110TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
110–652

DUNCAN HUNTER NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 5658

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 16, 2008.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

DUNCAN HUNTER NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

110TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
110–652

DUNCAN HUNTER NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 5658

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 16, 2008.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on theState of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

42–336 WASHINGTON : 2008

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

IKE SKELTON, Missouri

JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
MARTY MEEHAN, Massachusetts
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
RICK LARSEN, Washington
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
MARK UDALL, Colorado
DAN BOREN, Oklahoma
BRAD ELLSWORTH, Indiana
NANCY BOYDA, Kansas
PATRICK J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
HANK JOHNSON, Georgia
CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa
KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, New York
JOE SESTAK, Pennsylvania
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida
KATHY CASTOR, Florida

DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York
TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
KEN CALVERT, California
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey
TOM COLE, Oklahoma
ROB BISHOP, Utah
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
PHIL GINGREY, Georgia
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
THELMA DRAKE, Virginia
CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, Washington
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
GEOFF DAVIS, Kentucky

ERIN C. CONATON, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	1
Purpose	2
Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations	2
Summary of Discretionary Authorizations in the Bill	2
Summary Table of Authorizations	4
Budget Authority Implication	14
Summary Table of Budget Authority Implication	15
Rationale for the Committee Bill	18
Hearings	20
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS	21
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	21
OVERVIEW	21
Aircraft Procurement, Army	24
Overview	24
Items of Special Interest	28
Armed reconnaissance helicopter	28
Compact aircraft support cart for Army National Guard rotorcraft	28
UH–60A to UH–60L helicopter upgrade	29
Missile Procurement, Army	29
Overview	29
Item of Special Interest	32
Guided multiple launch rocket system	32
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	32
Overview	32
Items of Special Interest	36
Army vehicle modernization plans	36
Small arms acquisition strategy	37
Stryker mobile gun system production delay	37
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	38
Overview	38
Item of Special Interest	43
XM982 precision guided extended range artillery projectile	43
Other Procurement, Army	43
Overview	43
Items of Special Interest	57
Army enterprise resource planning systems	57
Counterfire radars	57
Defense Advanced GPS Receivers	57
Interoperable radios for Texas Army National Guard disaster response	58
Multi-temperature refrigerated container system	58
Non-system training device program	58
Operations center technology	59
Profiler meteorological system	59
Single channel ground and airborne radio system	59
Tactical operations centers	60
Tactical wheeled vehicle acquisition strategy	60
Warfighter information network—tactical	61
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	61
Overview	61
Items of Special Interest	63
Explosives signatures database	63
Unfunded counter-improvised explosive device requirements and needs	63

Page

Aircraft Procurement, Navy 64
Overview 64
Items of Special Interest 69
Electronic warfare system core depot development 69
F/A–18E/F and EA–18G 69
Navy helicopter force structure 69
Weapons Procurement, Navy 70
Overview 70
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps 74
Overview 74
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy 78
Overview 78
Items of Special Interest 81
Aircraft carrier force structure 81
Attack submarine force structure requirements 81
Service-life extension of SSN–688 Los Angeles class hulls 82
U.S. Navy shipbuilding plan 82
Other Procurement, Navy 84
Overview 84
Items of Special Interest 96
Boat davit system improvements 96
CVN propeller replacement program 96
Jet fuel electric valve actuators 96
Multi-climate protection system 96
Surface ship SPQ–9B radar improvements 97
Procurement, Marine Corps 97
Overview 97
Items of Special Interest 103
Abrams tank total integrated engine revitalization program strategy for Marine Corps Abrams tanks 103
Chemical biological incident response force 103
Marine Corps radio systems 103
Unit operations centers 104
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 104
Overview 104
Items of Special Interest 112
Air National Guard RC–26B modernization 112
KC–45 aerial refueling aircraft program 112
Mission support aircraft 113
Special Operations Command aircraft recapitalization 113
Strategic airlift aircraft programs 113
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force 115
Overview 115
Missile Procurement, Air Force 118
Overview 118
Other Procurement, Air Force 122
Overview 122
Item of Special Interest 128
General information technology 128
Procurement, Defense-Wide 128
Overview 128
Items of Special Interest 137
Standard Missile-3 interceptors 137
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense procurement 137
Rapid Acquisition Fund 137
Overview 137
National Guard and Reserve Equipment 138
Overview 138
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 140
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 140
Sections 101-104—Authorization of Appropriations 140
Section 105—National Guard and Reserve Equipment 140
Section 106—Rapid Acquisition Fund 140
Subtitle B—Army Programs 140
Section 111—Separate Procurement Line Items for Future Combat Systems Program 140

Page

Section 112—Restriction on Contract Awards for Major Elements of the Future Combat Systems Program 140
Section 113—Restriction on Obligation of Funds for Army Tactical Radio Pending Report 140
Section 114—Restriction on Obligation of Procurement Funds for Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter Program Pending Certification 141
Subtitle C—Navy Programs 141
Section 121—Refueling and Complex Overhaul of the U.S.S. Theodore Roosevelt 141
Section 122—Applicability of Previous Teaming Agreements for Virginia-Class Submarine Program 141
Section 123—Littoral Combat Ship Program 141
Section 124—Report on F/A–18 Procurement Costs, Comparing Multi-year to Annual 141
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs 142
Section 131—Limitation on Retiring C–5 Aircraft 142
Section 132—Maintenance of Retired KC–135E Aircraft 142
Section 133—Repeal of Multi-Year Contract Authority for Procurement of Tanker Aircraft 142
Section 134—Report on Processes Used for Requirements Development for KC 09X 143
Subtitle E—Joint and Multi-Service Matters 143
Section 141—Body Armor Acquisition Strategy 143
Section 142—Small Arms Acquisition Strategy and Requirements Review 143
Section 143—Requirement for Common Ground Stations and Payloads for Manned and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles 144
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 144
OVERVIEW 144
Army Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 146
Overview 146
Items of Special Interest 165
Advanced lithium iron phosphate battery system for light tactical vehicles 165
Antiballistic windshield armor 165
Army intelligent agent software programs 165
Army missile modernization 166
Chemical mechanical self-destruct fuze 166
Common Missile Warning System 166
Condition based maintenance 167
Data links aerial systems 167
Dynamometer facility upgrade program 167
Enhanced holographic imager 168
Future Combat Systems 168
Future Combat Systems manned ground vehicles 169
Future Combat Systems modular brigade enhancement 170
Future Combat Systems system of systems engineering and program management 170
Future Combat Systems unmanned aerial vehicles 171
Future Combat Systems unmanned ground vehicles 171
Glass ceramic armor technology for vehicle survivability 171
Capital Global Command and Control System-Army 172
Ground soldier systems concept development 172
Heavy duty hybrid electric vehicle demonstration 172
High mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicle bloc improvements 173
Integrated fire control system for small arms 173
Joint Cargo Aircraft program 173
Landmine Warfare/Barrier—system development and demonstration 174
Multi-threat explosive detection initiative 174
Near-net shaped direct-sinistered silicon carbide torso plate technology 175
Platform soldier mission readiness system for tactical wheeled vehicles 175
Polymer matrix composites for rotorcraft drive systems 175
RAND Arroyo Center 175
Stryker family of vehicles research and development 176
Torque-vectoring rollover prevention technology 176

Page
Warfighter Information Network—Tactical, increment 3, program 176
Weapon shot counter technology 177
Wearable personal area network technology 177
Navy Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 177
Overview 177
Items of Special Interest 194
Advanced anti-radiation guided-missile weapon data link program 194
Advanced electric motor development 194
Affordable weapon system 194
All-weather sense-and-avoid system for unmanned aerial vehicles 195
Composite Sea Lion craft project 196
Extended range guided-munitions 196
Global Command and Control System-Maritime 196
Helicopter windscreen laminate appliqués 197
High-Integrity Global Positioning Systems 197
Hyper-spectral targeting sensor 197
Large-scale demonstration item for VA-Class bow dome 198
Marine Corps assault vehicles 198
Marine Corps shotgun modernization program 198
Marine mammal awareness, alert and response systems 198
MK–48 torpedo technology development 199
Naval Ship Hydrodynamic Test Facilities, NSWC, Carderock 199
Navy strategy for maritime domain awareness 199
Non-lethal weapons and technology 200
Recapitalization of anti-submarine warfare aircraft 201
Reliable Replacement Warhead 201
Report on energetic materials research development and manufacturing technology 202
Ruggedized helicopter avionics displays 202
Sea-based strategic deterrent/undersea launched missile study 203
Seafighter 203
SSGN/Virginia payload tube development 203
Threat-D missile target development 204
Trigger and alert sonobuoy 204
Ultraviolet-cure structural repair adhesives 204
Urban operations laboratory 205
VH–71 presidential helicopter program 205
Warfighter rapid awareness processing technology 205
Air Force Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 206
Overview 206
Items of Special Interest 223
B–2 small Diameter Bomb Moving-Target-Kill integration 223
C–130J development 223
Combat search and recovery vehicle-x 223
Common vertical lift support platform 224
Cyber boot camp 224
Global Command and Control System-Air Force 224
High Accuracy Network Determination System 225
Improved reliability for optimized inspection 225
Intercontinental ballistic missile cryptography upgrade 225
Joint cargo aircraft program 226
Joint strike fighter 227
Low profile arresting gear 228
Metals affordability initiative 229
Multiple unmanned aerial vehicle employment against a common objective 229
Next-generation tactical environmental clothing 229
Non-attribution of open source intelligence research 230
Operationally responsive space 230
RAND Project Air Force 231
Single-mode optical connectors for advanced air vehicles 231
Space control test capabilities 232
Third Generation Infrared Surveillance 232
Winglets for in-service aerial refueling aircraft 232
Wire integrity technology program 233
Defense Wide Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 234
Overview 234

