850		2,850
294	Virginia	Navy	NAB Little Creek	Police & Security Ops Facility		6,700	6,700
295	Virginia	Navy	NAS Oceana	Post 2 Security Improvements	2,770		2,770
296	Virginia	Navy	NS Norfolk	Gate 5 Security Improvements	4,330		4,330
297	Virginia	Navy	NS Norfolk	Pier 11 Replacement, Increment 2	40,000		40,000

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
298	Virginia	Navy	NWS Yorktown	Ordnance Handling Vehicle Maintenance Shop	9,870		9,870
299	Virginia	DLA	Def Dist Depot Richmond	Conference Center	3,600		3,600
300	Virginia	DLA	Def Dist Depot Richmond	Security Enhancements	6,500		6,500
301	Virginia	DLA	DFSP NAS Oceana	Bulk Fuel Storage Tank	3,589		3,589
302	Virginia	Spec Ops	FCTC Dam Neck	Addition SOF Operational Trainer Support Facility	4,300		4,300
303	Virginia	Spec Ops	FCTC Dam Neck	SOF High Explosives Magazine	1,400		1,400
304	Virginia	Spec Ops	Ft A.P. Hill	SOF Ground Mobility Support Building	1,500		1,500
305	Virginia	Spec Ops	NAB Little Creek	Boat Support Facility	10,500		10,500
306	Virginia	Spec Ops	NAB Little Creek	SEAL Team Operations Facility		9,000	9,000
307	Virginia	Spec Ops	NAB Little Creek	SOF Combat Skills Compound	12,700		12,700
308	Virginia	Spec Ops	NAB Little Creek	SOF Ground Mobility Maintenance Facility	1,000		1,000
309	Virginia	Army National Guard	Ft Pickett	Infantry Platoon Battle Course (SBCT)	5,170		5,170
310	Virginia	Army National Guard	Ft Pickett	MOUT Assault Course (SBCT)	1,409		1,409
311	Virginia	Navy Reserve	NMCRC Norfolk	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	3,290		3,290
312	Virginia	TMA	Ft Belvoir	Hospital Replacement, Phase I	43,000		43,000
313	Virginia	TMA	Langley AFB	Add/Alter Hospital	50,800		50,800
314	Washington	Army	Ft Lewis	Barracks Complex-41st Div Dr/B St, Phase 2	48,000		48,000
315	Washington	Navy	NAS Whidbey Island	Hazardous Materials Storehouse		1,990	1,990
316	Washington	Navy	NS Bremerton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters-Shipboard Ashore	34,125		34,125
317	Washington	Navy	NSY Puget Sound	CVN Maintenance Complex	20,305		20,305
318	Washington	Navy	NSY Puget Sound	Ocean Engineering Support Facility		3,150	3,150
319	Washington	Navy	SWFPAC Bangor	Limited Area Processing & Storage Complex	35,770		35,770
320	Washington	Army National Guard	Camp Murray	Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,400		1,400
321	Washington	Army Reserve	Vancouver	Land Acquisition	2,500		2,500
322	West Virginia	Air National Guard	Martinsburg ANG	C-5 Maintenance Hangar and Shops	36,000		36,000
323	Wisconsin	Air National Guard	Truax Field	ASA - Munitions Maintenance and Storage Complex	5,900		5,900
324	Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Ft McCoy	Infantry Platoon Battle Course	2,712		2,712
325	Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Ft McCoy	Squad Defense Range	1,248		1,248
326	Wyoming	Air Force	F.E. Warren AFB	Upgrade Storm Water Drainage System Ph 1		5,500	5,500
327	Bahamas	Navy	NUWC Andros Island	Bachelor Quarters	20,750		20,750
328	Diego Garcia	Navy	NAVSUPPFAC Diego Garcia	Solid Waste Management Center	17,500		17,500
329	Diego Garcia	TMA	Diego Garcia	Dental Clinic Replacement	3,800		3,800
330	Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Barracks Complex	28,500		28,500

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
331	Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Barracks Complex - Brigade	34,000		34,000
332	Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Brigade Support Complex	14,700		14,700
333	Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	Small Diameter Bomb Facilities	1,200		1,200
334	Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	USAFE Theater Aerospace Operations Support Center	24,204		24,204
335	Germany	DODEA	Grafenwoehr	New Elementary/Middle School	36,247		36,247
336	Germany	DODEA	Vilseck	High School Renovation/Addition	9,011		9,011
337	Germany	TMA	Grafenwoehr	Add/Alter Dispensary/Dental Clinic	13,000		13,000
338	Greenland	Air Force	Thule AB	Dormitory (72 Rm)	19,800		19,800
339	Guam	Navy	NPWC Guam	Water Treatment Plant Upgrade	20,700		20,700
340	Guam	Navy	NS Guam	KILO Wharf Improvements	12,500		12,500
341	Guam	Air Force	Andersen AFB	War Reserve Storage Facility	19,593		19,593
342	Guam	Spec Ops	NS Guam	SOF Ground Mobility Support Building	2,200		2,200
343	Guam	DODEA	NS Guam	High School Replacement	26,964		26,964
344	Italy	Army	Livorno	Warehouse Operations Facility	26,000		26,000
345	Italy	Navy	Sigonella	Access Improvements	7,430		7,430
346	Italy	Navy	Sigonella	Base Operations Support, Phase 2	15,120		15,120
347	Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Add/Alter Weapons Load/Maintenance Training Facility	2,300		2,300
348	Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Airfield Obstruction-Expand North Ramp, Phase 2	1,626		1,626
349	Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Flight Simulator	2,834		2,834
350	Japan	Air Force	Misawa AB	Expand Strategic Airlift Ramp	6,700		6,700
351	Japan	DLA	Misawa AB	Hydrant Fuel System	19,900		19,900
352	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Sanitary Sewer System	12,000		12,000
353	Korea	Air Force	Kunsan AB	Dorm (144 Rm)	18,550		18,550
354	Korea	Air Force	Kunsan AB	Dorm (144 Rm)	18,550		18,550
355	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Dormitory (156 Rm)	18,600		18,600
356	Portugal	Air Force	Lajes Field	Add/Alter Fitness Center, Phase 2	5,689		5,689
357	Portugal	DLA	DFSP Lajes Field	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	19,113		19,113
358	Puerto Rico	Army Reserve	ARC Aguadilla	Army Reserve Center	21,523		21,523
359	Spain	Navy	NS Rota	Command Operations Consolidation	32,700		32,700
360	Spain	Air Force	NS Rota	Aircraft Parking Apron, Phase 2	14,153		14,153
361	United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	4-Bay Mission Training Center	5,500		5,500
362	United Kingdom	Spec Ops	RAF Mildenhall	SOF Operations/Intelligence Facility	10,200		10,200
363	Worldwide Classified	Air Force	Classified	Classified	28,090		28,090

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
364	Worldwide Classified	Air Force	Worldwide Unspecified Clas	Special Tactical Unit Detachment Facility	704		704
365	Worldwide Classified	Spec Ops	Worldwide Unspecified Clas	SOF Building Addition	2,600		2,600
366	Worldwide Classified	Spec Ops	Worldwide Unspecified Clas	SOF Information Operations Facility Addition	4,800		4,800
367	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	20,000		20,000
368	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	130,335	9,874	140,209
369	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Host Nation Support	21,000		21,000
370	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	12,000		12,000
371	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	White Side Complex	18,560		18,560
372	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	87,067	6,737	93,804
373	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Presidential Helicopter Programs Support Facility	80,000		80,000
374	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Predator B Beddown	26,121		26,121
375	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	13,000		13,000
376	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	140,786	25,340	166,126
377	Worldwide Unspecified	Spec Ops	Unspecified Worldwide	Training Facility	2,900		2,900
378	Worldwide Unspecified	Spec Ops	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,710		2,710
379	Worldwide Unspecified	Spec Ops	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	10,566	1,300	11,866
380	Worldwide Unspecified	MDA	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,769		2,769
381	Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	30,845	13,262	44,107
382	Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,472	2,700	7,172
383	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,500		5,500
384	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	11,764	6,552	18,316
385	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	1,804		1,804
386	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,923		2,923
387	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	11,225	2,622	13,847
388	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	1,503	150	1,653
389	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	5,493	3,314	8,807
390	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,263		5,263
391	Worldwide Unspecified	DFAS	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,497		1,497
392	Worldwide Unspecified	BRAC IV	BRAC IV	Base Realignment & Closure	246,116		246,116
393	Worldwide Unspecified	TJS	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,214		7,214
394	Worldwide Unspecified	Other	Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	60,000	(10,000)	50,000
395	Worldwide Unspecified	Other	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000		3,000
396	Worldwide Unspecified	Other	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	22,216		22,216

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
397	Worldwide Unspecified	Other	Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	10,000		10,000
398	Worldwide Unspecified	Other	Unspecified Worldwide	NATO Security Investment Program	165,800		165,800
399	Worldwide Unspecified	DODEA	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	746		746
400	Worldwide Unspecified	TMA	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,002		3,002
401	Worldwide Unspecified	TMA	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	29,400		29,400
402	Alaska	Army	Ft Richardson	Family Housing Replacement Construction	42,000		42,000
403	Alaska	Army	Ft Wainwright	Family Housing New Construction	41,000		41,000
404	Alaska	Army	Ft Wainwright	Family Housing Replacement Construction	37,000		37,000
405	Alaska	Army	Ft Wainwright	Family Housing Replacement Construction	46,000		46,000
406	Arizona	Army	Ft Huachuca	Family Housing Replacement Construction	41,000		41,000
407	Arizona	Army	Yuma PG	Family Housing Replacement Construction	14,900		14,900
408	Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 6	48,500		48,500
409	California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Replace Family Housing	41,202		41,202
410	California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 8	30,906		30,906
411	Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Construct Housing Maintenance Facility	1,250		1,250
412	Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 6	21,723		21,723
413	Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 6	39,333		39,333
414	Kansas	Army	Ft Riley	Family Housing Replacement Construction	33,000		33,000
415	Mississippi	Air Force	Columbus AFB	Family Housing Management Facility	711		711
416	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 6	37,087		37,087
417	Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Replace Family Housing	29,910		29,910
418	New Mexico	Army	White Sands Missile Range	Family Housing Replacement Construction	31,000		31,000
419	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point	Replace SLOCUM Village, Phase 3	27,002		27,002
420	North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 8	32,693		32,693
421	North Dakota	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase H	26,169		26,169
422	North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 11	37,087		37,087
423	Oklahoma	Army	Ft Sill	Family Housing Replacement Construction	47,000		47,000
424	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Construct Huntley Park Fire Station	1,976		1,976
425	South Dakota	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 4	21,482		21,482
426	Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 5	28,664		28,664
427	Texas	Air Force	Goodfellow AFB	Construct Military Family Housing, Phase 1	20,604		20,604
428	Virginia	Army	Ft Lee	Family Housing Replacement Construction	46,000		46,000
429	Virginia	Army	Ft Monroe	Family Housing Replacement Construction	16,000		16,000

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
430	Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	Replace Family Housing	57,691		57,691
431	Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Replace Housing Office	2,542		2,542
432	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Construct Family Housing, Phase 3	46,834		46,834
433	United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Replace Family Housing	43,976		43,976
434	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	36,174		36,174
435	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	402,060	(2,400)	399,660
436	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	211,990		211,990
437	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	37,411		37,411
438	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	74,895		74,895
439	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support	26,644		26,644
440	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	132,356		132,356
441	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,333		1,333
442	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	218,033		218,033
443	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Interest Payments	1		1
444	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	29,209		29,209
445	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	137,226		137,226
446	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	57,691		57,691
447	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	136,883		136,883
448	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	654		654
449	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	81,859		81,859
450	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	20,756		20,756
451	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support	16,991		16,991
452	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Interest Payments	61		61
453	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	112,105		112,105
454	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	252,383	(8,200)	244,183
455	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Interest Payments	38		38
456	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	119,908		119,908
457	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	38,266		38,266
458	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	44,459	(2,500)	41,959
459	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	26,070		26,070
460	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	2,396		2,396
461	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support	39,104		39,104
462	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	435,782	(230)	435,552

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2005
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2005 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2005 Committee Authorization
463	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	125,459		125,459
464	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	238,353		238,353
465	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	70,680	(6,500)	64,180
466	Worldwide Unspecified	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	397		397
467	Worldwide Unspecified	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	293		293
468	Worldwide Unspecified	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	76		76
469	Worldwide Unspecified	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	36		36
470	Worldwide Unspecified	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	419		419
471	Worldwide Unspecified	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	11,257		11,257
472	Worldwide Unspecified	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	53		53
473	Worldwide Unspecified	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	471		471
474	Worldwide Unspecified	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	13		13
475	Worldwide Unspecified	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	1,939		1,939
476	Worldwide Unspecified	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	381		381
477	Worldwide Unspecified	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	116		116
478	Worldwide Unspecified	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	49		49
479	Worldwide Unspecified	DIA	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	30,199		30,199
480	Worldwide Unspecified	DIA	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	3,925		3,925
481	Worldwide Unspecified	Other	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,500		2,500
				Total Authorization of Appropriations	9,480,475	450,000	9,930,475

TITLE XXI—ARMY

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,771,285,000 for Army military construction and $1,565,006,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $1,866,209,000 for military construction and $1,562,606,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects: $750,000 for an aircraft maintenance hangar at Cairns Army Air Field, Fort Rucker, Alabama; $561,000 for a runway extension at Amedee Army Airfield, Sierra Army Depot, California; $2,250,000 for a receptee barracks expansion at Fort Benning, Georgia; $310,000 for a law enforcement complex at Fort Gordon, Georgia; $365,000 for a consolidated shipping center at Bluegrass Depot, Kentucky; $278,000 for a child development center at Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania; $486,000 for a military operations on unbanized terrain collective training facility at Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia; and $500,000 for access roads at Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2005. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2005.

Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize new improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2005.

Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Army's budget for fiscal year 2005. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2004 Projects

This section would amend the table in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136) to increase the amounts authorized for construction at Fort Stewart, Georgia, and Fort Drum, New York.

Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2003 Project

This section would amend the table in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314) to increase the amount authorized for construction at Fort Sill, Oklahoma.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,060,455,000 for Navy military construction and $843,611,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $1,077,862,000 for military construction and $835,411,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Navy complete planning and design activities for the following projects: $250,000 for an advanced sensors integration facility at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California; $268,000 for physical gate security enhancements at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, California; $150,000 for phase two of an aircraft parking apron at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida; $150,000 for a consolidated operations support facility at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida; and $1,032,000 for improvements to machine shops at Norfolk Naval Shipyard Detachment, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2005. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2005.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize new improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2005.

Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Navy's budget for fiscal year 2005. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $663,964,000 for Air Force military construction and $1,710,855,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $792,054,000 for military construction and $1,701,625,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following projects: $880,000 for a security forces operational facility at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida; $8,000,000 for a consolidated Central Command facility at MacDill Air Force Base, Florida; $1,340,000 for a logistics readiness center at Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho; $1,332,000 for a consolidated mobility processing center at McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas; $890,000 for alteration of a fuel cell dock at Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota; $497,000 for runway repair at Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska; $837,000 for a fire and crash rescue station at Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada; and $670,000 for a mission support complex at Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2005. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2005.

Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize new improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2005.

Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Air Force's budget for fiscal year 2005. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $699,437,000 for defense agency military construction and $49,624,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2005. The budget request also included $81,886,000 for chemical demilitarization construction projects in a separate title. The committee recommends including chemical demilitarization construction in Title XXIV. Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of $790,823,000 for military construction and $49,624,000 for family housing for defense agencies for fiscal year 2005.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized defense agencies construction projects for fiscal year 2005. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2402—Improvements to Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2005.

Section 2403—Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Section 2404—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize specific amounts for each line item contained in the defense agencies' budgets for fiscal year 2005. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the defense agencies may spend on military construction projects.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $165,800,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) infrastructure fund (NATO Security Investment Program) for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $165,800,000 for fiscal year 2005.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this bill and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize $165,800,000 as the U.S. contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $619,936,000 for military construction of guard and reserve facilities for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2005 of $839,845,000 to be distributed as follows:

Army National Guard	$393,225,000
Air National Guard	184,620,000
Army Reserve	116,955,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	30,955,000
Air Force Reserve	114,090,000
Total	839,845,000

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Planning and Design, Air National Guard

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following projects: $772,000 for a composite operations and training facility at Montgomery, Alabama; $509,000 for a space warning system squadron support facility at Greeley Air National Guard Station, Colorado; $300,000 for the relocation of the base entrance at Capital Municipal Airport, Illinois; $650,000 for a fire and crash rescue station at Rosecrans Memorial Airport, Missouri; $990,000 for a pararescue complex at

Francis S. Gabreski Airport, New York; and $501,000 for a fire and crash rescue station at Stewart International Airport, New York.

Planning and Design, Air Reserve

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following project: $954,000 for phase one of a joint services lodging facility at Youngstown Air Reserve Station, Ohio.

Planning and Design, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects: $789,000 for a joint armed forces reserve center at Daytona Beach, Florida; $844,000 for a armed forces reserve center at Gary, Indiana; $614,000 for a national guard and reserve center building at Lincoln Airbase, Nebraska; $485,000 for a readiness center at Hermitage, Pennsylvania; $1,999,000 for phase two of a readiness center addition and alteration at Nashville, Tennessee; $935,000 for a joint armed forces reserve center at Smyrna, Tennessee; $530,000 for a readiness center at Winchester, Virginia; and $2,014,000 for a readiness center at Fort Lewis, Washington.

Planning and Design, Army Reserve

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following project: $843,000 for a reserve center at Garden Grove, California.

Unspecified Minor Construction, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Army execute the following project: $2,700,000 for a wastewater treatment facility at Camp Shelby, Mississippi.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION

Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction for the guard and reserve by service component for fiscal year 2005. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law

This section would provide that authorizations for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, and guard and reserve projects will expire on October 1, 2007, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2008, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2007, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2008, whichever is later.

Section 2702—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2002 Projects

This section would extend fiscal year 2002 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2005, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2006, whichever is later. The extended authorization applies to the following projects: $23,000,000 for construction of a power plant cooling tower at Fort Wainwright, Alaska; $1,500,000 for Parker Ranch land acquisition at Pohakuloa Training Area, Hawaii; $11,400,000 for construction of family housing at Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado; and $7,300,000 to replace family housing at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana.

Section 2703—Extension and Renewal of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2001 Projects

This section would extend certain fiscal year 2001 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2005, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2006, whichever is later. The extended authorizations apply to the following projects: $250,000 for construction of family housing at Fort Jackson, South Carolina; $7,400,000 for Defense Finance and Accounting Service building renovation at Kleber Kaserne, Germany; and $843,000 for an elementary school classroom addition at Osan Air Base, Korea.

Section 2704—Effective Date

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, and XXVI of this bill shall take effect on October 1, 2004, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Base Realignment and Closure

By May 16, 2005, the Secretary of Defense must present recommendations for base closures and realignments to Congress and the base closure commission. With this deadline approximately one year away, the committee is increasingly concerned by the significant number of uncertainties and ongoing turbulent events that will dramatically affect the Department's infrastructure requirements both during and after the base closure process.

For example, the demands of the global war on terrorism continue to change, the manpower and infrastructure requirements related to the effort to rebuild Iraq continue to evolve, the Department has not yet completed a global review of its overseas military installations, each of the military services is in the midst of force transformation, end strength requirements of the services continue to be unsettled issues, and the infrastructure and force requirements for the Department to meet homeland security missions have not yet been determined.

Therefore, the committee includes a provision to require the Department to report to Congress on a number of unresolved infrastructure-related issues. Pending submission of these reports, the provision would suspend the base closure process until 2007.

The committee notes that a two-year postponement of the base closure and realignment round would have several benefits. First, postponement would allow the Department to stabilize force and funding requirements related to Iraq, Afghanistan, the war against terrorism, and homeland security before making base closure and realignment recommendations. Second, postponement would allow DOD to understand the impact of, and in some cases resolve, significant infrastructure-related issues such as global basing and transformation before making irreversible base closure decisions. Finally, base closure actions historically result in significant upfront costs with net savings not occurring for several years after closure activities. Delay of the base closure round until 2007 would provide relief to significant budgetary pressures on the Department during the next five years.

The committee also includes a provision to amend and codify the criteria used by the Department to make base closure and realignment recommendations. The committee's recommended changes address many of the comments that the Department received during the public comment period on the selection criteria.

Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs Health Care Facility Sharing

The committee continues to support efforts by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to design, construct, maintain, and operate health care facilities in a joint manner, and encourages the Department and VA to take advantage of opportunities to share health care facilities whenever possible. The committee report (H. Rept. 108–106) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, advocated

DOD participation in and contribution to the VA's plans to build a new hospital at the site of the closed Fitzsimons Army Hospital in Colorado. The committee reiterates its support for a joint DOD–VA hospital at the Fitzsimons Hospital site, and encourages the Department of Defense to contribute funds, at a level representative of its medical requirements, to design and construct such a facility.

Housing Requirements Analyses

The committee is aware that recent changes to methodology used in Housing Requirements Analyses have resulted in significant decreases to on-base housing requirements at many military installations, including McChord Air Force Base, Washington and Travis Air Force Base, California. Military Housing Privatization Initiative authorities do not prohibit privatized housing maintenance or construction in excess of the minimum requirement. As such, the committee encourages the services to inform housing privatization bidders of this point, particularly for those installations that have experienced significant decreases in on-base housing requirements as a result of the new housing methodology. In the specific case of McChord Air Force Base, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to explore joint efforts with the Army and the national guard to ensure that the privatized housing initiative at McChord is responsive to the needs of all active-duty military personnel in the region.

Military Housing Privatization Program

The committee continues to support the Department of Defense's efforts to privatize military family and unaccompanied housing. By the end of fiscal year 2004, the Department anticipates having used the privatization program to leverage private investments to provide quality housing to more than 90,000 military families. The success of this program to date validates the committee's recommendation to eliminate the $850.0 million statutory ceiling on government investment in privatization projects (section 2806), effective October 1, 2005.

Furthermore, the committee believes that the housing privatization model may be a viable means of providing housing to military personnel at enduring overseas installations. As such, the committee urges the Department to consider the feasibility of expanding housing privatization authorities to permit overseas military family housing privatization.

Finally, the committee notes that some local taxation authorities have chosen to levy real property taxes upon privatized housing projects. By taxing these properties, local authorities divert resources from reinvestment into military family housing facilities and cause significant reductions in the level of educational impact aid provided to communities with military dependents. Of particular concern are those cases where local taxation authorities have chosen to tax privatized family housing even though the local government is not providing municipal services such as trash collection and fire and police protection. The committee reminds local and state taxation authorities that taxation of privatized military family housing facilities has a direct effect on the quality of life of

military personnel stationed in their communities, and urges such authorities to repeal and refrain from real property taxation of such projects.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801—Increase in Certain Thresholds for Carrying Out Unspecified Minor Military Construction Projects

This section would amend section 2805(b) of title 10, United States Code, to increase from $750,000 to $1,000,000 the threshold at which service secretaries must approve the use of operation and maintenance funds for unspecified minor construction projects. This section would also amend section 2805(c) to establish a single limit of $1,500,000 at which operation and maintenance funds may be used for unspecified minor construction projects.

Section 2802—Assessment of Vulnerability of Military Installations to Terrorist Attack and Annual Report on Military Construction Requirements Related to Antiterrorism and Force Protection

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish guidance for the military services on appropriate levels of antiterrorism and force protection requirements for facilities construction and perimeter defenses (including gate and fence line construction). This section would also require the Secretary to certify that all major Department installations have been assessed for vulnerabilities to terrorist attack since September 11, 2001. Finally, this section would require the Department of Defense to provide an annual list of unfunded antiterrorism and force-protection military construction requirements.

Section 2803—Change in Threshold for Congressional Notification Regarding Use of Operation and Maintenance Funds for Facility Repair

This section would amend section 2811(d) of title 10, United States Code, to lower the threshold at which congressional notification is required for facility repairs using operation and maintenance funds from $10,000,000 to $7,500,000.

Section 2804—Reporting Requirements Regarding Military Family Housing Requirements for General Officers and Flag Officers

This section would require the Department of Defense to conduct an analysis of general and flag officer housing requirements in the national capital region by March 30, 2005. This analysis must be based upon available housing in the local housing market as well as requirements for key and essential personnel to be housed in secure locations.

The military services maintain more than 170 general and flag officer quarters in the national capital region. Although the committee recognizes the value of military family housing to quality of life, it is difficult to justify the high costs of building, operating, and maintaining a sizeable inventory of large general and flag offi-

cer quarters in the region. Therefore, this section would ensure that the Department determines whether the current number of such homes is appropriate.

This section would also require the Department to report to Congress, by March 30, 2005, on its inventory of general and flag officer housing, including annual expenditures of each house for operations, utilities, and maintenance and repair over the past five years. The committee notes with concern the large expenditures on maintenance, repair, operations, and utilities on general and flag officers quarters reported in the fiscal year 2005 budget justification documents. This section is intended to provide the Congress with an historical perspective of the number and costs associated with general and flag officer quarters.

Finally, this section would require the Department to provide as part of its annual budget justification documents, by March 30 of each year, a detailed list of each general and flag officer quarters for which operations, utilities, and maintenance and repair costs, in sum, are anticipated to exceed $20,000 in the coming year. Currently, annual appropriations laws require congressional notification prior to the expenditure of more than $35,000 for maintenance and repair for any single general or flag officer quarters. This section would enhance congressional oversight of total costs associated with general and flag officer housing.

Section 2805—Congressional Notification of Deviations from Authorized Cost Variations for Military Construction Projects and Military Family Housing Projects

This section would amend section 2853(c)(3) of title 10, United States Code, to shorten the notice and wait period for significant project cost increases or scope decreases from 21 days to 14 days, if notification is provided in an electronic format to Congress.

Section 2806—Repeal of Limitation on Use of Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Family Housing

This section would amend section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, to repeal the limitation on budget authority for contracts and investments in military housing privatization projects, effective October 1, 2005.

Section 2807—Temporary Authority to Accelerate Design Efforts for Military Construction Projects Carried Out Using Design-Build Selection Procedures

This section would establish a demonstration program to allow the Department of Defense to enter into a design-build construction contract using design funds made available under sections 2807 and 18233 of title 10, United States Code, prior to the authorization of the project. Contracts entered into under this demonstration program must be selected using existing design-build contract procedures. In addition, the federal government's liability for termination for convenience of any such contract may not exceed the project's design cost. This section would permit the Department to enter into 36 contracts through September 30, 2008, and would require a report to Congress on the value of the program by March 1, 2007.