Page

Operational Research, Development, Test and Evaluation 252
Overview 252
Items of Special Interest 254
Acquisition of foreign material for training purposes 254
Advanced energy storage technology initiative 254
Analysis of the industrial base for space acquisitions 255
Army advanced hypersonic weapon 255
Ballistic missile defense 255
Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense 255
Airborne Laser 256
Arrow Weapons System 257
Ballistic missile defense discrimination radar in Israel 257
Ballistic missile defense reductions 257
Ballistic missile defense sensors 258
Ballistic missile defense system space program 258
European Ground-based Midcourse Defense component 258
Kinetic Energy Interceptor 259
Missile defense force structure 260
Missile defense program element structure 260
Missile defense program oversight 261
Missile defense testing and targets 261
Multiple Kill Vehicle 262
Short-range ballistic missile defense 262
Space Tracking and Surveillance System 263
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense 263
Blood cell storage 263
Center for Technology and National Security Policy at the National Defense University 264
Chemical and biological defense basic and applied research and advanced technology development initiative 264
Chemical/biological defense advanced technology development initiative 264
Chemical/biological defense applied research initiative 265
Chemical/biological defense basic research initiative 265
Cyberterror protection expansion for the Department of Defense 265
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency 265
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency relocation 266
Defense Agencies Initiative sustainment 267
Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research 267
Defense Information System for Security 268
Department of Defense bandwidth requirements for the future 268
Energy technology investment roadmap 269
Foliage penetration capability 269
Green information technology standards 270
Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions 270
Human, social, and cultural behavioral modeling advanced development 271
Human, social, and cultural behavior modeling research 272
Human systems integration 272
Increase in basic research 273
Independent verification and validation for financial management systems 273
Information technology clearinghouse 273
K–12 computer sciences and mathematics education 274
Lean Six Sigma process analysis within the Office of Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics 274
Managing and extending Department of Defense asset lifecycles 275
Nanocrystal source display 275
Naval Postgraduate School 275
Open source software systems 275
Post-detonation nuclear forensics 276
Pre-Key Decision Point-B system vulnerability assessment 276
Printed circuit board technology 277
Review of cost reimbursements on defense research grants and contracts 277
Science and technology for strategic communication 278

Page
Social science research within the Department of Defense 279
Sustainment of Business Transformation Agency programs 279
Technology to improve future spectrum management usage 280
Transformational Medical Technology Initiative 280
Wounded Warriors as information technology, scientific, and engineering specialists 281
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 281
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 281
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations 281
Section 202—Amount for Defense Science and Technology 281
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 281
Section 211—Additional Determinations to be Made as Part of Future Combat Systems Milestone Review 281
Section 212—Analysis of Future Combat Systems Communications Network and Software 282
Section 213—Future Combat Systems Manned Ground Vehicle Selected Acquisition Reports 282
Section 214—Separate Procurement and Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Line Items and Program Elements for Sky Warrior Unmanned Aerial Systems Project 282
Section 215—Restriction on Obligations of Funds for the Warfighter Information Network—Tactical Program 282
Section 216—Limitation on Source of Funds for Certain Joint Cargo Aircraft Expenditures 282
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs 283
Section 221—Independent Study of Boost Phase Missile Defense 283
Section 222—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Procurement, Construction, and Deployment of Missile Defenses in Europe 283
Subtitle D—Other Matters 283
Section 231—Oversight of Testing of Personnel Protective Equipment by Director, Operational Test, and Evaluation 283
Section 232—Assessment of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions Program 284
Section 233—Technology-Neutral Information Technology Guidelines and Standards to Support Fully Interoperable Electronic Personal Health Information for the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs 284
Section 234—Repeal of Requirement for Technology Transition Initiative 285
Section 235—Trusted Defense Systems 285
Section 236—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Enhanced AN/TPQ–36 Radar System Pending Submission of Report 286
Section 237—Capabilities Based Assessment to Outline a Joint Approach for Future Development of Vertical Lift Aircraft & Rotorcraft . 286
Section 238—Availability of Funds for Prompt Global Strike Capability Development 287
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 287
OVERVIEW 287
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 325
Budget Request Adjustments 325
Air Sovereignty Alert 326
Cheyenne Mountain 326
Defense Contract Management Agency Restoration of Staffing 327
F–15 Maintenance 327
Navy Headquarters Organizational Changes 327
Other Contracts 328
Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative 328
Readiness Shortfalls 328
Secure Site 329
Energy Issues 329
Energy Conversation 329
Energy Security on Military Installations 329
Improving Energy Efficiency in Reset and Recapitalization Programs 330
Environmental Issues 330
Marine Mammal Protection Act National Defense Exemption 330
Measurement of Encroachment Impacts on Military Readiness 331
Environmental Management Information Systems 332

Page
Workplace and Depot Issues 332
Army Rail Shop Relocation Study 332
Post-Reset Depot Maintenance 333
Inherently Governmental Functions 333
Report on Actions Taken Related to Public-Private Competitions 334
Other Matters 335
Army Logistics Modernization Program 335
Clarification of Department of Defense Transportation Regulations 336
Corrosion Control and Prevention 336
Defense Travel System 337
Report on Feasibility of Department of Defense Civilian Law Enforcement Force 338
Report on Improving Supply Chain Management to Enhance Joint Logistics Capability 338
Space-Available Priority for Military Retirees with Specialty Medical Care Referral 339
Space Wargames and Exercises 339
Tactical and Medium-Altitude Unmanned Aerial Systems Pilot Training and Management 339
Tire Privatization 340
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 341
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 341
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding 341
Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions 341
Section 311—Authorization for Department of Defense Participation in Conservation Banking Programs 341
Section 312—Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for Certain Costs in Connection with Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington 342
Section 313—Expand Cooperative Agreement Authority for Management of Natural Resources to Include Off-Installation Mitigation 342
Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot Issues 342
Section 321—Time Limitation on Duration of Public-Private Competitions 342
Section 322—Comprehensive Analysis and Development of Single Government- Wide Definition of Inherently Governmental Function 343
Section 323—Study on Future Depot Capability 343
Section 324—High-Performing Organization Business Process Reengineering 343
Section 325—Temporary Suspension of Studies and Public-Private Competitions Regarding Conversion of Functions of the Department of Defense Performed by Civilian Employees to Contractor Performance 344
Section 326—Consolidation of Air Force and Air National Guard Aircraft Maintenance 344
Section 327—Guidance for Performance of Civilian Personnel Work Under Air Force Civilian Personnel Consolidation Plan 344
Section 328—Report on Reduction in Number of Fire Fighters on Air Force Bases 345
Subtitle D—Energy Security 345
Section 331—Annual Report on Operational Energy Management and Implementation of Operational Energy Strategy 345
Section 332—Consideration of Fuel Logistics Support Requirements in Planning, Requirements Development, and Acquisition Processes 345
Section 333—Study on Solar Energy for Use at Forward Operating Locations 345
Section 334—Study on Coal-to-Liquid Fuels 345
Subtitle E—Reports 346
Section 341—Comptroller General Report on Readiness of Armed Forces 346
Section 342—Report on Plan to Enhance Combat Skills of Navy and Air Force Personnel 346
Section 343—Comptroller General Report on the Use of the Army Reserve and National Guard as an Operational Reserve 346
Section 344—Comptroller General Report on Link Between Preparation and Use of Army Reserve Component Forces to Support Ongoing Operations 347