Section 2808—Exchange or Sale of Reserve Component Facilities to Acquire Replacement Facilities

This section would amend section 18233 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to receive facilities, cash, or a combination of facilities and cash for existing reserve component facilities. Existing law only permits the Secretary to exchange reserve facilities for replacement facilities.

Section 2809—One-Year Extension of Temporary, Limited Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects Outside the United States

This section would extend for one year the authority provided by section 2808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) to permit the Secretary of Defense to utilize operation and maintenance funds to construct facilities necessary for temporary operational requirements related to a declaration of war, national emergency, or contingency.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Increase in Certain Thresholds for Reporting Real Property Transactions

This section would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from $750,000 to $1,500,000 the thresholds at which the military services must report to Congress real property transactions. This section would also make adjustments to annual reporting requirements for minor real property transactions.

Section 2812—Reorganization of Existing Administrative Provisions Relating to Real Property Transactions

This section would consolidate and reorganize sections of chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 2813—Treatment of Money Rentals from Golf Course at Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois

This section would amend section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to allow 50 percent of lease receipts from the Rock Island Arsenal Golf Club, a community club that leases and operates the arsenal's golf course for the general public and local military personnel, to be placed into the Rock Island Arsenal morale, welfare, and recreation fund.

Section 2814—Number of Contracts Authorized Department-Wide Under Demonstration Program on Reduction in Long-Term Facility Maintenance Costs

This section would amend section 2814 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) to adjust the number of contracts permitted under the building commissioning program. The existing program allows each military department to enter into 12 contracts for the construction and short-term maintenance of a facility. This section would adjust the limit to allow a total of 36 contracts for the Department of Defense.

Section 2815—Repeal of Commission on Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States

This section would repeal section 128 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–132), which established the Commission on the Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States.

Section 2816—Designation of Airmen Leadership School at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, in Honor of John J. Rhodes, a Former Minority Leader of the House of Representatives

This section would designate the Airmen Leadership School at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, the John J. Rhodes Airmen Leadership School in honor of the former minority leader of the House of Representatives, Congressman John J. Rhodes. Congressman Rhodes served in the United States Army Air Corps, served in the Arizona National Guard as a staff judge advocate, and represented the congressional district containing Luke Air Force Base for the majority of his service in the House of Representatives.

Section 2817—Elimination of Reversionary Interests Clouding United States Title to Property Used as Navy Homeports

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into agreements with holders of reversionary interests at Navy homeports to secure permanent title to the properties for the Navy. In exchange, the Navy may provide in-kind consideration including forfeiture of existing agreements that require payment to the Navy for real property improvements. The committee believes that such an exchange is in the interest of all parties, and would ensure that disposal of property at these homeports, should they be closed, realigned, or otherwise declared excess to Navy needs, is conducted in a manner that does not place local communities and developers at a disadvantage to locations which do not have reversionary agreements in place.

Section 2818—Report on Real Property Disposal at Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy, within 180 days of enactment, to report to Congress on the effort to dispose of real property at Marine Corps Air Station El Toro, California, anticipated future uses of the property, and requests received from other federal agencies for property at the air station.

SUBTITLE C—BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT

Section 2821—Two-Year Postponement of 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Round and Submission of Reports Regarding Future Infrastructure Requirements for the Armed Forces

This section would amend current base realignment and closure law to postpone the 2005 base closure and realignment round until 2007, pending receipt of several reports on significant infrastructure issues.

First, this section would require the Department of Defense to study and report to Congress on the following issues: the Depart-

ment's Integrated Global Basing Strategy, including basing locations, rotational plans and policies, and overseas and domestic infrastructure requirements associated with that strategy; a study of the infrastructure requirements associated with force transformation efforts; a report on infrastructure requirements related to changes to the active and reserve personnel mixtures of the services; a study of the infrastructure requirements resulting from the Secretary of Defense's "10–30–30" objective; a reassessment of excess infrastructure capacity that is based upon infrastructure, facility, and space requirements of current, future, and surged military forces; and a definition of, and infrastructure requirements associated with, "surge requirements" as determined by the Secretary as required by section 2822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). These reports must be submitted between January 1, 2006, and March 15, 2006, or the authority to conduct an additional round of base closures would be terminated.

In order to permit sufficient time for congressional review of these documents and to allow the Department to incorporate the findings of these reports into base closure and realignment recommendations, this section would suspend the base realignment and closure process until 2007.

Finally, this section would require resubmission of a force structure plan based on an assessment of probable threats to national security during the 20 year period beginning with fiscal year 2007, including anticipated endstrength and force units necessary to meet those threats. It would also require the Secretary of Defense to certify the need for an additional round of base closures as part of the fiscal year 2007 budget justification materials.

The committee notes that a two-year postponement of the base closure and realignment round would have several benefits. First, postponement would allow the Department to stabilize force and funding requirements related to Iraq, Afghanistan, the war against terrorism, and homeland security before making base closure and realignment recommendations. Second, postponement would allow DOD to understand the impact of, and in some cases resolve, significant infrastructure-related issues such as global basing and transformation before making irreversible base closure decisions. Finally, base closure actions historically result in significant upfront costs with net savings not occurring for several years after closure activities. Delay of the base closure round until 2007 would provide relief to significant budgetary pressures on the Department during the next five years.

Section 2822—Establishment of Specific Deadline for Submission of Revisions to Force-Structure Plan and Infrastructure Inventory for Next Base Closure Round

This section would amend section 2912(a)(4) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510, as amended) to establish March 15 of the base closure round year as the final deadline for revision of the force structure plan or infrastructure inventory. The Secretary of Defense published an initial force structure plan and infrastructure inventory, as required by base closure law, in March 2004. This force structure plan and infrastructure inventory, along with selec-

tion criteria, will be used by the Secretary to make base closure and realignment recommendations. While section 2912(a)(4) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 permits the Secretary to revise the plan and inventory by submitting such a revision to Congress as part of the budget justification documents for fiscal year 2006, existing law does not include a specific deadline for submission. This section would establish March 15, of the base closure round year as the deadline, thereby ensuring that any revision to the force structure plan and infrastructure inventory is made with sufficient time to permit congressional review and Department of Defense implementation.

Section 2823—Specification of Final Selection Criteria for Next Base Closure Round

This section would amend and codify the criteria that will be used by the Secretary of Defense in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States during the next base closure round.

The Secretary published draft selection criteria in the Federal Register on December 23, 2003. Following a public comment period, during which the Secretary received comments relating to approximately 200 areas of concern, the final selection criteria were published on February 12, 2004. Despite the number of public comments and criticisms, the final published selection criteria were identical to the initial proposal. This section would modify the selection criteria to incorporate many of the comments and concerns received by the Department of Defense during the comment period and would codify the amended criteria into base closure law.

Section 2824—Requirement for Unanimous Vote of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission to Add to or Otherwise Expand Closure and Realignment Recommendations made by Secretary of Defense

This section would amend section 2914(d) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510, as amended) to require a unanimous vote of the base closure commission to recommend closure, realignment, or expanded realignment of an installation not recommended for closure or realignment by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 2825—Adherence to Certain Authorities on Preservation of Military Depot Capabilities During Any Subsequent Round of Base Closures and Realignments

This section would amend the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510, as amended) to require that base closure and realignment actions comply with provisions of title 10, United States Code, that address government-owned, government-operated depot-level maintenance, repair, and logistics capabilities within the Department of Defense. In addition, this section would prohibit any base closure or realignment action from including a waiver to sections 2464 or section 2466 of title 10, United States code, relating to the preservation of government-owned, government-operated depot facilities and the annual percentage of military department funding for depot level

maintenance and repair activities that may be expended on private sector depot activities.

SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

PART I—ARMY CONVEYANCES

Section 2831—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer, without consideration, administrative jurisdiction over approximately 20 acres of real property to the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs to be used for the location of a veterans' outpatient clinic.

Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Fort Hood, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey approximately 662 acres at Fort Hood, Texas, to the Texas A&M University system of the state of Texas for the purpose of establishing Texas A&M University, Central Texas. In exchange, the Army shall receive fair market value in cash or in-kind consideration for the property. Finally, conveyance of the property is contingent upon the Secretary of the Army's determination that use of the land as a university will not adversely impact operations at Fort Hood's Robert Gray Army Airfield.

Section 2833—Land Conveyance, Army National Guard Facility, Seattle, Washington

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, approximately 10 acres of real property, including a portion of a national guard facility, to the state of Washington to support relocation of a guard unit.

PART II—NAVY CONVEYANCES

Section 2841—Transfer of Jurisdiction, Nebraska Avenue Naval Complex, District of Columbia

This section would transfer jurisdiction of the Nebraska Avenue Naval Complex in Washington, D.C., from the Navy to the Administrator of General Services for the purpose of accommodating the Department of Homeland Security. The initial costs incurred by the Navy as a result of the transfer, including move-out costs and first-year lease costs, shall be paid for by the Department of Homeland Security, subject to appropriations.

The section would also express the sense of Congress that long-term relocation costs incurred by the Navy, to include final relocation costs and permanent construction, shall be paid for from federal sources outside of the Department of Defense. In addition, the provision would require the President, after consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the committees on Armed Services and Appropriations, to certify within three years of the transfer whether the Navy's costs related to its departure from the complex have been fully compensated. If the Navy's costs have not been fully compensated, the property shall revert to the jurisdiction of

the Navy, which must then dispose of the property by competitive sale.

Section 2842—Land Conveyance, Navy Property, Former Fort Sheridan, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, a parcel of environmentally sensitive property to a nonprofit land conservation organization for the purpose of ensuring permanent protection of the lands.

Section 2843—Land Exchange, Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey approximately five acres of real property at Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland, to the state of Maryland. In exchange, the Navy shall receive approximately 1.5 acres of property of an equal value to the conveyance.

PART III—AIR FORCE CONVEYANCES

Section 2851—Land Exchange, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey the Maxwell Heights Housing site at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, to the city of Montgomery, Alabama. In exchange, the Air Force shall receive approximately 35 acres of land contiguous to Maxwell Air Force Base.

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

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $16,797.6 million for the national security activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2005. Of this amount, $9,048.7 million is for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and $7,748.9 million is for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $16,700.6 million, a decrease of $97.0 million.

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	Committee Authorization
Weapons Activities					
Directed stockpile work (DSW)		(39,000)		(39,000)	(39,000)
B61 life extension program	117,927				117,927
W76 life extension program	213,111				213,111
W80 life extension program	146,400				146,400
W87 life extension program					
B61 stockpile systems	91,256				91,256
W62 stockpile systems	18,401				18,401
W76 stockpile systems	137,527				137,527
W78 stockpile systems	44,313				44,313
W80 stockpile systems	49,507				49,507
B83 stockpile systems	44,995				44,995
W84 stockpile systems	6,119				6,119
W87 stockpile systems	94,884				94,884
W88 stockpile systems	49,093				49,093
Retired warheads stockpile systems	65,258				65,258
Stockpile services research & development certification and safety	157,986				157,986
Stockpile services management, technology and production	133,101				133,101
Stockpile services advanced concepts	9,000				9,000
Stockpile services robust nuclear earth penetrator	27,557				27,557
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,406,435	(39,000)		(39,000)	1,367,435
Campaigns					
Science campaigns		(19,500)		(19,500)	(19,500)
Primary assesment technology	81,473				81,473
Dynamic materials properties	91,521				91,521
Advanced radiography	62,371				62,371
Secondary assessment technologies	65,597				65,597
Total, Science campaigns	300,962	(19,500)		(19,500)	215,865
Engineering campaign					
Enhanced surety	38,121				38,121
Weapons system engineering assessment technology	27,270				27,270
Nuclear survivability	24,460				24,460
Enhanced surveillance	99,879				99,879

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	Committee Authorization
Microsystems and engineering sciences (MESA) other project costs (OPC)	4,600				4,600
Microsystems and engineering sciences					
Application (MESA) construction	48,654	20,000	20,000		68,654
Total, Engineering campaign	242,984	20,000	20,000		262,984
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign					
Ignition	76,437				76,437
Support of stockpile program	38,987				38,987
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experiment support	44,023				44,023
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	10,080				10,080
Univeristy grants/other support	7,776				7,776
Facility operations and target production	63,056				63,056
Inertial fusion technology					
NIF demonstration program	113,700				113,700
High-energy petawatt laser development	7,975				7,975
NIF other project costs (OPC)					
NIF construction	130,000				130,000
Total, Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign	492,034				492,034
Advanced simulation and computing campaign		(20,000)		(20,000)	(20,000)
Advanced application development	150,793				150,793
Verification and walidation	49,780				49,780
Materials and physics modeling	72,062				72,062
Problem solving environment (PSE)	45,072				45,072
Distance computing (DisCom)	17,068				17,068
Pathforward	18,000				18,000
Visual interactive environment for weapons simulation (VIEWS)	61,635				61,635
Physical infrastructure & platforms	140,000				140,000
Computational systems	64,081				64,081
Simulation support	59,413				59,413
Advanced architecture	3,000				3,000
University partnerships	47,980				47,980
ASCI integration	9,148				9,148
Construction projects	3,228				3,228
Total, Advanced simulation and computing campaign	741,260	(20,000)		(20,000)	721,260

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	Committee Authorization
Pit manufacturing and certification campaign	336,473				336,473
Readiness Campaign					
Stockpile readiness	45,812				45,812
High explosives and weapon operations	34,220				34,220
Non-nuclear readiness	35,457				35,457
Tritium readiness	58,850				58,850
Tritium readiness construction	21,000				21,000
Advanced design & production technologies	84,788				84,788
Construction:					
Total, Readiness campaign	280,127				280,127
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)					
Operations of facilities					
Kansas City Plant	101,775	5,000	5,000		106,775
LLNL	54,765	8,000	8,000		62,765
LANL	318,913				318,913
Nevada Test Site	70,180				70,180
Pantex Plant	97,741	19,000	19,000		116,741
Sandia National Laboratories	150,710	18,000	18,000		168,710
Savannah River Site	95,173				95,173
Y-12 National Security Complex	98,194	18,000	18,000		116,194
Institutional site support	30,106				30,106
Program readiness	106,204				106,204
Special projects	20,534				20,534
Material recycle and recovery	86,965				86,965
Containers	17,910				17,910
Storage	18,982				18,982
Subtotal, operations & maintenance	1,268,152	68,000	68,000		1,336,152
Construction:					
05-D-140 Project engineering design various locations	11,600				11,600
05-D-401 Building 12-64 production bays upgrades Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	25,100				25,100
05-D-402 Berylium capability (BEC) project, Y-12 National Security Complex, Oakridge, TN	3,627				3,627
04-D-103 Project engineering and design, (PED) various locations	1,500				1,500

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	Committee Authorization
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	24,000				24,000
04-D-126 Building 12-44 production cellsupgrade, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	2,600				2,600
03-D-102 LANL Admininistration Building (LANL)	37,348				37,348
03-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	15,275				15,275
03-D-123 Special nuclear materials component requalification facility, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	4,602				4,602
02-D-103 Project engineering and design, various locations	5,250				5,250
02-D-105 Engineering technology complex upgrade (ETCU), LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,400				5,400
01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	6,000				6,000
01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	64,000				64,000
Total, Construction	206,302				206,302
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,474,454	68,000	68,000		1,542,454
Secure transportation asset					
Operations and equipment	143,873				143,873
Program direction	57,427				57,427
Subtotal, Secure transportation asset	201,300				201,300
Total, Secure transportation asset	201,300				201,300
Nuclear weapons incident response					
Emergency response	93,119				93,119
Emergency management	6,090				6,090
Total, nuclear weapons incident response	99,209				99,209
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program					
Operation and maintenance	291,543				291,543
Construction					
05-D-160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), project engineering and design (PED)	8,700				8,700
05-D-601Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y-12, National security complex, Oakridge, TN	4,400				4,400
05-D-602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	10,000				10,000
05-D-603 New master substation (NMSU) SNL	600				600
04-D-203 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), project engineering design (PED)	981				981
Total, Construction	24,681				24,681
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	316,224				316,224
Safeguards and security					

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	Committee Authorization
Physical security	589,491				589,491
Cyber Security	80,500				80,500
Subtotal, operations and maintanence	669,991				669,991
Construction:					
05-D-170 Project engineering and design, various locations	17,000				17,000
05-D-701 Security perimeter project, Los Alamos, National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	20,000				20,000
Subtotal, construction	37,000				37,000
Total, Safeguards and security	706,991				706,991
Subtotal, Weapons Activities	6,598,453	9,500	88,000	(78,500)	6,607,953
Adjustments					
Use of prior year balances					
Less security charge for reimbursable work	(30,000)				(30,000)
Total, Adjustments	(30,000)				(30,000)
Total, Weapons Activities	6,568,453	9,500	88,000	(78,500)	6,547,953
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation					
Nonproliferation and verification R&D					
Operation and maintenance	220,000				220,000
Nonproliferation and international security	124,000				124,000
IAEA Safeguards and Nonproliferation Policy					
Nuclear Noncompliance Verification					
Nonproliferation programs with Russia					
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	238,000	(10,500)		(10,500)	227,500
Russian transition initiatives	41,000				41,000
HEU transparency implementation	20,950				20,950
International nuclear safety and cooperation					
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	50,097				50,097
Fissile materials disposition					
U S surplus materials disposition	184,700				184,700
Russian surplus materials disposition	64,000				64,000
Total, Fissile materials disposition	248,700				248,700
Construction:					

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	Committee Authorization
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	32,300				32,300
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	368,000				368,000
Total, Construction	400,300				400,300
Total, Fissile materials disposition	649,000				649,000
Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia	999,047	(10,500)		(10,500)	988,547
Offsight source recovery project	5,600				5,600
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,348,647	(10,500)		(10,500)	1,338,147
Adjustments:					
Use of prior year balances					
Total, Adjustments					
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,348,647	(10,500)		(10,500)	1,338,147
Naval Reactors					
Naval reactors development					
Operation and maintenance	761,211				761,211
Construction:					
05-N-900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY	6,200				6,200
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	989				989
Total, Construction	7,189				7,189
Total, Naval reactors development	768,400				768,400
Program direction	29,500				29,500
Subtotal, Naval Reactors	797,900				797,900
Total, Naval Reactors	797,900				797,900
Office Of The Administrator					
Office of the Administrator	333,700				333,700
Total, Office of the Administrator	333,700				333,700
Defense Site Acceleration Completion *(Defense Facilities Closure Projects)*					
2006 Accelerated completions					
Operation and maintenance	1,251,799				1,251,799

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	Committee Authorization
2012 Accelerated Completions					
Operation and maintenance	1,437,001				1,437,001
Construction:					
04-D-414 Project engineering and design, various locations	3,000				3,000
04-D-423 3013 container surveillance capability in 235-F, SR	20,640				20,640
01-D-416 Waste treatment and immobilization plant, RL	690,000				690,000
Total, Construction	713,640				713,640
Total, 2012 Accelerated Completions	2,150,641				2,150,641
2035 Accelerated Completions					
Operation and maintenance	1,849,512				1,849,512
Construction:					
04-D-408 Glass waste storage building #2, SR	43,827				43,827
Total, Construction	43,827				43,827
Total, 2035 Accelerated Completions	1,893,339				1,893,339
Safeguards and security	265,059				265,059
High level waste legislative proposal		(100,000)		(100,000)	(100,000)
Operation and maintenance	249,442				249,442
Construction					
05-D-401 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	52,000				52,000
04-D-414 04-02 PED: Sodium bearing waste treatment, Idaho	24,900				24,900
03-D-414 PED: salt waste processing facility alternative, Savannah River	23,658				23,658
Total, Construction	100,558				100,558
Total, High level waste legislative proposal	350,000	(100,000)		(100,000)	250,000
Technology development and deployment	60,142	6,000			66,142
Hammer			6,000		
Subtotal, Defense Site Acceleration Completion	5,970,980	(94,000)		(100,000)	5,876,980
Use of prior year balances					
Less security charge for reimbursable work	(143)				(143)
Total, Defense Site Acceleration Completion	5,970,837	(94,000)	6,000	(100,000)	5,876,837

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	Committee Authorization
Defense Environmental Services					
Community and regulatory support	60,547				60,547
Federal contribution to the uranium enrichment	463,000	4,000			467,000
Non-closure environmental activities			4,000		
Operation and maintenance	187,864				187,864
Program direction	271,059				271,059
Subtotal, Defense Environmental Services	982,470	4,000	4,000		986,470
Use of prior year balances					
Total, Defense Environmental Services	982,470	4,000	4,000		986,470
Other Defense Activities					
Energy security and assurance					
Energy security	6,100				6,100
Program direction	4,500				4,500
Total, Energy security and assurance	10,600				10,600
Office of Security					
Nuclear safeguards and security	143,197				143,197
Security investigations	53,554				53,554
Program direction	58,350				58,350
Total, Office of Security	255,101				255,101
Independent oversight and performance assurance	24,669				24,669
Civilian radioactive waste management					
Spent nuclear fuel management	21,190				21,190
Program direction	1,060				1,060
Total, Civilian radioactive waste management	22,250				22,250
Environment, safety & health					
Environment, safety and health (defense)	99,105				99,105
Program direction	20,414				20,414
Total, Environment, safety and health	119,519				119,519

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	Committee Authorization
Office of Legacy Management					
Legacy management	19,194				19,194
Worker and community transition	2,500	(2,500)		(2,500)	
Program direction	13,201				13,201
Total, Office of Legacy Management	34,895	(2,500)		(2,500)	32,395
Nuclear energy					
Infrastructure					
Idaho facilities management					
INEEL infrastructure O&M	20,886	1,500	1,500		22,386
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	58,103				58,103
Total, Infrastructure	78,989	1,500	1,500		80,489
Program direction	33,858				33,858
Total, Nuclear energy	112,847	1,500	1,500		114,347
Defense related administrative support	92,440				92,440
Office of hearings and appeals	4,318				4,318
Office of Future Liabilities					
Future Liabilities	5,000	(5,000)		(5,000)	
Subtotal, Other defense activities	681,639	(6,000)	1,500	(7,500)	675,639
Adjustments:					
Use of prior year balances	(15,000)				(15,000)
Less security charge for reimbursable work (SO)					
Less security charge for reimbursable work (NE)	(2,021)				(2,021)
Total, Adjustments	(17,021)				(17,021)
Total, Other Defense Activities	664,618	(6,000)	1,500	(7,500)	658,618
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal					
Defense nuclear waste disposal	131,000				131,000

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	FY 2005 Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	Committee Authorization
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	6,568,453	9,500	88,000	(78,500)	6,577,953
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,348,647	(10,500)		(10,500)	1,338,147
Naval reactors	797,900				797,900
Office of the administrator	333,700				333,700
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	9,048,700	(1,000)	88,000	(89,000)	9,047,700
Environmental and other defense activities:					
Defense site acceleration completion	5,970,837	(94,000)	6,000	(100,000)	5,876,837
Defense environmental services	982,470	4,000	4,000		986,470
Other defense activities	664,618	(6,000)	1,500	(7,500)	658,618
Defense nuclear waste disposal	131,000				131,000
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	7,748,925	(96,000)	11,500	(107,500)	7,652,925
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	16,797,625	(97,000)	99,500	(196,500)	16,700,625
Defense Nuclear Facilites Safety Board	20,268	1,000	1,000		21,268
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program - Corps of Engineers	[140,000]				
Total, Department of Energy (053)	16,817,893	(96,000)	100,500	(196,500)	16,721,893

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Overview

The budget request contained $9,048.7 million for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2005. The committee recommends $9,047.7 million, a decrease of $1.0 million.

Adjustments to the Budget Request

Reductions

Directed stockpile work

The budget request contained $1,406.4 million for directed stockpile work.

The committee notes that the nuclear weapon stockpile requirements that guide the stockpile life extension programs are under review by the Department of Defense as part of a periodic assessment of the Nuclear Posture Review. The committee also notes that it is difficult for the committee to support increases in funding for individual warhead life extension programs until this assessment is completed and forwarded to the congressional defense committees.

The committee recommends $1,367.4 million, a decrease of $39.0 million.

Campaigns

The budget request contained $301.0 million for the science campaign.

The committee notes with concern that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) reported mixed results in meeting the fiscal year 2003 science campaign performance targets contained in the NNSA Future-Year Nuclear Security Program.

The committee recommends $281.5 million, a decrease of $19.5 million. This funding level represents an increase of $18.0 million over the fiscal year 2004 appropriation.

The budget request contained $741.3 million for the Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASC) campaign. The committee notes that the ASC campaign has experienced cost growth and schedule slippage. The committee also notes that the campaign is apparently procuring a considerably larger set of computers than originally envisioned.

The committee recommends $721.3 million, a decrease of $20.0 million. This funding represents funding at the fiscal year 2004 level.

International nuclear materials protection and cooperation

The budget request contained $43.0 million within the International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation program for security enhancements at the MinAtom Weapons complex.

The committee understands that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has had limited success in completing security upgrades at these sites due to MinAtom not granting access. While the committee supports the goals of this program, it does not

support authorizing funds for projects where NNSA does not have the access required to accomplish program objectives.

The committee recommends $32.5 million, a decrease of $10.5 million. The recommended funding is equivalent to the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2004. The committee directs the Administrator of the NNSA to submit a report with the fiscal year 2006 budget request on the status of NNSA access, as of the end of fiscal year 2004, to those MinAtom sites where Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for security upgrades.

Increases

Engineering campaign

The budget request contained $48.7 million in the engineering campaign for construction of the Microsystems and Engineering Sciences Application (MESA) complex at Sandia National Laboratories (project 01–D–108).

The committee notes that when complete, MESA will be a significant facility for modernizing the electrical, optical, and mechanical components of the nuclear stockpile using computationally enabled micro-technologies. Accelerated construction of the MESA complex will ensure timely availability of critical tools for stockpile stewardship.

The committee recommends $68.7 million, an increase of $20.0 million for further acceleration of MESA construction. The NNSA Administrator is directed to submit a revised MESA construction baseline with the fiscal year 2006 budget request that reflects congressional funding increases through the end of fiscal year 2005.

Readiness in technical base and facilities

The budget request contained $1,474.5 million for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities.

The committee has been encouraged by the progress made in the reduction of deferred maintenance backlogs in the defense nuclear complex.

The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million for replacement of aging equipment, correction of deferred maintenance, and disposition of legacy materials consistent with the National Nuclear Security Administration approved 10 year comprehensive site plan as follows: $5.0 million at the Kansas City Plant, $8.0 million at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, $19.0 million at Pantex and $18.0 million at the Y–12 plant.