Page

Section 345—Comptroller General Report on Adequacy of Funding, Staffing, and Organization of Department of Defense Military Munitions Response Program 347
Section 346—Report on Options for Providing Repair Capabilities to Support Ships Operating Near Guam 347
Subtitle F—Other Matters 348
Section 351—Extension of Enterprise Transition Plan Reporting Requirement 348
Section 352—Demilitarization of Loaned, Given, or Exchanged Documents, Historical Artifacts, and Condemned or Obsolete Combat Materiel 348
Section 353—Repeal of Requirement that Secretary of Air Force Provide Training and Support to Other Military Departments for A–10 Aircraft 348
Section 354—Display of Annual Budget Requirements for Air Sovereignty Alert Mission 348
Section 355—Sense of Congress that Air Sovereignty Alert Missions Should Receive Sufficient Funding and Resources 348
Section 356—Revision of Certain Air Force Regulations Required 349
Section 357—Transfer of C–12 Aircraft to California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 349
Section 358—Availability of Funds for Irregular Warfare Support Program 349
Section 359—Sense of Congress Regarding Procurement and Use of Munitions 350
Section 360—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Air Combat Command Management Headquarters 350
Section 361—Increase of Domestic Sourcing of Military Working Dogs Used by the Department of Defense 350
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS 350
OVERVIEW 350
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 351
Subtitle A—Active Forces 351
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces 351
Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels 352
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 352
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve 352
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserve Components 352
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) 353
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2009 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians 353
Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized to be on Active Duty for Operational Support 353
Section 416—Additional Waiver Authority of Limitation on Number of Reserve Component Members Authorized to be on Active Duty 354
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 354
Section 421—Military Personnel 354
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY 356
OVERVIEW 356
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 357
Advance Deployment Notice to Reserve Component Members 357
Air Force Academy Athletic Association 357
Competitions to Provide Unofficial Information Services to Service Members 358
Financial Counseling for Homeowners in the Armed Forces 359
National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 359
Report on Duty Status of the Reserve Component 359
Review of Full-Time Manning for the Army National Guard and Army Reserves 360
Review of Reserve Officer Joint Requirements 360
Searchable Military Decorations Database 361
Strategic Plan to Address Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and Education 361
Youth Information in Recruiting Databases 362
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 362

Page
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy Generally 362
Section 501—Mandatory Separation Requirements for Regular Warrant Officers for Length of Service 362
Section 502—Requirements for Issuance of Posthumous Commissions and Warrants 363
Section 503—Extension of Authority to Reduce Minimum Length of Active Service Required for Voluntary Retirement as an Officer 363
Section 504—Increase in Authorized Number of General Officers on Active Duty in the Marine Corps 363
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management 363
Section 511—Extension to All Military Departments of Authority to Defer Mandatory Separation of Military Technicians (Dual Status) 363
Section 512—Increase in Authorized Strengths for Marine Corps Reserve Officers on Active Duty in the Grades of Major and Lieutenant Colonel to Meet Force Structure Requirements 363
Section 513—Clarification of Authority to Consider for a Vacancy Promotion National Guard Officers Ordered to Active Duty in Support of a Contingency Operation 363
Section 514—Increase in Mandatory Retirement Age for Certain Reserve Officers 364
Section 515—Age Limit for Retention of Certain Reserve Officers on Active- Status List as Exception to Removal for Years of Commissioned Service 364
Section 516—Authority to Retain Reserve Chaplains and Officers in Medical and Related Specialties until Age 68 364
Section 517—Study and Report Regarding Personnel Movements in Marine Corps Individual Ready Reserve 364
Subtitle C—Joint Qualified Officers and Requirements 364
Section 521—Joint Duty Requirements for Promotion to General or Flag Officer 364
Section 522—Technical, Conforming, and Clerical Changes to Joint Specialty Terminology 364
Section 523—Promotion Policy Objectives for Joint Qualified Officers 365
Section 524—Length of Joint Duty Assignments 365
Section 525—Designation of General and Flag Officer Positions on Joint Staff as Positions to be Held Only by Reserve Component Officers 365
Section 526—Treatment of Certain Service as Joint Duty Experience 365
Subtitle D—General Service Authorities 366
Section 531—Increase in Authorized Maximum Reenlistment Term 366
Section 532—Career Intermission Pilot Program 366
Subtitle E—Education and Training 366
Section 541—Repeal of Prohibition on Phased Increase in Midshipmen and Cadet Strength Limit at United States Naval Academy and Air Force Academy 366
Section 542—Promotion of Foreign and Cultural Exchange Activities at Military Service Academies 366
Section 543—Compensation for Civilian President of Naval Postgraduate School 367
Section 544—Increased Authority to Enroll Defense Industry Employees in Defense Product Development Program 367
Section 545—Requirement of Completion of Service under Honorable Conditions for Purposes of Entitlement to Educational Assistance for Reserve Components Members Supporting Contingency Operations 367
Section 546—Consistent Education Loan Repayment Authority for Health Professionals in Regular Components and Selected Reserve 367
Section 547—Increase in Number of Units of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps 367
Subtitle F—Military Justice 368
Section 551—Grade of Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps 368
Section 552—Standing Military Protection Order 368
Section 553—Mandatory Notification of Issuance of Military Protective Order to Civilian Law Enforcement 368
Section 554—Implementation of Information Database on Sexual Assault Incidents in the Armed Forces 368

Page
Subtitle G—Decorations, Awards, and Honorary Promotions 368
Section 561—Replacement of Military Decorations 368
Section 562—Authorization and Request for Award of Medal of Honor to Richard L. Etchberger for Acts of Valor during the Vietnam War ... 369
Section 563—Advancement of Brigadier General Charles E. Yeager, United States Air Force (Retired), on the Retired List 369
section 564—Advancement of Rear Admiral Wayne E. Meyer, United States Navy (Retired), on the Retired List 369
Section 565—Award of Vietnam Service Medal to Veterans Who Participated in Mayaguez Rescue Operation 369
Subtitle H—Impact Aid 369
Section 571—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees 369
Section 572—Calculation of Payments under Department of Education's Impact Aid Program 370
Subtitle I—Military Families 370
Section 581—Presentation of Burial Flag 370
Section 582—Education and Training Opportunities for Military Spouses 370
Subtitle J—Other Matters 370
Section 591—Inclusion of Reserves in Providing Federal Aid for State Governments, Enforcing Federal Authority, and Responding to Major Public Emergencies 370
Section 592—Interest Payments on Certain Claims Arising from Correction of Military Records 370
Section 593—Extension of Limitation on Reductions of Personnel of Agencies Responsible for Review and Correction of Military Records .. 371
Section 594—Authority to Order Reserve Units to Active Duty to Provide Assistance in Response to a Major Disaster or Emergency 371
Section 595—Senior Military Leadership Diversity Commission 371
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS 371
OVERVIEW 371
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 372
Defense Commissary Agency Construction Funding 372
Disabled Veterans Access to Commissary and Exchanges 372
Post-Deployment Leave Policy 373
Telephone Services in Combat Zones 373
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 374
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 374
Section 601—Fiscal Year 2009 Increase in Military Basic Pay 374
Section 602—Permanent Prohibition on Charges for Meals Received at Military Treatment Facilities by Members Receiving Continuous Care 374
Section 603—Equitable Treatment of Senior Enlisted Members in Computation of Basic Allowance for Housing 374
Section 604—Increase in Maximum Authorized Payment or Reimbursement Amount for Temporary Lodging Expenses 374
Section 605—Availability of Portion of a Second Family Separation Allowance for Married Couples with Dependents 374
Section 606—Stabilization of Pay and Allowances for Senior Enlisted Members and Warrant Officers Appointed as Officers and Officers Reappointed in a Lower Grade 375
Section 607—Extension of Authority for Income Replacement Payments for Reserve Component Members Experiencing Extended and Frequent Mobilization for Active Duty Service 375
Section 608—Guaranteed Pay Increase for Members of the Armed Forces of One- Half of One Percentage Point Higher than Employment Cost Index 375
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 375
Section 611—Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces 375
Section 612—Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals 375
Section 613—Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers 376

Page

Section 614—Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays 376
Section 615—Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Referral Bonuses 376
Section 616—Increase in Maximum Bonus and Stipend Amounts Authorized under Nurse Officer Candidate Accession Program 376
Section 617—Maximum Length of Nuclear Officer Incentive Pay Agreements for Service 376
Section 618—Technical Changes Regarding Consolidation of Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities of the Uniformed Services 376
Section 619—Use of New Skill Incentive Pay and Proficiency Bonus Authorities to Encourage Training in Critical Foreign Languages and Foreign Cultural Studies 377
Section 620—Temporary Targeted Bonus Authority to Increase Direct Accessions of Officers in Certain Health Professions 377
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances 377
Section 631—Increased Weight Allowance for Transportation of Baggage and Household Effects for Certain Enlisted Members 377
Section 632—Additional Weight Allowance for Transportation of Materials Associated with Employment of a Member's Spouse or Community Support Volunteer or Charity Activities 377
Section 633—Transportation of Family Pets during Evacuation of Non-Essential Personnel 377
Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits 378
Section 641—Equity in Computation of Disability Retired Pay for Reserve Component Members Wounded in Action 378
Section 642—Effect of Termination of Subsequent Marriage on Payment of Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity to Surviving Spouse or Former Spouse Who Previously Transferred Annuity to Dependent Children 378
Section 643—Extension to Survivors of Certain Members Who Die on Active Duty of Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance for Persons Affected by Required Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity Offset for Dependency and Indemnity Compensation 378
Section 644—Election to Receive Retired Pay for Non-Regular Service upon Retirement for Service in an Active Reserve Status Performed after Attaining Eligibility for Regular Retirement 378
Section 645—Recomputation of Retired Pay and Adjustment of Retired Grade of Reserve Retirees to Reflect Service after Retirement 379
Section 646—Correction of Unintended Reduction in Survivor Benefit Plan Annuities Due to Phased Elimination of Two-Tier Annuity Computation and Supplemental Annuity 379
Section 647—Presumption of Death for Participants in Survivor Benefit Plan in Missing Status 379
Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations 379
Section 651—Use of Commissary Stores Surcharges Derived from Temporary Commissary Initiatives for Reserve Components and Retired Members 379
Section 652—Requirements for Private Operation of Commissary Store Functions 380
Section 653—Additional Exception to Limitation on Use of Appropriated Funds for Department of Defense Golf Courses 380
Section 654—Enhanced Enforcement of Prohibition on Sale or Rental of Sexually Explicit Material on Military Installations 380
Section 655—Requirement to Buy Military Decorations, Ribbons, Badges, Medals, Insignia, and Other Uniform Accouterments Produced in the United States 380
Section 656—Use of Appropriated Funds to Pay Post Allowances or Overseas Cost of Living Allowances to Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Employees Serving Overseas 380
Section 657—Study Regarding Sale of Alcoholic Wine and Beer in Commissary Stores in Addition to Exchange Stores 381
Subtitle F—Other Matters 381
Section 661—Bonus to Encourage Army Personnel and Other Persons to Refer Persons for Enlistment in the Army 381

Page

Section 662—Continuation of Entitlement to Bonuses and Similar Benefits for Members of the Uniformed Services Who Die, are Separated or Retired for Disability, or Meet Other Criteria 381
Section 663—Providing Injured Members of the Armed Forces Information Concerning Benefits 382
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS 382
OVERVIEW 382
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 383
Pain Care Initiative in Military Health Care Facilities 383
Reserve Component Dental Readiness 384
Suicide Prevention in the Armed Forces 384
Wounded Warriors as Health Providers 384
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 385
Subtitle A—Health Care Matters 385
Section 701—One-Year Extension of Prohibition on Increases in Certain Health Care Costs for Members of the Uniformed Services 385
Section 702—Temporary Prohibition on Increase in Copayments under Retail Pharmacy System of Pharmacy Benefits Program 385
Section 703—Prohibition on Conversion of Military Medical and Dental Positions to Civilian Medical and Dental Positions 385
Section 704—Chiropractic Health Care for Members on Active Duty 385
Section 705—Requirement to Recalculate TRICARE Reserve Select Premiums Based on Actual Cost Data 386
Section 706—Program for Health Care Delivery at Military Installations Projected to Grow 386
Section 707—Guidelines for Combined Federal Medical Facilities 386
Subtitle B—Preventive Care 386
Section 711—Waiver of Copayments for Preventative Services for Certain TRICARE Beneficiaries 386
Section 712—Military Health Risk Management Demonstration Project 387
Section 713—Smoking Cessation Program Under TRICARE 387
Section 714—Availability of Allowance to Assist Members of the Armed Forces and their Dependents Procure Preventive Health Care Services 387
Subtitle C—Wounded Warrior Matters 388
Section 721—Center of Excellence in Prevention, Diagnosis, Mitigation, Treatment, and Rehabilitation of Hearing Loss and Auditory System Injuries 388
Section 722—Clarification to Center of Excellence Relating to Military Eye Injuries 388
Section 723—National Casualty Care Research Center 388
Section 724—Peer-Reviewed Research Program on Extremity War Injuries 389
Section 725—Review of Policies and Processes Related to the Delivery of Mail to Wounded Members of the Armed Forces 389
Subtitle D—Other Matters 389
Section 731—Report on Stipend for Members of Reserve Components for Health Care for Certain Dependents 389
Section 732—Report on Providing the Extended Health Care Option Program to Autistic Dependents of Military Retirees 389
Section 733—Sense of Congress Regarding Autism Therapy Services 389
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS 389
OVERVIEW 389
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 391
Acquisition Workforce 391
Defense Industrial Security 392
Implementation of Changes to Protections for Specialty Metals 392
Implementation of Gansler Commission Recommendations 393
Implementation of Revolving Door Requirements 394
Increase in Bid Protests 394
Iraqi Recipients of Special Immigrant Visas 395
Memorandum of Understanding on Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan 396
Preservation of the Tool and Die Industry 396
Service Contractor Inventory 397

Page
Small Business Programs 398
Utilization of Local Businesses for Contracts on Guam 398
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 399
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management 399
Section 801—Review of Impact of Illegal Subsidies on Acquisition of KC–45 Aircraft 399
Section 802—Assessment of Urgent Operational Needs Fulfillment 399
Section 803—Preservation of Tooling for Major Defense Acquisition Programs 399
Section 804—Prohibition on Procurement from Beneficiaries of Foreign Subsidies 400
Section 805—Domestic Industrial Base Considerations during Source Selection 400
Section 806—Commercial Software Reuse Preference 400
Section 807—Comprehensive Proposal Analysis Required During Source Selection 400
Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations 401
Section 811—Acquisition Workforce Expedited Hiring Authority 401
Section 812—Definition of System for Defense Acquisition Challenge Program 401
Section 813—Career Path and Other Requirements for Military Personnel in the Acquisition Field 401
Section 814—Technical Data Rights for Non-FAR Agreements 402
Section 815—Clarification that Cost Accounting Standards Apply to Federal Contracts Performed Outside the United States 402
Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Inherently Governmental Matters 402
Section 821—Policy on Personal Conflicts of Interest by Employees of Department of Defense Contractors 402
Section 822—Development of Guidance on Personal Services Contracts 403
Section 823—Limitation on Performance of Product Support Integrator Functions 403
Subtitle D—Defense Industrial Security 404
Section 831—Requirements Relating to Facility Clearances 404
Section 832—Foreign Ownership Control or Influence 405
Section 833—Congressional Oversight Relating to Facility Clearances and Foreign Ownership Control or Influence; Definitions 405
Subtitle E—Other Matters 406
Section 841—Clarification of Status of Government Rights in the Designs of Department of Defense Vessels, Boats, Craft, and Components Thereof 406
Section 842—Expansion of Authority to Retain Fees from Licensing of Intellectual Property 406
Section 843—Transfer of Sections of Title 10 Relating to Milestone A and Milestone B for Clarity 406
Section 844—Earned Value Management Study and Report 407
Section 845—Report on Market Research 407
Section 846—System Development and Demonstration Benchmark Report 407
Section 847—Additional Matters Required to be Reported by Contractors Performing Security Functions in Areas of Combat Operations ... 407
Section 848—Report Relating to Munitions 408
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT .....
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 408
Cyber Command Responsibilities 408
Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs 408
Inter-agency transformation of the United States Southern Command .. 409
Long-Term Nature of Business Transformation Agency Work 411
Planning Assumptions on the Level of Contract Support 411
Quadrennial Defense Review 411
United States Africa Command 412
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 413
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management 413
Section 901—Revisions in Functions and Activities of Special Operations Command 413
Section 902—Requirement to Designate Officials for Irregular Warfare . 413