The committee is aware that accelerated construction and delivery of the Z Petawatt laser will add significant radiographic diagnostic capabilities to the stockpile stewardship campaign. The committee recommends an increase of $13.0 million for the Z Petawatt laser.

The committee is aware that adding a second operations shift to the Z facility will meet the increased demand for experiments conducted on the Z machine. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to fund a second shift operation at the Z facility.

Advanced Concepts and Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator

The committee supports the budget request of $9.0 million for Advanced Concepts and $27.6 million for completion of the 6.2/2A

Air Force-led study on the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP). The committee strongly reaffirms the importance of these two initiatives and authorizes the full amount of the request.

The committee notes that the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has stated in testimony before the committee that the RNEP study was being conducted at the request of the Department of Defense. The committee also takes note that a recent Defense Science Board Task Force study on Future Strategic Strike Forces specifically recommended that research be initiated on nuclear weapons that produce much lower collateral damage than those weapons in the existing nuclear stockpile. The committee also reminds the NNSA that any efforts beyond a study could only be pursued if the President approves and funds are authorized and appropriated by Congress.

Advanced Technology Research and Development

The committee notes that the budget requests funds for advanced technology research and development in several activities within the National Nuclear Security Administration. The committee encourages the Administrator to review individual advanced technology research and development programs to ensure they are coordinated with, and do not duplicate, other similar research and development efforts.

Los Alamos Public Schools

The committee report on H.R. 1588 (H. Rept. 108–106) stated the concern that little progress has been made in developing an exit strategy for the Department of Energy to discontinue funding for the Los Alamos Public Schools system. The fiscal year 2005 budget request contained no funding for the Los Alamos Public Schools, ending a practice whereby for many years this school district was the only one receiving assistance from the Department.

The Department, in its February 2004 report, "Support for Public Education in the Vicinity of Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico," concluded that the Los Alamos Public School District must receive stable financial support if the Los Alamos Public School District is to maintain the standard of educational excellence that the Los Alamos National Laboratory staff demands. According to the report, this support to the public schools is required in order for the laboratory to attract and retain the talented and highly educated individuals required to execute its national security mission. One option the report recommended for supplementing the resources of the Los Alamos Public Schools was to allow the management and operating contractor for Los Alamos National Laboratory to support the Los Alamos Public Schools within the confines of the existing operating contract.

The committee understands the need to attract and retain highly talented personnel for the national laboratory complex. Therefore, the committee directs the Department, from within those funds authorized for Department activities at Los Alamos National Laboratory, to provide $8.0 million per year out of site contractor overhead, to support the Los Alamos Public School District.

Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility

The committee notes the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) recent announcement of a delay until the summer of 2005 for starting construction of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility (MOX) in the Russian Federation due to delays in resolving a government-to-government liability agreement. Recent discussions with the NNSA indicate that the 2005 commencement date may also be in jeopardy. The committee notes that the projected start of construction has slipped four years since the project began in fiscal year 2000.

While the committee fully supports the MOX program objective of conversion of weapons grade plutonium into fuel for commercial reactors, it is concerned with these delays and does not want to further add to the existing uncommitted balances in the NNSA nonproliferation accounts. The committee directs the Administrator of the NNSA to notify the congressional defense committees within 30 days of any decision that construction of the MOX facility will not begin by the end of fiscal year 2005.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained $7,748.9 million for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $7,652.9 million, a decrease of $96.0 million.

Adjustments to the Budget Request

Reductions

Waste incidental to reprocessing

The budget request contained $350.0 million for a High Level Waste Proposal program within the Defense Site Acceleration Completion account to address a contingency for "Waste Incidental to Reprocessing." The budget materials state that these funds will only be requested to the extent that legal uncertainty concerning certain reprocessing wastes is satisfactorily resolved through pending litigation or by new legislation. This uncertainty was raised by a 2003 federal district court ruling that the Department of Energy's reclassification of waste streams generated by reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel violated the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (*Natural Resources Defense Council* v. *Spencer Abraham*, District Court of Idaho, 2003).

The committee understands that this request concerns matters that are both pending the outcome of litigation and the subject of negotiations with individual states. The committee has not received formal transmittal of a legislative proposal. However, the committee notes that the Department is actively working with the states to achieve consensus on a legislative proposal that would clarify the law and allow cleanup activities to proceed. The committee also notes it does not appear that the federal court decision requires a cessation of all current waste cleanup activities and that the budget request contains $3,368.0 million for Defense Site Acceleration Completion for sites in Idaho, South Carolina, and Washington.

The committee notes that some of the activities proposed to be funded in the High Level Waste Proposal may either be precluded by or imprudent to conduct under the federal district court ruling. The committee urges the Department to proceed with those cleanup activities that are not prevented by the federal district court ruling or are not otherwise deemed inappropriate due to the legal uncertainty resulting from the court ruling. The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 1, 2005 stating which of those activities listed under the High Level Waste Proposal can proceed consistent with the current legal determination and those that cannot, clearly stating the rationale for each such determination. The committee also urges the Department to submit a legislative proposal at the earliest opportunity to clarify the law on Waste Incidental to Reprocessing in order to facilitate long-term cleanup plans across all defense sites.

The committee recognizes the significant costs and schedule impacts for future defense site acceleration cleanup plans in the event the district court ruling stands and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act is not amended. The committee includes a legislative provision calling for a National Academy of Sciences study of the Department's plans to manage and treat prior to final disposal the high-level radioactive waste at the Savannah River Site, South Carolina, the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho and the Hanford Reservation, Washington.

The committee recommends $250.0 million, a decrease of $100.0 million. Should funds in excess of the amount authorized be required for site cleanup activities under the High Level Waste Proposal in fiscal year 2005, the Department of Energy is directed to submit a request for reprogramming of funds to the congressional defense committees.

Worker and community transition

The budget request contained $2.5 million for worker and community transition within the Office of Legacy Management.

The committee notes that the budget request states that the need for worker transition assistance has considerably diminished in recent years and that there is no estimated need for community transition assistance during fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommends no funds for worker and community transition and recommends the Department of Energy terminate the program.

Office of future liabilities

The budget contained $5.0 million for the Office of Future Liabilities. The committee notes that the Office of Future Liabilities was just recently established by the Department of Energy to fund and manage environmental liabilities not assigned to the Office of Environmental Management or other organizations within the Department. The committee also notes that the Department had previously established a new Office of Legacy Management in 2003.

While the committee is encouraged that the Office of Environmental Management is taking a long term view of future management issues, it appears premature to establish an Office of Future

Liabilities when the current Defense Site Acceleration Completion activities are scheduled to continue through fiscal year 2035.

The committee recommends no funds for the Office of Future Liabilities and encourages the Department to perform those functions within the Office of Environmental Management or Office of Legacy Management.

Increases

2035 defense site accelerated completions

The budget request contains no funds for the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response Training and Education (HAMMER) center.

The committee is aware that the HAMMER center provides valuable training for emergency response personnel. The committee is also aware that the Department of Energy is reviewing whether the HAMMER center should be operated by the Office of Environmental Management or by the Office of Energy Security and Assurance.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for operation of the HAMMER center. The committee also urges the Secretary to make a determination as to what office within the Department should have long-term responsibility for operation of the HAMMER center.

Non-closure environmental activities

The budget request contained $187.9 million for non-closure environmental activities.

The committee is aware of a need to fund newly generated waste requirements and ground water cleanup activities at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

The committee recommends $191.9 million, an increase of $4.0 million for newly generated waste requirements and ground water cleanup activities at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Project HQ–SW–0013Y).

Idaho facilities management-other defense activities

The budget request contained $20.9 million for Idaho Facilities Management-Other Defense Activities.

The committee is aware that spent nuclear fuel, a portion of which is the responsibility of the Department of Energy through contracts by the Department and its predecessor federal agencies, is in long-term storage in aluminum canisters at the Lynchburg Technology Center operated by BWX Technologies in Lynchburg, Virginia. The committee also notes that both the Department and BWX Technologies have indicated that inspections, and possibly repackaging, of the stored spent nuclear fuel are required to ensure proper long-term storage.

The committee recommends $22.4 million, an increase of $1.5 million, for the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology to inspect and repackage, as appropriate, its spent nuclear fuel stored in outside storage wells at the Lynchburg Technology Center in Lynchburg, Virginia. After the spent nuclear fuel is inspected and appropriate repackaging is completed, it is to be replaced in refurbished storage wells. The specific spent nuclear fuel covered by

this requirement is that spent nuclear fuel described in the storage contract (DE–AC02–02NE23429) between the Department, as administered by the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science, and Technology, and BWX Technologies. The committee intends for this work to start in fiscal year 2005 and conclude no later than the end of fiscal year 2007.

Technology Deployment and Development

The committee notes that several high-level waste separation technologies under development could potentially reduce costs and shorten schedules for high-level waste remediation. The committee encourages the Department, within funds authorized under Defense Site Acceleration Completion for technology deployment and development, to fund technology demonstrations that provide alternative solutions for high-level waste separation.

Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program

The committee is concerned with the lack of progress the Department of Energy has made in processing the backlog of defense nuclear worker claims under Subtitle D of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act. The committee notes that recent Department statistics reflect that 2,257 cases have been completed out of the 23,996 applications received for health-related claims under the Act. However, the committee also notes that only a handful of workers determined to have valid health-related claims have actually received any compensation. The committee also understands that a recent GAO report notes that the lack of a "willing payer" of workers" compensation benefits for some workers means that some workers with valid defense nuclear complex health claims may receive no compensation.

While the Department has made some progress in processing the claims, the committee notes that further improvements to processing are required to ensure that claims can be processed with proper physician advice in a manner that is both speedy and medically sound. The committee notes that the Department has requested increased funding and has requested legislative remedies that may improve the efficiency of the physician review panels.

The committee remains concerned that these and possibly other improvements are needed to achieve timely physician review panel determinations and urges the Department to work with the committee to identify any additional actions required to expedite processing and payment of claims. The committee also urges the Department to continue to work with federal agencies and other organizations to propose solutions for the "willing payer" problems.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2005, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and the Office of the Administrator.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Management

This section would authorize funds for defense environmental management activities for fiscal year 2005, including funds for defense site acceleration completion and defense environmental services.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize funds for other defense activities for fiscal year 2005.

Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

This section would authorize funds for defense nuclear waste disposal for fiscal year 2005.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 3111—Extension of Authority for Appointment of Certain Scientific, Engineering and Technical Personnel

This section would amend section 4601 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 USC 2701) to extend authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering, and technical personnel.

Section 3112—Requirements for Baseline of Projects under Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program

This section would amend section 3114 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) to give the NNSA Administrator greater flexibility in adding projects or updating priorities to projects within the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 3131—Transfers and reprogrammings of National Nuclear Security Administration funds

Title XXXII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (50 USC 2401), otherwise known as the "NNSA Act") established the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). In passing the Act, Congress created the NNSA as a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy. The mission of the NNSA is to enhance national security through the military application of nuclear energy, reduce global danger from weapons of mass destruction, and promote international nuclear safety. The cornerstone of this Act is a significant level of autonomy for the NNSA.

Among the various functions assigned in the Act, the NNSA Administrator has authority over, and is responsible for, all programs and activities of the NNSA including budget formulation, guidance and execution, and other financial matters (50 USC 2402). The NNSA Act also provides for separate treatment of the NNSA budget request within the President's budget request (50 USC 2451) and for the Administrator to establish procedures for planning, programming, budgeting, and financial activities (50 USC 2452).

The committee is concerned that execution of the NNSA budget process may not reflect the degree of autonomy intended in the NNSA Act. In order to carry out the above budget functions as intended by Congress, this provision directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security specifically to submit notifications and requests for reprogramming directly to the congressional defense committees, with the only role of the Department of Energy being for the Chief Financial Officer to certify whether funds covered by the notice or request are available. This provision is necessary to ensure responsive oversight and to safeguard the autonomy of the Administration.

The committee remains concerned that there may be additional areas of the budget process in which the autonomy intended by Congress is not being exercised. The committee encourages the Administrator to review the budget and programming process to ensure NNSA is in complete compliance with the letter and spirit of the NNSA Act.

Section 3132—National Academy of Sciences study on management by Department of Energy of high-level radioactive waste

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to complete a study of the Department's "residual" waste streams management plans. These streams are from the Department's high-level waste tanks, which are not planned for disposal into a high-level waste repository.

This study should provide an explicit assessment of the waste streams that are planned for disposal in place in the tanks or that result from the processing of retrieved tank wastes at the Hanford Reservation in Washington, the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory in Idaho, and the Savannah River Site in South Carolina. The examination should address the full range of "residual wastes" including, among others, the high-level waste tank remainders that the Department considers incidental to reprocessing, the streams from tank waste processing, such as saltstone at the Savannah River Site, and tank waste the Department plans to immobilize and ship for disposal to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

The National Academy of Sciences should deliver an interim report on the waste planned for disposal in place in the tanks to the committee and the Secretary six months after entering into the agreement to undertake this study. A final report addressing the remainder of the task objectives should be issued twelve months after funding is received. Within funds allocated for defense environmental management the Department authorizes up to $1,500,000 for the study.

Section 3133—Contract to Review Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, New Mexico

The current five-year Congressional authorization for Independent Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Oversight expires at the end of fiscal year 2004. This section would direct the Secretary of Energy to enter into a new contract for independent reviews of the de-

sign, construction and operations of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize $21.3 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2005, an increase of $1.0 million to fund cost-of-living pay increases for permanent staff and to hire outside consultants as needed for technical oversight of new Department of Energy projects.