Page

Section 903—Plan Required for Personnel Management of Special Operations Forces 413
Section 904—Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs 413
Section 905—Corrosion Control and Prevention Executives for the Military Departments 414
Section 906—Alignment of Deputy Chief Management Officer Resposibilities 414
Section 907—Requirement for the Secretary of Defense to Prepare a Strategic Plan to Enhance the Role of the National Guard and Reserves 414
Section 908—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps 415
Section 909—Support to Commitee Review 415
Subtitle B—Space Activities 415
Section 911—Extension of Authority for Pilot Program for Provision of Space Surveillance Network Services to Non-United States Government Entities 415
Section 912—Investment and Acquisition Strategy for Commercial Satellite Capabilities 415
Subtitle C—Chemical Demilitarization Program 415
Section 921—Chemical Demilitarization Citizens Advisory Commissions in Colorado and Kentucky 415
Section 922—Prohibition on Transport of Hydrolystate at Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado 416
Subtitle D—Intelligence-Related Matters 416
Section 931—Technical Changes Following the Redesignation of National Imagery and Mapping Agency as National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency 416
Section 932—Technical Amendments to Title 10, United States Code, Arising from Enactment of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 416
Section 933—Technical Amendments Relating to the Associate Director of the CIA for Military Affairs 417
Subtitle E—Other Matters 417
Section 941—Establishment of Department of Defense School of Nursing 417
Section 942—Amendments of Authority for Regional Centers for Security Studies 417
Section 943—Findings and Sense of Congress Regarding the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation 417
Section 944—Restriction on Obligation of Funds for United States Southern Command Development Assistance Activities 418
Section 945—Authorization of Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities 418
Section 946—Report on United States Northern Command Development of Interagency Plans and Command and Control Relationships . 418

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS 419
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 419
Counter-Drug Activities 419
Overview 419
Items of Special Interest 419
Budget requests 419
International Support 419
South-propelled semi-submersible vessels and low profile vessels without nationality 419
Southwest Border Fence 420
Temporary expansion of the Joint Inter-Agency Task Force-South 420
Other Activities 421
Civil Affairs 421
Humanitarian Assistance Requirements of the Navy 422
Inclusion of Non-Lethal Capability in Defense Civil Support Requirements Plan 423
Long-term Plans for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance 423
National Language Service Corps 424
Nuclear Weapons Inventory Control 424
Oversight of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Proposals for New Capabilities 425

Page

Strengthening Inter-Agency Stabilization and Reconstruction Contingency Planning 426
Unmanned Aircraft Systems Task Force 426
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 427
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 427
Section 1001—General Transfer Authority 427
Section 1002—Requirement of Separate Display of Budget for Afghanistan 427
Section 1003—Requirement for Separate Display of Budget for Iraq 428
Section 1004—One Time Shift of Military Retirement Payments 428
Subtitle B—Policy Relating to Vessels and Shipyards 428
Section 1011—Conveyance, Navy Drydock, Aransas Pass, Texas 428
Section 1012—Report on Repair of Naval Vessels in Foreign Shipyards 428
Section 1013—Policy Relating to Major Combatant Vessels of the Strike Forces of the United States Navy 428
Section 1014—National Defense Sealift Fund Amendments 429
Section 1015—Report on Contributions to the Domestic Supply of Steel and Other Metals from Scrapping of Certain Vessels 429
Subtitle C—Counter-Drug Activities 429
Section 1021—Continuation of Reporting Requirement Regarding Department of Defense Expenditures to Support Foreign Counter-drug Activities 429
Section 1022—Extension of Authority for Join Task Forces to Provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counter-terrorism Activities 429
Section 1023—Extention of Authority to Support Unified Counter-drug and Counter-terrorism Campaign in Colombia and Continuation of Numerical Limitation on Assignment of United States Personnel 430
Section 1024—Expansion and Extension of Authority to Provide Additional Support for Counter-drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments 430
Section 1025—Comprehensive Department of Defense Strategy for Counter- narcotics Efforts for West Africa and the Maghreb 431
Section 1026—Comprehensive Department of Defense Strategy for Counter- narcotics Efforts in South and Central Asian Regions 431
Subtitle D—Boards and Commissions 432
Section 1031—Strategic Communications Board 432
Section 1032—Extension of Certain Dates for Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States 432
Section 1033—Extension of Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack 432
Subtitle E—Studies and Reports 433
Section 1041—Report on Corrosion Control and Prevention 433
Section 1042—Study on Using Department of Defense Modular Airborne Fire Fighting Systems in a Federal Response to Wildfires 433
Section 1043—Study on Rotorcraft Survivability 434
Section 1044—Studies to Analyze Alternative Models for Acquisition and Funding of Inter-connected Cyberspace Systems 434
Section 1045—Report on Non-strategic Nuclear Weapons 434
Section 1046—Study on National Defense Implications of Section 1083 . 434
Section 1047—Report on Methods Department of Defense Utilizes to Ensure Compliance with Guam Tax and Licensing Laws 434
Subtitle F—Congressional Recognitions 435
Section 1051—Sense of Congress Honoring the Honorable Duncan Hunter 435
Section 1052—Sense of Congress in Honor of the Honorable Jim Saxton, a Member of the House of Representatives 435
Section 1053—Sense of Congress Honoring the Honorable Terry Everett 435
Section 1054—Sense of Congress Honoring the Honorable Jo Ann Davis 435
Subtitle G—Other Matters 435
Section 1061—Amendment to Annual Submission of Information Regarding Information Technology Capital Assets 435
Section 1062—Restriction on Department of Defense Relocation of Missions or Functions from Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station 435
Section 1063—Technical and Clerical Amendments 436

Page

Section 1064—Submission to Congress of Revision to Regulation on Enemy Prisoners of War, Retained Personnel, Civilian Internees, and Other Detainees 436
Section 1065—Authorization of Appropriations for Payments to Portuguese Nationals Employed by the Department of Defense 436
Section 1066—State Defense Force Improvement 436
Section 1067—Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, New Jersey 436
Section 1068—Sense of Congress Regarding the Roles and Mission of the Department of Defense and Other National Security Institutions 437
Section 1069—Sense of Congress Relating to 2008 Supplemental Appropriations 437
Section 1070—Sense of Congress Regarding Defense Requirements of the United States 437
TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS 437
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 437
Implementation of Existing Policies for Medical Care for Department of Defense and Non—Department of Defense Civilians Injured or Wounded in Support of Contingency Operations 437
Information Technology Workforce Analysis 438
Review of Medical Care for Federal Civilian Employees Serving in a Contingency Operation 438
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 439
Section 1101—Temporary Authority to Waive Limitation on Premium Pay for Federal Employees 439
Section 1102—Extension of Authority to Make Lump-Sum Severance Payments 439
Section 1103—Extension of Voluntary Reduction-in-Force Authority of Department of Defense 440
Section 1104—Technical Amendment to Definition of Professional Accounting Position 440
Section 1105—Expedited Hiring Authority for Health Care Professionals 440
Section 1106—Authority to Adjust Certain Limitations on Personnel and Reports on Such Adjustments 440
Section 1107—Temporary Discretionary Authority to Grant Allowances, Benefits, and Gratuities to Personnel on Official Duty in a Combat Zone 441
Section 1108—Requirement Relating to Furloughs During the Time of a Contingency Operation 441
Section 1109—Direct Hire Authority for Certain Positions at Personnel Demonstration Laboratories 441
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS 441
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 441
Combatant Commanders' Initiative Fund 441
Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Iraq 442
Foreign Disclosure 443
Foreign Military Sales 443
Graduates of the Jordanian International Police Training Center 444
Honoring and Acknowledging Service Members Redeploying from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom 444
Integrating Inter-agency Capabilities into Department of Defense Planning for Stability Operations 445
Oversight of Department of Defense Policies on Iran 445
Reconstruction, Security, and Stabilization Assistance 446
Report on Command and Control Structure for Military Forces Operating in the Republic of Korea 446
Report on Efforts to Train and Equip the Afghan National Security Forces 446
Security Developments in Pakistan and Implications for Afghanistan 449
Security for Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Iraq 450
Special Inspector General for Afghanistan 450
Unity of Command in Provincial Reconstruction Teams 450
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 451
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training 451
Section 1201—Extension of Authority to Build the Capacity of the Pakistan Frontier Corps 451

Page

Section 1202—Military-to-Military Contacts and Comparable Activities 451
Section 1203—Enhanced Authority to Pay Incremental Expenses for Participation of Developing Countries in Combined Exercises 451
Section 1204—Extension of Temporary Authority to Use Acquisition and Cross- servicing Agreements to Lend Military Equipment for Personnel Protection and Survivability 451
Section 1205—One-Year Extension of Authority for Distribution to Certain Foreign Personnel of Education and Training Materials and Information Technology to Enhance Military Interoperability 451
Section 1206—Modification and Extension of Authorities Relating to Program to Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces 452
Section 1207—Extension of Authority for Security and Stabilization Assistance 452
Section 1208—Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism 452
Section 1209—Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program 453
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Iraq and Afghanistan 453
Section 1211—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Certain Purposes Relating to Iraq 453
Section 1212—Report on Status of Forces Agreements between the United States and Iraq 453
Section 1213—Strategy for United States-Led Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Iraq 453
Section 1214—Commanders' Emergency Response Program 454
Section 1215—Performance Monitoring System for United States-led Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan 454
Section 1216—Report on Command and Control Structure for Military Forces Operating in Afghanistan 454
Section 1217—Report on Enhancing Security and Stability in the Region along the Border of Afghanistan and Pakistan 455
Section 1218—Study and Report on Iraqi Police Training Teams 456
Subtitle C—Other Matters 456
Section 1221—Payment of Personnel Expenses for Multilateral Cooperation Programs 456
Section 1222—Extension of Department of Defense Authority to Participate in Multinational Military Centers of Excellence 456
Section 1223—Study of Limitation on Classified Contracts with Foreign Companies Engaged in Space Business with China 456
Section 1224—Sense of Congress and Congressional Briefings on Readiness of the Armed Forces and Report on Nuclear Weapons-Capabilities of Iran 457

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION 457
OVERVIEW 457
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 458
Biological Threat Reduction 458
Shchuch'ye Chemical Weapons Destruction Project 459
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 460
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds 460
Section 1302—Funding Allocations 460

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 466
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 466
Advance Procurement Funding for Dry-Cargo Ammunition Ships (T-AKE) 466
Use of the National Defense Sealift Fund for Procurement of New Construction Vessels in the Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future) .. 466
Subtitle A—Military programs 466
Section 1401—Working Capital Funds 466
Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund 466
Section 1403—Defense Health Program 467
Section 1404—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense 467
Section 1405—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide 467
Section 1406—Defense Inspector General 467
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile 467

Page

Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds 467
Section 1412—Revisions to Previously Authorized Disposals from the National Defense Stockpile 467
Subtitle C—Armed Forces Retirement Home 468
Section 1421—Armed Forces Retirement Home 468
Subtitle D—Other Matters 468
Section 1431—Inapplicability of Executive Order 13457 468

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM 468
OVERVIEW 468
SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS 469
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 472
Army Aircraft Repair and Recapitalization 472
Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Operations Integration Center 472
Counter Rockets, Artillery, and Mortars Program 473
F–22 473
Global Improvised Explosive Device Threat Estimate 473
Increased Army Training 474
Iraq Security Forces Fund 475
Human Terrain Team Support 475
Production Rates of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles 475
Special Operations Command Aircraft Radar Warning Receivers 476
Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization 476
War Reserve Secondary Items—Prepositioned Stocks 477
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 477
Section 1501—Purpose 477
Section 1502—Army Procurement 477
Section 1503—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement 477
Section 1504—Air Force Procurement 478
Section 1505—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement 478
Section 1506—Rapid Acquisition Fund 478
Section 1507—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund 478
Section 1508—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for the Joint Improvised Explosive Devices Defeat Organization Pending Notification to Congress 478
Section 1509—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 478
Section 1510—Operation and Maintenance 479
Section 1511—Other Department of Defense Programs 479
Section 1512—Iraq Security Forces Fund 479
Section 1513—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund 479
Section 1514—Military Personnel 479
Section 1515—Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund 479
Section 1516—Special Transfer Authority 479
Section 1517—Treatment as Additional Authorizations 479

TITLE XVI—RECONSTRUCTION AND STABILIZATION CIVILIAN MANAGEMENT 479
OVERVIEW 479
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 480
Section 1601—Short Title 480
Section 1602—Findings 480
Section 1603—Definitions 480
Section 1604—Authority to Provide Assistance for Reconstruction and Stabilization Crises 480
Section 1605—Reconstruction and Stabilization 481
Section 1606—Authorities Related to Personnel 481
Section 1607—Reconstruction and Stabilization Strategy 481
Section 1608—Annual Reports to Congress 481

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 481
PURPOSE 481
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW 481
Section 2001—Short Title 500
Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law 500

TITLE XXI—ARMY 500
SUMMARY 500

Page
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 500
Sierra Army Depot Drinking Water 500
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 500
Planning and Design 501
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 501
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 501
Section 2102—Family Housing 502
Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 502
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army 502
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Projects 502
Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Projects 502
Section 2107—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects 502
Section 2108—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Projects 502
TITLE XXII—NAVY 502
SUMMARY 502
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 503
Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center (MCAGCC), Twentynine Palms, California Land Expansion 503
Planning and Design 503
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 503
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 503
Section 2202—Family Housing 503
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 503
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy 503
Section 2205—Modification of Authority to Carry out Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Project 504
Section 2206—Modification of Authority to Carry out Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Projects 504
Section 2207—Report on Impacts of Surface Ship Homeporting Alternatives 504
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE 504
SUMMARY 504
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 504
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 504
Planning and Design 505
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 505
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 505
Section 2302—Family Housing 505
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 505
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force 505
Section 2305—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects 505
Section 2306—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Projects 505
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES 506
SUMMARY 506
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 506
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 506
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 508
Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations 508
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 508
Section 2402—Energy Conservation Projects 508
Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies 508
Section 2404—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Project 508
Section 2405—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Projects 508

Page

Section 2406—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects ... 508
Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations ... 509
Section 2411—Authorized Chemical Demilitarization Program Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 509
Section 2412—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide ... 509
Section 2413—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 1997 Projects ... 509
Section 2414—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2000 Projects ... 509
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM ... 509
SUMMARY ... 509
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 509
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 509
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO ... 509
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES ... 510
SUMMARY ... 510
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 510
Planning and Design, Army National Guard ... 510
Planning and Design, Army Reserve ... 510
Planning and Design, Air National Guard ... 510
Planning and Design, Air Reserve ... 511
Niagara Air Reserve Base, New York ... 511
LEGISLATIVE PROVISION ... 511
Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 511
Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 511
Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 511
Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 511
Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 511
Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve ... 511
Section 2607—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects ... 512
Section 2608—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Project ... 512
TITLE XXVII—BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACTIVITIES ... 512
SUMMARY ... 512
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 521
Base Closure and Realignment 2005 Program Underfunding ... 521
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 521
Subtitle A—Authorizations ... 521
Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 ... 521
Section 2702—Authorized Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 ... 521
Section 2703—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 ... 522
Subtitle B—Amendments to Base Closure and Related Laws ... 522
Section 2711—Repeal of Commission Approach to the Development of Recommendations in Any Future Round of Base Closures and Realignments ... 522
Section 2712—Modification of Annual Base Closure and Realignment Reporting Requirements ... 522
Section 2713—Technical Corrections Regarding Authorized Cost and Scope of Work Variations for Military Construction and Military Family Housing Projects Related to Base Closures and Realignments 523

Page
Subtitle C—Other Matters 523
Section 2721—Conditions on Closure of Walter Reed Army Medical Hospital and Relocation of Operations to National Naval Medical Center and Fort Belvoir 523
Section 2722—Report on Use of BRAC Properties as Sites for Refineries or Nuclear Power Plants 523
TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS 523
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 523
Defense Critical Infrastructure Program 523
Facilities Sustainment 524
Formerly Used Defense Sites Review 525
Guam Integrated Water Management System 525
Joint Land Use Study at Shaw Air Force Base 526
Military Spouse and Families Memorial 526
Recycled Materials for Road Construction and other Uses 526
Safe Housing for Military Families 527
Training Range Expansion 527
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 527
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 527
Section 2801—Incorporation of Principles of Sustainable Design in Documents Submitted as Part of Proposed Military Construction Projects 527
Section 2802—Extension of Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds For Construction Projects Outside the United States 528
Section 2803—Revision of Maximum Lease Amount Applicable to Certain Domestic Army Family Housing Leases to Reflect Previously Made Annual Adjustments in Amount 528
Section 2804—Use of Military Family Housing Constructed Under Build and Lease Authority to House Members without Dependents 528
Section 2805—Lease of Military Family Housing to the Secretary of Defense for Use as Residence 528
Section 2806—Repeal of Reporting Requirement in Connection with Installation Vulnerability Assessments 528
Section 2807—Modification of Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing 528
Section 2808—Report on Capturing Housing Privatization Best Practices 529
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 529
Section 2811—Clarification of Exceptions to Congressional Reporting Requirements for Certain Real Property Transactions 529
Section 2812—Authority to Lease Non-Excess Property of Military Departments and Defense Agencies 529
Section 2813—Modification of Utility System Conveyance Authority 529
Section 2814—Permanent Authority to Purchase Municipal Services for Military Installations in the United States 529
Section 2815—Defense Access Roads 530
Section 2816—Protecting Private Property Rights during Department of Defense Land Acquisitions 530
Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Guam Realignment 530
Section 2821—Guam Defense Policy Review Initiative Account 530
Section 2822—Sense of Congress regarding Use of Special Purpose Entities for Military Housing Related to Guam Realignment 530
Section 2823—Sense of Congress Regarding Federal Assistance to Guam 530
Section 2824—Comptroller General Report Regarding Interagency Requirements Related to Guam Realignment 530
Section 2825—Energy and Environmental Design Initiatives in Guam Military Construction and Installations 531
Section 2826—Department of Defense Inspector General Report Regarding Guam Realignment 531
Section 2827—Eligibility of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for Military Base Reuse Studies and Community Planning Assistance 531
Section 2828—Prevailing Wage Applicable to Guam 531
Subtitle D—Energy Security 531