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3301—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $59.7 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund for the operation and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2005. The provision would also permit the use of additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions 45 days after Congress receives notification.

Section 3302—Revision of Limitations on Required Disposals of Certain Materials in National Defense Stockpile

This section would amend section 3306 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) by authorizing the Secretary of Defense to dispose of 100,000 short tons of high carbon manganese ferro of the highest grade during fiscal year 2005, rather than 50,000 short tons as currently authorized.

Section 3303—Authority to Dispose of Certain Materials in National Defense Stockpile

This section would amend section 3303 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to dispose of materials in the National Defense Stockpile so as to result in $785.0 million in receipts by the end of fiscal year 2005, and $870.0 million in receipts by the end of fiscal year 2009.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION

Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $20.0 million for fiscal year 2005 for the operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for Maritime Administration for Fiscal Year 2005

This section would authorize a total of $149.1 million for fiscal year 2005, an increase of $13.4 million above the budget request for the Maritime Administration. Of the funds authorized, $109.3 would be for operations and training programs, $4.8 million would be for administrative expenses related to providing loan guarantees authorized by title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, (46 App. United States Code 1271 et seq.), and $35 million would be for the disposal of obsolete ships in the National Defense Reserve Fleet. Within the funds provided for the disposal of obsolete vessels, the committee includes $2 million to begin the decommissioning, removal, and disposal of the nuclear reactor and hazardous materials aboard the Nuclear Ship Savannah, which is located at the James River facility in Virginia.

Section 3502—Extension of Authority to Provide War Risk Insurance for Merchant Marine Vessels

This section would extend for five years the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to provide war risk insurance and reinsurance relating to merchant marine vessels. This section would also modify the existing provision to reflect the current Department of the Treasury practice of investing in public debt securities of the United States, with maturities and interest rates suitable to the needs of the fund.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, March 11, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2005.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose a few additional legislative initiatives for inclusion in the same Bill.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. HAYNES II,
General Counsel.

COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 12, 2004 the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 4200, as amended, by a vote of 60–0.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: Thank you for working with me in your development of H.R. 4200, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005," specifically:

(1) Section 590. Continuation of impact aid assistance on behalf of dependents of certain members despite change in state of member.

(2) Section 595. Assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees.

(3) Section 596. Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps and recruiter access at institutions of higher education.

(4) Section 904. Modification of obligated service requirements under National Security Education Program.

As you know, these provisions are within the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee. While I do not intend to seek sequential referral of H.R. 4200, the Committee does hold an

interest in preserving its future jurisdiction with respect to issues raised in the aforementioned provisions and its jurisdictional prerogatives should the provisions of this bill or any Senate amendments thereto be considered in a conference with the Senate. We would expect to be appointed as conferees on these provisions should a conference with the Senate arise.

Again, I thank you for working with me in developing the amendments to H.R. 4200 and look forward to working with you on these issues in the future.

Sincerely,

JOHN BOEHNER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: On May 12, 2004, the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. As ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services, this legislation contains a number of provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

These provisions include the following:

Section 596. Reserve Senior Officer Training Corps and recruiter access at institutions of higher education.

Section 601. Increase in basic pay for fiscal year 2005.

Section 3111. Extension of authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering, and technical personnel.

Section 3112. Requirements for baseline of projects under Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program.

Section 3131. Transfers and reprogrammings of National Nuclear Security Administration funds.

Section 3132. National Academy of Sciences study on management by Department of Energy of high-level radioactive waste.

Section 3133. Contract to review Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, New Mexico.

Section 3201. Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board authorization.

Recognizing your interest in bringing this legislation before the House expeditiously, the Committee on Energy and Commerce agrees not to seek a sequential referral of the bill. By agreeing not to seek a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not waive its jurisdiction over these provisions or any other provisions of the bill that may fall within its jurisdiction. In addition, the Committee on Energy and Commerce reserves its right to seek conferees on any provisions within its jurisdiction which are considered in the House-Senate conference, and asks for your support in being accorded such conferees.

I request that you include this letter as part of the report on H.R. 4200 and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

Sincerely,

JOE BARTON, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. JOE BARTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: On May 12, 2004, the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. As you know, the H.R. 4200, as

reported, contains a number of provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. These provisions implicate the committee's jurisdiction on a number of subject including: the disposition of Federal property, the Freedom of Information Act, the Federal civil service, and procurement.

Because of your willingness to consult with this Committee, and because of your desire to move this legislation expeditiously, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Committee on Government Reform. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 4200. In addition, the Committee reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request for conferees by the Committee on H.R. 4200 or similar legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Committee on Government Reform has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2004.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write with respect to the export control provisions of this year's proposed National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), H.R. 4200, which your Committee is preparing to mark up and report in the near future. I request that you include

in H.R. 4200 those provisions in Title XIV, Subtitle A, relating to export controls. These provisions would strengthen military export controls in areas in which the Department of Defense plays a major role, often alongside U.S. private firms regulated under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act. Other provisions would reinforce the role and responsibility of Congress to provide appropriate oversight in these areas.

These provisions complement and reinforce the policy that the Committee on International Relations has long followed in these areas and are fully consistent with provisions in H.R. 1950 (the State Department Authorization Act), which the House passed last year during the first session of the 108th Congress. In particular, I am very sympathetic to purposes which the NDAA export control provisions would advance concerning: (1) the need to strengthen (not relax) military export controls in the context of the global war on terror, and (2) to set high (not reduced) standards internationally for other governments to follow multilaterally, as well as in the administration of their national systems, regarding the control of weapons technology and military systems and equipment. Similarly, at a time when our European allies are seeking increasingly greater access to the United States defense procurement market and to our weapons technology in order to help meet their defense commitments to NATO, while simultaneously pursuing a process to expand weapons technology transfers to the People's Republic of China, it behooves our Government to ensure that fundamental principles of U.S. law and policy are upheld. This includes, above all, the right of the United States to consent to the re-export or retransfer of U.S. weapons technology by a foreign government or person to any third party or person, including the government of another country, before such a re-export or retransfer may take place.

For the foregoing reasons, I strongly support adoption by your Committee of these provisions in the proposed NDAA.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that on Wednesday, May 12, 2004, the Committee on Armed Services ordered favorably reported H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. The bill includes a number of provisions that fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations pursuant to Rule X(k) of the House of Representatives.

With respect to Section 1202, Assistance to Military or Security Forces of Iraq and Afghanistan, I will request from the Speaker a referral of H.R. 4200, should this provision not be removed from the bill before it is filed.

Additional provisions within our Committee's jurisdiction are: (1) Section 811, Defense Trade Reciprocity; (2) Section 1013, Authority to Transfer Specified Former Naval Vessels to Certain Foreign Countries; (3) Section 1027, Encouragement of Agreements with Foreign Countries; (4) Section 1031, Continuation of Authority to Use Department of Defense Funds for Unified Counter-Drug and Counter-Terrorism Campaign in Colombia; (5) Section 1204, Status of Iraqi Security Forces; (6) Section 1211, Assignment of Allied Naval Personnel to Submarine Safety Programs; (7) Section 1212, Expansion of Entities of the People's Republic of China Subject to Certain Presidential Authorities When Operating in the United States; (8) Section 1213, Report by the President on Global Peace Operations Initiative; (9) Section 1214, Procurement Sanctions Against Foreign Persons that Transfer Certain Defense Articles and Services to the People's Republic of China; (10) Title XIII, Cooperative Threat Reduction with the States of the Former Soviet Union; and (11) Title XIV, Export Controls and Counter-Proliferation Matters.

Pursuant to Chairman Dreier's announcement that the Committee on Rules will move expeditiously to consider a rule for H.R. 4200 and your desire to have the bill considered on the House floor next week, the Committee on International Relations will not seek a sequential referral of the bill as a result of including these provisions, without waiving or ceding now or in the future this Committee's jurisdiction over the provisions in question. I will seek to have conferees appointed for these provisions during any House-Senate conference committee.

In that regard, I am particularly concerned about certain provisions in Title XIV, Subtitle B and C, regarding counter-proliferation matters and initiatives related to the former Soviet Union. I look forward to working with you regarding my concerns about these provisions as H.R. 4200 moves forward in the legislative process.

I would appreciate your including this letter as a part of the report on H.R. 4200 and as part of the record during consideration of the bill by the House of Representatives.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2004.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: In recognition of the desire to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 4200, the Department of Defense authorization bill, the Committee on the Judiciary hereby waives consideration of the bill. This waiver is made with the understanding that proposed sections that have been reviewed by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to the bankruptcy treatment of certain military bonuses and pay incentives, compensating employees who were exposed to radiation in certain government programs, and the

title to sunken military ships (to the extent such provision contained matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary) will not be included in the bill. These sections contain matters within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction.

I further understand that proposed sections that have been reviewed by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to the misuse of civilian medals, Federal Tort Claims Act coverage for volunteers performing volunteer duties at sea and for committee members of the Employee Support for the Guard and Reserve, waivers of DOJ prison reviews for several land conveyances, state tax preemption for the Non-Appropriated Fund Health Benefits Programs, trademark licensing of military slogans and the like, military legal assistance, a public-private employee exchange program, and allowing assignment of contract claims to sureties will be included in the bill. If these sections are added to the bill, I will not seek a sequential referral based on inclusion.

The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdiction over these provisions is in no way diminished or altered. I would appreciate your including this letter in your Committee's report on H.R. 4200 and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in matters being considered in H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 4200 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over a number of provisions of the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, that every effort will be made to include any agreements worked out by staff of our two Committees in amendments as the bill is taken to the House Floor, and that a copy of this letter and of your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2004.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the Committee on Armed Services that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs hereby waives any jurisdiction it has over the provisions of section 2831 of H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, regarding "Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio." Our Committee does not desire referral of these provisions, a copy of which is enclosed.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, May XX, 2004.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to consideration of H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. Certain provisions of this important legislation are within the jurisdiction of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI). I support the legislation and share your desire to have it considered expeditiously by the House; hence, I do not intend to seek referral of this legislation to the HPSCI.

However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice this Committee's

valid jurisdictional interests and prerogatives on these provisions or any other similar legislation. Likewise, this should not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the HPSCI in the future. Furthermore, should these provisions or similar provisions be included in any Senate amendments and considered in a conference with the Senate, I would request that the Speaker appoint Members of the HPSCI as conferees on those provisions. Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in your report to accompany the bill. I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

PORTER GOSS, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. PORTER GOSS,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2004.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has come to my attention that a new section has been added to the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, incorporating the text of H.R. 3966, the "ROTC and Military Recruiter Equal Access to Campus Act of 2004." As noted in my previous letter dated, March 19, 2004, provisions of H.R. 3966 directly impact the programs and operations of the Department of Homeland Security by limiting its ability to distribute funds to institutions of higher education by grant or contract. Although I believe that these provisions fall within the jurisdiction of the Select Committee under H. Res. 5, I will not seek a sequential referral given the importance of expediting passage of this bill, which I co-sponsored and strongly support.

The Select Committee on Homeland Security takes this action with the understanding that its jurisdiction over the provision as

included in the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 is in no way diminished or altered. I would appreciate your including this letter in the Committee Report on the bill. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER COX, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2004.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER COX,
Chairman, Select Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

I agree that the Select Committee on Homeland Security has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Select Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 2005 and each of the following five fiscal years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the committee cost estimate, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

Under clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives and 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the committee has requested but not received a cost estimate for this bill from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an estimate and a comparison by the committee of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out this bill.

H.R. 4200 would authorize appropriations of $418.5 billion for fiscal year 2005 for the activities of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the national security programs of the Department of Energy (DOE). The budget authority implication of the authorization of appropriations in H.R. 4200 is $422.1 billion. It would also

authorize an additional $25 billion emergency appropriation for fiscal year 2005 to support Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom.

The committee estimates that enacting H.R. 4200 would not increase mandatory budget authority for fiscal year 2004 or the following five years. In terms of discretionary and mandatory budget authority, H.R. 4200 is within the allocation provided by H. Con. Res. 393, as passed by the House on March 25, 2004, which establishes the Congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 through 2009.

The committee has been in close and constant consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and has provided copies of H.R. 4200 as ordered reported on May 12, 2004, to develop an estimate and comparison as required under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The committee expects to receive this letter prior to the consideration of H.R. 4200 by the House of Representatives.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and are reflected in the body of this report.

With respect to clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this legislation does not include any new spending or credit authority, nor does it provide for any increase or decrease in tax revenues or expenditures. The bill does, however, authorize appropriations. Other fiscal features of this legislation are addressed in the estimate prepared by the committee under clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation would address several general and outcome-related performance goals and objectives. The general goal and objective of this legislation is to improve the quality of life for military personnel and their families, military readiness, the modernization and eventual transformation of the armed forces, to enhance the development of ballistic missile defenses, and to improve the condition of military housing and facilities.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving the quality of life for military personnel and their families, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Add 10,000 Army personnel and 3,000 Marine Corps personnel each year in fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007, enabling the military services to begin meeting long-standing manpower shortages, as well as new manning requirements;

(2) Provide every military service member an across-the-board pay raise of 3.5 percent effective January 1, 2005; and

(3) Eliminate out-of-pocket housing costs for military personnel.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving force protection for our troops, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide over $2.0 billion for force protection initiatives, including armor for vehicles, new munitions and surveillance programs; and

(2) Establish a streamlined acquisition process in order to respond in a timely manner to urgent requests for combat equipment by commanders in the battlefield.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of successfully prosecuting continuing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide an additional $25.0 billion in emergency contingency operations supplemental funding to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 to support the war on terrorism's operational costs, personnel expenses and the procurement of new equipment; and

(2) Support the Army's efforts to transform the structure of its divisions into smaller organizations and create additional combat relevant units. This reorganization known as "modularity" will contribute to the reduction of stress on our troops due to the high operational tempo of operations in Southwest Asia.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving military housing and facilities, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide $9.9 billion for military construction and military family housing programs; and

(2) Eliminate the statutory ceiling for the military housing privatization program, allowing the Department of Defense to leverage private sector investments and business interests to build and revitalize family housing at domestic military bases.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to rule XIII, clause 3(d)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee finds the authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104–4, this legislation contains no federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no federal intergovernmental mandates.