Page

Section 2841—Certification of Enhanced Use Leases for Energy-Related Projects 531
Section 2842—Annual Report on Department of Defense Installations Energy Management 531
Subtitle E—Land Conveyances 532
Section 2851—Land Conveyance, Former Naval Air Station, Alameda, California 532
Section 2852—Land Conveyance, Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point, Norwalk California 532
Section 2853—Land Conveyance, Former Naval Station, Treasure Island, California 532
Section 2854—Condition on Lease Involving Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii 532
Section 2855—Land Conveyance, Sergeant First Class M.L. Downs Army Reserve Center, Springfield, Ohio 532
Section 2856—Land Conveyance, John Sevier Range, Knox County, Tennessee 532
Section 2857—Land Conveyance, Bureau of Land Management Land, Camp Williams, Utah 532
Section 2858—Land Conveyance, Army Property, Camp Williams, Utah 533
Section 2859—Extension of Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail through Fort Belvoir, Virginia 533
Subtitle F—Other Matters 533
Section 2871—Revised Deadline for Transfer of Arlington Naval Annex to Arlington National Cemetery 533
Section 2872—Decontamination and Use of Former Bombardment Area on Island of Culebra 533
Section 2873—Acceptance and Use of Gifts for Construction of Additional Building at National Museum of the United States Air Force, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 533
Section 2874—Establishment of Memorial to American Rangers at Fort Belvoir, Virginia 533
Section 2875—Lease Involving Pier on Ford Island, Pearl Harbor Naval Base, Hawaii 534
Section 2876—Naming of Health Facility, Fort Rucker, Alabama 534
TITLE XXIX—ADDITIONAL WAR-RELATED AND EMERGENCY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 534
SUMMARY 534
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 537
Section 2901—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 537
Section 2902—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 537
Section 2903—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 537
Section 2904—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 537
Section 2905—Termination of Authority to Carry Out Fiscal Year 2008 Army Projects for which Funds Were not Appropriated 537
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 537
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 537
OVERVIEW 537
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 561
National Nuclear Security Administration 561
Overview 561
Weapons Activities 561
Assesssment of life extension programs 561
Reliable Replacement Warhead 561
Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility 562
Stockpile Services 562
Research and Development Support 562
Research and Development Certification and Safety 562
Pit Manufacturing and Pit Manufacturing Capability 562

Page

Advanced Certification ... 563
Engineering Campaign ... 563
Enhanced Surety ... 563
Enhanced Surveillance ... 563
Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign ... 564
Readiness Campaign—Tritium Readiness ... 564
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities ... 564
Operations of Facilities—Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory 564
Operations of Facilities—Pantex Plant ... 565
Operations of Facilities—Y-12 ... 565
National Nuclear Security Administration nuclear weapons transport ... 565
National Nuclear Technical Forensics ... 566
Defense Nuclear Security—Operations and Maintenance—Physical Security systems—Y-12 ... 566
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation ... 566
Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development ... 567
Radiation detection technology ... 568
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Capability Replacement Laboratory ... 568
Nonproliferation and International Security ... 568
Global Nuclear Energy Partnership ... 568
Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention ... 569
International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation ... 569
Second Line of Defense ... 569
Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production ... 570
Fissile Materials Disposition ... 570
United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition ... 570
Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition ... 571
Global Threat Reduction Initiative ... 571
Office of the United States Coordinator for the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism ... 572
Office of the Administrator ... 572
Environmental and Other Defense Activities ... 572
Overview ... 572
Defense Environmental Cleanup ... 573
Defense Environmental Cleanup program funding ... 573
Federal facility agreement and consent order milestones ... 573
Consolidation and disposition of surplus special nuclear materials .. 573
Coordination of disposition efforts ... 574
Mound Site Cleanup ... 574
Low-activity waste treatment and disposition at Hanford ... 575
Other Defense Activities ... 575
Nuclear energy—Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility ... 575
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal ... 576
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 576
Subtitle A—National Security Program Authorizations ... 576
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration ... 576
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup ... 576
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities ... 576
Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal ... 576
Section 3105—Energy Security and Assurance ... 576
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations ... 576
Section 3111—Utilization of International Contributions to Russian Plutonium Disposition Program ... 576
Section 3112—Extension of Deadline for Comptroller General Report on Department of Energy Protective Force Management ... 577
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD ... 577
OVERVIEW ... 577
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 577
Section 3201—Authorization ... 577
TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES ... 577
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 577
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations ... 577
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION ... 577
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 577

Page

Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2009 577
Section 3502—Limitation on Export of Vessels Owned by the Government of the United States for the Purpose of Dismantling, Recycling, or Scrapping 578
Section 3503—Student Incentive Payment Agreements 578
Section 3504—Riding Gang Member Requirements 578
Section 3505—Maintenance and Repair Reimbursement Program for the Maritime Security Fleet 578
Section 3506—Temporary Program Authorizing Contracts with Adjunct Professors at the United States Merchant Marine Academy 579
Departmental Data 579
Department of Defense Authorization Request 579
Committee Position 583
Communications From Other Committees 583
Fiscal Data 592
Congressional Budget Office Estimate 593
Congressional Budget Office Mandatory Cost Estimate 593
Committee Cost Estimate 595
Compliance with House Rule XXI 595
Oversight Findings 631
General Performance Goals and Objectives 631
Constitutional Authority Statement 632
Statement of Federal Mandates 632
Record Votes 632
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported 644
Additional Views 645
Additional views of Duncan Hunter, Jim Saxton, John M. McHugh, Terry Everett, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Mac Thornberry, Robin Hayes, W. Todd Akin, J. Randy Forbes, Joe Wilson, Frank A. LoBiondo, Tom Cole, Rob Bishop, John Kline, Phil Gingrey, Mike Rogers, Trent Franks, Bill Shuster, Thelma D. Drake, K. Michael Conaway, Doug Lamborn, Robert J. Wittman 645
Additional views of Jim Marshall, Tom Cole, Rob Bishop, Michael Turner ... 649
Additional views of Rob Bishop 651
Additional views of Niki Tsongas 654

110TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
110–652

DUNCAN HUNTER NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

MAY 16, 2008.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 5658]

[Includes committee cost estimate]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 5658) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2009, and for other purposes, 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. 5658. 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.

42–336

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The bill would—(1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for procurement and for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2009: (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 2009 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 2009 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 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 DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE BILL

The President requested discretionary budget authority of $601.4 billion for programs in the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee for fiscal year 2009. Of this amount, $515.4 billion was requested for "base" Department of Defense programs, $70 billion was requested as a "bridge fund" to cover costs of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom for the first several months of fiscal year 2009, and $16.0 billion was requested for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The committee recommends an overall discretionary authorization of $601.4 billion including $70.0 billion for war operations. The committee authorization is $232.7 million less than the President's request for the Department of Defense and an equal amount higher for the Department of Energy.

The following table summarizes the committee's recommended discretionary authorizations by appropriation account and compares these amounts to the President's request.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE			
Department of Defense Authorizations -- Base Bill			
Division A: Department of Defense Authorization			
Title I -- PROCUREMENT			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,009,835	-97,100	4,912,735
Missile Procurement, Army	2,211,460	-10,000	2,201,460
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	3,687,077	-147,900	3,539,177
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	2,275,791	19,000	2,294,791
Other Procurement, Army	11,367,926	-166,050	11,201,876
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund /1	496,300	-496,300	
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	14,716,774	-89,500	14,627,274
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,575,482		3,575,482
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	1,122,712		1,122,712
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	12,732,918	185,001	12,917,919
Other Procurement, Navy	5,482,856	-20,930	5,461,926
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,512,765	-216,438	1,296,327
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	12,676,496	-57,831	12,618,665
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,536,728		5,536,728
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	894,478	40,000	934,478

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Other Procurement, Air Force	16,128,396	6,500	16,134,896
Procurement, Defense-Wide	3,164,228	321,200	3,485,428
National Guard and Reserve Equipment		800,000	800,000
Rapid Acquisition Fund /1	102,045	-52,045	50,000
Defense Production Act Purchases /2	[36,365]		
Subtotal, PROCUREMENT	**102,694,267**	**17,607**	**102,711,874**

1/ Transferred to Title XV.