RECORD VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record and voice votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 4200. The record of these votes is attached to this report.

The committee ordered H.R. 4200 reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 60–0, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
108TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Motion to Close **Date: 05/12/04**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Meehan			
Mr. McKeon				Mr. Reyes			
Mr. Thornberry	X			Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Turner (TX)			
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Gibbons	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hayes	X			Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mrs. Wilson (NM)	X			Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Calvert	X			Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Simmons	X			Mr. Hill	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)	X			Mr. Larson (CT)	X		
Mr. Schrock	X			Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)	X			Mr. Larsen (WA)	X		
Mr. Wilson (SC)	X			Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Marshall	X		
Mr. Cole	X			Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley	X			Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Bishop	X			Mr. Alexander	X		
Mr. Turner (OH)	X			Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline	X						
Mrs. Miller (MI)							
Mr. Gingrey	X						
Mr. Rodgers	X						
Mr. Franks	X						

Roll Call Vote Total:

56 Aye **0 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
108TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 83 **Date: 05/12/04**

Description: **Hefley substitute to Langevin** **Offered by: Hefley**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Skelton		X	
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Spratt		X	
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Ortiz		X	
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Evans		X	
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor		X	
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Abercrombie		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Meehan		X	
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Reyes			
Mr. Thornberry	X			Mr. Snyder		X	
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Turner (TX)		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Ryun (KS)	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Gibbons	X			Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Hayes	X			Mr. Rodriguez		X	
Mrs. Wilson (NM)	X			Ms. Tauscher		X	
Mr. Calvert	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Simmons		X		Mr. Hill		X	
Mrs. Davis (VA)	X			Mr. Larson (CT)		X	
Mr. Schrock	X			Ms. Davis (CA)		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Israel		X	
Mr. Miller (FL)	X			Mr. Larsen (WA)		X	
Mr. Wilson (SC)	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Marshall		X	
Mr. Cole		X		Mr. Meek		X	
Mr. Bradley	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Bishop	X			Mr. Alexander			
Mr. Turner (OH)	X			Mr. Ryan (OH)		X	
Mr. Kline	X						
Mrs. Miller (MI)	X						
Mr. Gingrey	X						
Mr. Rodgers							
Mr. Franks	X						

Roll Call Vote Total:

28 Aye 30 Nay Present

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
108TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 36 **Date: 05/12/04**

Description: **Transfer BMD funds to Patriot Missile** **Offered by: Spratt**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor			
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes			
Mr. Thornberry		X		Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Turner (TX)	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Gibbons				Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mrs. Wilson (NM)		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Simmons		X		Mr. Hill	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)		X		Mr. Larson (CT)	X		
Mr. Schrock		X		Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Larsen (WA)	X		
Mr. Wilson (SC)		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Marshall	X		
Mr. Cole		X		Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Bishop		X		Mr. Alexander	X		
Mr. Turner (OH)		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline		X					
Mrs. Miller (MI)							
Mr. Gingrey		X					
Mr. Rodgers		X					
Mr. Franks		X					

Roll Call Vote Total:

26 Aye 31 Nay Present

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
108TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 54 **Date: 05/12/04**
Description: **Prohibit space-based BMD program** **Offered by: Sanchez**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes			
Mr. Thornberry		X		Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Turner (TX)	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mrs. Wilson (NM)		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Simmons		X		Mr. Hill	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)		X		Mr. Larson (CT)	X		
Mr. Schrock		X		Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Larsen (WA)	X		
Mr. Wilson (SC)		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Marshall		X	
Mr. Cole		X		Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Bishop		X		Mr. Alexander	X		
Mr. Turner (OH)		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline		X					
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X					
Mr. Gingrey		X					
Mr. Rodgers		X					
Mr. Franks		X					

Roll Call Vote Total:

26 Aye **34 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
108TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 34 **Date: 05/12/04**
Description: **Report on Near Field Infrared Experiment** **Offered by: Sanchez**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes			
Mr. Thornberry		X		Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Turner (TX)	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mrs. Wilson (NM)		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Simmons		X		Mr. Hill	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)		X		Mr. Larson (CT)	X		
Mr. Schrock		X		Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Larsen (WA)	X		
Mr. Wilson (SC)		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Marshall		X	
Mr. Cole		X		Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Bishop		X		Mr. Alexander	X		
Mr. Turner (OH)		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline		X					
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X					
Mr. Gingrey		X					
Mr. Rodgers		X					
Mr. Franks		X					

Roll Call Vote Total:

26 Aye **34 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
108TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 41 **Date: 05/12/04**
Description: **$67 billion in supplemental appropriations** **Offered by: Cooper**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie		X	
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes			
Mr. Thornberry		X		Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler				Mr. Turner (TX)	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mrs. Wilson (NM)		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Simmons		X		Mr. Hill		X	
Mrs. Davis (VA)		X		Mr. Larson (CT)	X		
Mr. Schrock		X		Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Larsen (WA)	X		
Mr. Wilson (SC)		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Marshall	X		
Mr. Cole		X		Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Bishop		X		Mr. Alexander		X	
Mr. Turner (OH)		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline		X					
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X					
Mr. Gingrey		X					
Mr. Rodgers		X					
Mr. Franks		X					

Roll Call Vote Total:

24 Aye **35 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
108TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 44 **Date: 05/12/04**
Description: **Revision of military sex offense laws** **Offered by: Sanchez**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes			
Mr. Thornberry		X		Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Turner (TX)	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mrs. Wilson (NM)		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Simmons		X		Mr. Hill	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)		X		Mr. Larson (CT)	X		
Mr. Schrock		X		Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Larsen (WA)	X		
Mr. Wilson (SC)		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Marshall	X		
Mr. Cole		X		Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Bishop		X		Mr. Alexander	X		
Mr. Turner (OH)		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline		X					
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X					
Mr. Gingrey		X					
Mr. Rodgers		X					
Mr. Franks		X					

Roll Call Vote Total:

27 Aye **33 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
108TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Final Passage of H.R. 4200 **Date: 05/12/04**
as Amended

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Skelton			
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Turner (TX)	X		
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Gibbons	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hayes	X			Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mrs. Wilson (NM)	X			Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Calvert	X			Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Simmons	X			Mr. Hill	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)	X			Mr. Larson (CT)	X		
Mr. Schrock	X			Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)	X			Mr. Larsen (WA)	X		
Mr. Wilson (SC)	X			Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Marshall	X		
Mr. Cole	X			Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley	X			Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Bishop	X			Mr. Alexander	X		
Mr. Turner (OH)	X			Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline	X						
Mrs. Miller (MI)	X						
Mr. Gingrey	X						
Mr. Rodgers	X						
Mr. Franks	X						

Roll Call Vote Total:

60 Aye 0 Nay Present

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

The committee intends to take steps to make available the analysis of changes in existing law made by the bill, as required by clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF IKE SKELTON

The 2005 defense authorization is a good bill that makes advances on a variety of issues. I am pleased that the committee worked largely in accordance with its nonpartisan traditions, and that important initiatives from each side were considered seriously and often adopted. A few of the bill's provisions are worthy of special mention.

When the surviving spouse of a military retiree, usually a widow, becomes eligible for Social Security at the age of 62, her spousal survivor benefits drop from 55 percent of her spouse's retired pay to 35 percent. Democrats have consistently called for legislation to eliminate this "Widow's Tax" in the Survivors Benefit Program (SBP), and urged the committee to address this issue. I therefore applaud the inclusion of legislation in this bill to eliminate the SBP offset over a five-year period, beginning on October 1, 2005. I will continue to work to ensure that this legislative victory is preserved in conference with the Senate.

I remain concerned by events in Iraq. June 30 is quickly approaching, and much remains unsettled about the transition of sovereignty to the Iraqis and the role of U.S. Armed Forces after the transition. The recent revelations of prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib compound these difficulties, and point to a clear need for better congressional oversight over both the goals and conduct of U.S.-Iraqi policies.

Several amendments to strengthen congressional oversight were adopted, including two that I offered. One is a progress report on Iraqi Security Forces, and the other is to require the Department of Defense to respond more expeditiously to congressional requests. Rep. Abercrombie successfully offered an amendment to better account for and manage civilian contractors in Iraq. The unsettling news of the alleged involvement of contractors in the prison abuses and the grisly beheading of an American businessman highlight the need for a better awareness of the number and role of contractors in Iraq. We need to ensure that their roles are appropriate and that their safety can be reasonably secured.

Despite the adoption of these and other related amendments, I am not satisfied that Congress has the access to information to conduct proper oversight, nor am I confident that the civilian and military leadership at the Pentagon has access to all the information they need to make critical policy decisions. Rep. Meek introduced and withdrew an amendment regarding how critical information is relayed in the military chain of command. I look forward to working with him and others during consideration of the bill on the floor to ensure that both the Legislative and Executive branches of our government are fully informed of important events in Iraq and can provide more vigorous oversight and leadership.

While Democrats also support the inclusion of a $25 billion authorization of an emergency supplemental for ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, I am disappointed that the committee did not accept an amendment offered by Reps. Jim Cooper and Tim Ryan to authorize $67 billion. The Cooper-Ryan Amendment represents a more realistic, good-faith estimate of the likely cost, and would better ensure that Iraq and Afghanistan operations are not "cash-flowed" from regular Department of Defense appropriations. "Cash-flowing" involves using regular operations and maintenance and military personnel appropriations for contingency operations, and this practice invariably leads to disruptions in readiness levels, training, base operations, equipment maintenance, and other important peace-time military activities. The $25 billion supplemental will serve as a useful "bridge" to a future supplemental, but the Cooper-Ryan amendment was a more responsible approach both militarily and fiscally.

A positive aspect of the $25 billion supplemental was that it also included much needed end-strength increases for the Army and Marine Corps. The stress on our ground forces has been tremendous. I know of soldiers who have returned home from one year of operations in Afghanistan, only to be told three months later that they will be deployed to Iraq for a year. The supplemental authorizes the end-strength increases (10,000 annually for three years) that the Secretary of Defense indicated was needed by the Army to conduct their transformational activities while still meeting their operational requirements. It also provides a necessary increase for the Marine Corps (3,000 annually for three years) to meet their mission requirements.

Finally, this Committee in 1989 laid the foundation for joint officer development and joint professional military education as it exists today. Recent combat experience demonstrates that the services have generally achieved a remarkable integration in executing joint operations. However, as the nature of warfare evolves, future operations will become more complex and joint at lower levels than before, and the framework for developing persons skilled in joint matters must also evolve. Our committee is again improving military education by raising joint military education requirements with a corresponding increase in joint military education opportunities. This is the first step in developing joint officers ready to face the challenge of 21st century warfare.

America is a nation at war. The fiscal 2005 defense authorization recognizes that exigency and provides those who protect America the tools they need to do the job. I look forward to improving the bill even further as the legislative process proceeds.

IKE SKELTON.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

The United States must take care to use a policy of impartial diplomacy in our future relations with both the Republic of China (Taiwan) and the People's Republic of China, at all levels of our diplomatic relationship. The Pacific Rim is an area of enormous economic trade with the United States. The One-China policy is a fundamental fixture of our international policy, and we must reinforce that at all levels of our government.

As a Member of Congress who has traveled extensively in that area on military and trade missions, I have come to love the people of both China and Taiwan. They are so similar, yet so unique. People of both nations are peace-loving, yet anxious about their national character.

Taiwan is currently finding their way through the emotional aftermath of a divisive 2004 presidential election, which has only worked to further strain their relationship with the People's Republic of China. This is a difficult moment for the U.S. as tensions simmer between our friends on the Pacific Rim. The United States has much at stake when it comes to a peaceful relationship between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China.

As one of the few Americans who has traveled to North Korea and talked to officials there, I want to note that we have multiple, dangerous, strategic military concerns in this region. We must focus our attention on diplomacy and the One-China policy. We must not step off that path. China helped to set up our meeting with North Korea, and continue to be an important intermediary between North Korea and us.

The United States, as a country, has long recognized the One-China policy. It is our long-term guiding principle, and we must tread carefully along the path of diplomacy as Taiwan and China confront and deal with their differences.

We must not implement policy that will fuel the fires of dissention that simmer between these two nations. Our obligation to the American people, and to peace in that region of the world, is to aid in the process of finding diplomatic solutions for our strategic interests through the One-China policy.

We continue to hope China and Taiwan will be able to get together to work out the differences between them. The U.S. needs to give them the time and space to do that. The world has a great stake in their coming together.

SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF STEVE ISRAEL

The FY 2005 defense authorization is important because it recognizes that the greatest investment we can make is in our troops, by developing the sometimes intangible qualities of leadership, education, judgment, initiative and historic knowledge. I am pleased that the authorization bill understands the centrality of foreign language and cultural expertise to the success of military operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, as well as the Global War on Terrorism.

I commend the Committee and the Department of Defense for including legislative language in the bill that establishes a Defense Language Office within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to ensure a strategic focus on meeting present and future requirements for language and regional expertise. Other language directing the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on how the military educates and trains our soldiers in language and culture will prove invaluable. The technological revolution that has made possible our recent successes must be accompanied by a similar progression in the way we wage war.

We must continue to build on the accomplishments of Representative Skelton and others on this committee who were instrumental in raising the standard of joint officer development and education that has been so critical to the success of our military. Faced with new challenges, we must recommit ourselves to creating the educational and training framework that will give our military the language and cultural expertise they need to succeed.

I also want to recognize the contribution of Major General Robert Scales. As a leading voice for re-shaping our military to deal with the challenges of the 21st Century, his testimony before the full committee was helpful in focusing the Committee's attention on this issue. With more than 30 years of experience in the military and former commandant of the Army War College, he would be a valuable resource for the Department of Defense when it begins its assessment of military education and training.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and the defense community to ensure that our men and women in uniform have the skill necessary to navigate the cultural and geopolitical complexities to conflict in the 21st century.

STEVE ISRAEL.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF KENDRICK B. MEEK

There are many things about which to be proud in the 2005 defense authorization bill. I am very pleased that this bill will provide additional funds over the original Pentagon request to provide for the current necessities of our fighting men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan. From equipping our troops with signal-jamming equipment to replacement of damaged air and ground vehicles to the over $700 million in added funds to completely up-armor our fleet of HMMWVs, the bill intends to outfit our troops in a manner befitting the heroes of a country with the greatest resources in the world.

However, merely supplying our troops with the means and methods to fight an asymmetrical war gives them only two-thirds of what they, and we, need for ultimate success in Iraq and Afghanistan. I am concerned that information necessary for proper strategic planning is not being utilized in high-level, decision-making processes. While this information appears to be available at the operations level, the most critical elements of it do not always rise to the policy level.

The United States finds itself in a quagmire resulting from detainee abuses at Abu Ghraib that not only complicates the stabilization of Iraq and the Middle East in general, but that brings into question the moral integrity of a country that has always fought hard, even within its own borders, for human rights. Unfortunately, had the Pentagon acted sooner, there is reason to believe this situation could have been at least contained, if not avoided altogether.

In late August of 2003 and again in mid-October, Allied Forces Commander, Lt. General Ricardo Sanchez, commissioned two separate evaluation and assessment investigations of the detention and interrogation situation in Iraq. Both reports contained admonishments that policies were lacking, training subpar, and oversight non-existent. Among the similarities in the two reports:

That there were no authorities or procedures in place to affect a unified strategy to detain and interrogate internees in Iraq;

That there was a lack of active control of the internees within the detention environment, and flawed use-of-force procedures;

That the general prison population was inappropriately comingled with EPWs;

That the soldier to detainee ratio was critically deficient;

That there was indication the MPs were actively, though indirectly engaged in interrogation actions despite Army Regulations to the contrary.

Any one of these items is worthy of command level discussion and subsequent briefing to the Pentagon. Taken together, they constituted a warning shot over the bow. In fact, in the Article 15–6 Investigation performed by MG Taguba, the IO specifically states,

"Unfortunately, many of the systemic problems that surfaced during MG Ryder's team's assessment are the very same issues that are the subject of this investigation." [Taguba Report, page 12, pg 2]. However, current Army regulations do not require the transmittal of such information up the chain of command beyond the commissioning authority [AR 15–6, ss 3–18, 3–19].

Currently, only Air Force HQ is aggressive in finding sensitive information and forwarding it up the chain of command, having done so since 1998. An office was set up within HQ whose sole purpose is to learn of sensitive information items and flag them. As part of the Air Force's formal rules, personnel who learn of explosive matters- including those "with potential community reaction or press coverage"—must inform the office for briefing to the Secretary of the Air Force. The Navy also has a limited version of the Air Force's program, though it is less ambitious.

Secretary Rumsfeld said last week that it would be difficult for him to reach down through the myriad of legal cases climbing through the military justice system and find those that are potentially explosive in nature. I would counter that with the right guidance he would not have to reach down, but could expect that information to be pushed up, even before it reaches the criminal investigation stage.

Military leadership has always required critical elements of information to make sound, timely, and informed decisions on the battlefield. Determining the information needed to make these decisions is crucial to a commander's ability to act decisively in the course of battle. That same depth and speed of information is necessary for the Pentagon to direct policy and decision-making in the course of stabilization efforts afterwards.

The amendment that I offered during committee intends to move mission-critical information from the commissioning authority up to the highest-levels in short order when that information portends events or situations detrimental to our strategic plan. The language merely required that the Secretary give guidance to all Department of Defense personnel with authority to commission assessments, evaluations or investigations on what types of information would be necessary to pass up the chain of command. This guidance would specifically target those items of such potentially volatile nature as to give even the layman a reason to raise a red flag.

Were it that MG Miller's assessment had been even a topic of discussion around the water cooler at the Pentagon, we might have been able to avoid the events at Abu Ghraib. Had more intense conversation happened after MG Ryder's investigation, we would have at least had the opportunity to contain the situation, develop a strategy for correcting the problem, and alert the world in a far less internationally embarrassing fashion. Instead of the issue being a part of Pentagon discussions in the summer and fall of 2003, it was left to a courageous specialist to try to put a stop to the vile episodes at Abu Ghraib in 2004, some five months after official reports highlighted conditions for a serious problem.

It is not enough to arm our soldiers with the means and methods of war fighting. We must arm them with strategic planning. Proper planning is the offspring of proper information gathering and proc-

essing at the decision-making level. It is ironic that there are suggestions that we seek more information on seeking more information before we act. I hope that before the defense authorization bill leaves the House of Representatives we are able to improve an excellent bill even more by addressing this pertinent and timely issue.

KENDRICK B. MEEK.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE MIKE D. ROGERS

As the Committee moves forward with H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, I want to share my concern over the Department of Defense's use of the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System. The Air Force, Army, and Navy each utilize the LEED standard in some respects in its building projects. Although sustainable building design can be a valuable goal, the Department's use of the LEED standard is troubling.

First, the LEED rating system clearly discriminates against the use of renewable wood products. Through several of its specific credits for steel and concrete, certain wood products are put at a significant disadvantage. It does not recognize that wood is among the most environmentally benign of all building materials, because, among other things, it is a renewable resource that sequesters huge amounts of carbon.

Second, LEED discriminates against wood products manufactured in the United States. The LEED rating system provides a specific credit only for forest products that have been certified by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), a standard initially developed by international environmental groups to combat tropical deforestation. It is predominately recognized in Europe. FSC-certified products manufactured from wood grown in the U.S. are not readily available. However, products from other credible third party certification programs are readily available. No credits are given for wood products produced by companies independently third-party certified to the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) Program standard or the American Tree Farm System®—the two largest sustainable forest management systems in the U.S.

Third, LEED has not been developed through a consensus process open to all interested parties. The process used by the U.S. Green Building Council to create and operate LEED does not meet any generally accepted definition of a voluntary consensus standard. For example, the USGBC fails to satisfy the measures of the voluntary consensus standards development process set out by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI).

And fourth, a recent National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) study, while recognizing that the LEED standard does have beneficial elements, concluded that it does not properly rate products based on environmental criteria. In the study, NIST was especially critical of LEED's arbitrary thresholds, its emphasis on cost rather than environmental impact measures, the lack of appropriate baselines and measures of improvement, and the program's inability to compare buildings in different locations on equal terms.

To address this issue, I urge the committee to accept in conference the following report language from Title XXVIII of the Senate version of the bill, S. 2400:

Use of sustainable design standards by the Department of Defense

Congress encourages the Department of Defense to utilize sustainable building design and construction methods to maximize the efficient use of renewable, recycled, and environmentally sound materials. However, concerns have been expressed that certain rating systems adopted by the Department to assess the standards of sustainable design and construction of facilities may unfairly discriminate against domestic producers of wood construction products. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the committee by June 1, 2005 which describes:

(1) the standards used by each military department to assess the use of sustainable design and construction methods, including credits provided for products made from renewable materials, as well as recycled materials;

(2) the extent to which such standards comply with the requirements of Section 6002 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, section 6962 of title 42, United States Code, Executive Order 13101, Office of Management and Budget Circular A–119, and other applicable requirements of law and regulation; and

(3) the extent to which the standards adopted by each military department unfairly discriminate against the use of products and materials manufactured in the United States.

The committee expects the Secretary to take appropriate action to address any noncompliance with applicable requirements of law or regulation and any unfair discrimination against any U.S. manufactured materials identified during the course of this review.

MIKE D. ROGERS.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES VIC SNYDER AND MAC THORNBERRY

We find ourselves in disagreement with the actions of the Committee regarding the delay contained in the bill of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. The Chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee included in his mark language that essentially delayed the BRAC process for two years by demanding that a series of reports be submitted late in 2005 and that the process then hold for 18 months until the committee had a chance to consider the amendments.

During the full committee markup process, an amendment was offered to cancel the entire BRAC process, to which a second degree amendment was offered reinstating the two year delay. This amendment was passed, although a number of members spoke against both amendments.

Arguments were made that the process should be delayed, and several reports be submitted, because there is a war currently going on. During debate on the amendments, the argument was advanced that the process should be cancelled because the Department of Defense has not yet been able to nominate directly to Congress any individual base that should be closed, and that, should the Department do this, Congress is perfectly capable of voting to close or realign individual bases. In my opinion, both of these arguments represent seriously wrong approaches.

We were pleased to see the committee reject the second argument. The BRAC process was created to ensure that politics and the self-interest of an individual district or member are removed from the process of base closure. To have the Department of Defense begin nominating bases and Congress voting to close individual bases would immediately cause even more tension in Congress and accusations of partisan bias in the system. This would result in gridlock and an utter failure to take needed action.

The former argument, that the process should be delayed due to the current issues in Iraq, is similarly flawed. There will never be a time during which sufficient peace and stability reign for us to carry out the BRAC process. Many people regard the 1990s as a time of relative peace, forgetting that during this window of stability the U.S. military carried out actions in Panama, Iraq, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Somalia, to say nothing of scores of other minor military engagements. Simply put, we almost always have been, and probably always will be, bemoaning the disorder that seems to constantly reign supreme. In addition, the BRAC process is as much about realignment as it is closure, and the realignment is needed to assist the Department of Defense in carrying out the very changes in the military that are designed to allow us to better address the current chaos.

There is a valid argument that the reports requested by the Committee in the provision contained in the bill should be submitted. We agree that the Committee should be better informed about the Global Posture Review, under which DoD is adjusting our overseas basing, and its diplomatic and military effects. Similarly, it would be beneficial to know more about the effects of homeland security missions and military transformation on basing. Nothing stops the Committee from demanding these reports now, and we believe that it would be entirely appropriate to do so. If we did so, presumably DoD could be ordered to produce the information by the spring of 2005 at the latest, which would give the Committee, and Congress as a whole, 6 months to consider the reports, digest the information, and hold hearings. Nothing is stopping us from carrying out this needed oversight but our own timidity, but the reports do not require delaying a much needed process by two years.

In conclusion, while the Committee has asked for much needed information, it has also delayed a needed process. It is my hope that the whole House, or at least the whole Congress acting through the conference committee, will reject the delay contained in the House bill and proceed with the process currently in law. Hoping for a respite in the current global environment is not only unrealistic, but does the military itself no favors.

VIC SNYDER.
MAC THORNBERRY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES JIM COOPER AND TIM RYAN

We commend Chairman Hunter for including a detailed authorization for $25 billion in this year's National Defense Authorization Act, but we are gravely concerned that this down payment on the cost of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in 2005 fails to tell the whole truth to the American people.

During committee consideration of the authorization bill, we offered an amendment authorizing a full-year supplemental appropriation of $67 billion. This larger figure reflects a realistic, detailed analysis of the likely total cost of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in 2005. This amendment included funding for all of the commendable items in the Chairman's bill, including funding for critical force protection equipment, deferred vehicle maintenance, new counter-terrorism technology, replacement vehicles for those destroyed in combat operations, and additional combat troops for the Army and Marine Corps. However, it also provided sufficient funds for combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan for all of fiscal year 2005, not just the few months of funding that the Chairman's bill authorized.

We offered this amendment because we believe the House bill should reflect the true costs of these wars. Piecemeal funding of these critical military efforts sends the wrong signal to our adversaries, the American people, and U.S. troops in the field. Our adversaries are watching our actions closely, and a robust full-year authorization would have sent the signal that despite the significant challenges we face in Iraq and Afghanistan, the United States is committed to victory. To Americans here at home, a full-year authorization would demonstrate that Congress takes seriously its duty to be honest with the American people, and that when it comes to providing funding for our troops in the field, politics should truly take a backseat. Finally, our troops in the field look to Congress to provide them what they need to accomplish the missions they are assigned. Authorization of a full-year supplemental would leave no doubt that Congress supports them and is willing to provide whatever is needed to win.

We were disappointed that no Republican members of our committee chose to support our amendment. We believe the American people will continue to support the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan where critical U.S. interests are at stake, but only if we are honest about the cost.

JIM COOPER.
TIM RYAN.

○