2/ Defense Production Act Purchases are not in the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee (see Budget Implication).

Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION			
RDT&E, Army	10,524,085	159,610	10,683,695
RDT&E, Navy	19,337,238	432,500	19,769,738
RDT&E, Air Force	28,066,617	171,732	28,238,349
RDT&E, Defense-Wide	21,499,229	-654,350	20,844,879
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	188,772		188,772
Subtotal, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL	**79,615,941**	**109,492**	**79,725,433**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Title III -- OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
Operation and Maintenance, Army	31,243,092	545,303	31,788,395
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	34,922,398	-52,300	34,870,098
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,597,254	82,800	5,680,054
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	35,902,487	-842,060	35,060,427
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	26,091,864	-285,207	25,806,657
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,642,341	16,800	2,659,141
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,311,085		1,311,085
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	213,131		213,131
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,142,892	60,000	3,202,892
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	5,875,546	24,800	5,900,346
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	5,879,576	50,000	5,929,576
US Court Of Appeals For The Armed Forces, Defense	13,254		13,254
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster And Civic Aid	83,273		83,273
Former Soviet Union (FSU) Threat Reduction	414,135	31,000	445,135
Environmental Restoration, Army	447,776		447,776
Environmental Restoration, Navy	290,819		290,819
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	496,277		496,277
Environmental Restoration, Defense	13,175		13,175

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Environmental Restoration Formerly Used Sites	257,796		257,796
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	9,101		9,101
Subtotal, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	**154,847,272**	**-368,864**	**154,478,408**
Title IV -- MILITARY PERSONNEL	**125,246,933**	**-587,165**	**124,659,768**
Title XIV -- OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS			
Defense Working Capital Funds	198,150		198,150
Defense Commissary Agency	1,291,084		1,291,084
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,962,253	-560,700	1,401,553
Defense Coalition Support Fund	22,000		22,000
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund /3	-1,300,000		-1,300,000
Defense Health Program	23,615,202	1,130,970	24,746,172
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction, Defense	1,485,634		1,485,634
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	1,060,463		1,060,463
Office of the Inspector General	247,845	26,000	273,845
Subtotal, OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**28,582,631**	**596,270**	**29,178,901**

3/ Transfer authorized in Section 1403.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Division B: Military Construction Authorization			
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION			
Military Construction, Army	4,615,920	29,616	4,645,536
Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	3,096,399	141,210	3,237,609
Military Construction, Air Force	934,892	41,632	976,524
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	1,783,998	-328,029	1,455,969
Chemical Demilitarization Construction	134,278		134,278
NATO Security Investment Program	240,867		240,867
Military Construction, Army National Guard	539,296	89,372	628,668
Military Construction, Army Reserve	281,687	920	282,607
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	57,045		57,045
Military Construction, Air National Guard	34,374	108,435	142,809
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	19,265	10,753	30,018
Subtotal, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	**11,738,021**	**93,909**	**11,831,930**
FAMILY HOUSING			
Family Housing Construction, Army	678,580	-32,000	646,580
Family Housing Operations and Maintenance, Army	716,110		716,110
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Marine Corps	382,778		382,778
Family Housing Ops and Maint, Navy & Marine Corps	376,062		376,062

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	395,879		395,879
Family Housing Ops and Maintenance, Air Force	599,465	-5,000	594,465
Family Housing Operations, Defense-Wide	49,231		49,231
Homeowners Assistance Fund	4,500		4,500
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	850		850
Subtotal, FAMILY HOUSING	**3,203,455**	**-37,000**	**3,166,455**
BRAC			
Base Realignment and Closure Account 1990	393,377		393,377
Base Realignment and Closure Account 2005	9,065,386		9,065,386
Subtotal, BRAC	**9,458,763**		**9,458,763**
Prior Year Savings		-56,909	-56,909
Subtotal, MILITARY CON, FAMILY HOUSING & BRAC	**24,400,239**		**24,400,239**
General Transfer Authority (non-add)			[4,000,000]
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	**515,387,283**	**-232,660**	**515,154,623**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Division C: Atomic Energy Defense Authorization			
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	**7,622**		**7,622**
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
Weapons Activities	6,618,079	-8,440	6,609,639
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,247,048	208,100	1,455,148
Naval Reactors	828,054		828,054
Office of the Administrator	404,081	5,000	409,081
Subtotal NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMIN	**9,097,262**	**204,660**	**9,301,922**
ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,297,256	20,000	5,317,256
Other Defense Activities	1,313,461	8,000	1,321,461
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	247,371		247,371
Subtotal ENVIRON AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTS	**6,858,088**	**28,000**	**6,886,088**
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	**15,962,972**	**232,660**	**16,195,632**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Independent Federal Agency Authorization			
Defense Nuclear Facilitities Safety Board	25,499		25,499
Subtotal, DEFENSE NUC FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD	**25,499**		**25,499**
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053	**15,988,471**	**232,660**	**16,221,131**
TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTH (050) -- BASE BIL	**531,375,754**		**531,375,754**
Department of Defense War-Related Authorizations			
Title XV -- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM			
Aircraft Procurement, Army			84,000
Procurement of WTCV, Army			822,674
Procurement of Ammunition, Army			46,500
Other Procurement, Army			1,255,050
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund			2,496,300
Other Procurement, Navy			476,248
Procurement, Marine Corps			565,425
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force			4,624,842

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Other Procurement, Air Force			1,500,644
Procurement, Defense-Wide			177,237
Rapid Acquisition Fund			102,000
Subtotal, PROCUREMENT			**12,150,920**
RDT&E, Navy			113,228
RDT&E, Air Force			72,041
RDT&E, Defense-Wide			202,559
Subtotal, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL			**387,828**
Operation & Maintenance, Army			37,363,243
Operation & Maintenance, Navy			3,500,000
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps			2,900,000
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force			5,000,000
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide			2,648,569
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve			79,291
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve			42,490
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve			47,076
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve			12,376
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard			333,540
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard			52,667
Subtotal, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			**51,979,252**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
MILITARY PERSONNEL			**1,194,000**
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund			2,000,000
Iraq Security Forces Fund			1,000,000
Defense Health Program			1,100,000
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense			188,000
Subtotal, OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS			**4,288,000**
Special Transfer Authority (non-add)			[4,000,000]
TOTAL, WAR-RELATED AUTHORIZATION	**70,000,000**		**70,000,000**
TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE	**601,375,754**		**601,375,754**
MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS			
Title IV -- Armed Forces Retirement Hm (Function 600)	63,010		63,010
Title XXXIV -- Naval Petroleum Reserves (Function 270)	19,099		19,099
Title XXXV -- Maritime Administration (Function 400)	117,848		117,848

BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

The President's total request for the national defense budget function (050) in fiscal year 2009 is $612.5 billion, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. In addition to funding for programs addressed in this bill, the total 050 request includes discretionary funding for national defense programs not in the committee's jurisdiction, discretionary funding for programs that do not require additional authorization in fiscal year 2009, and mandatory programs.

The fiscal year 2009 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 312) as passed by the House provides recommended levels of spending on national defense in three categories: national defense discretionary, national defense discretionary and mandatory, and overseas deployments and other activities. The fiscal year 2009 concurrent resolution recommendation for national defense equals the President's request.

The following table shows amounts authorized in the bill compared to amounts recommended by the budget resolution for national defense.

BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Amounts Applicable to Request	House Change	Amounts Applicable to H.R. 5658
Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	515,387,283	-232,660	515,154,623
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)	15,988,471	232,660	16,221,131
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION (050) -- BASE BILL	531,375,754		531,375,754
WAR-RELATED AUTHORIZATION /1	70,000,000		70,000,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE	**601,375,754**		**601,375,754**
FY 2009 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H.Con.Res. 312)			
1/ Recommended Level for Overseas Deployments and Other Activities			**70,000,000**
Authorized Level compared with Budget Resolution Allowance			**0**
National Defense Discretionary Programs Not In the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, or Not Requiring Additional Authorization			
Defense Production Act Purchases	36,365		36,365
National Science Center, Army (051)	22		22
Disposal Of DOD Real Property (051)	11,993		11,993
Disposal of DOD Real Property, CBO Adjustment (051)	5,000		5,000
Lease Of DOD Real Property (051)	3,517		3,517
DOD Overseas Mil Facility Investment Recovery (051)	739		739
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**57,636**		**57,636**
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (053)	130,000		130,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**130,000**		**130,000**
Federal Bureau of Investigation (054)	2,793,000		2,793,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation, CBO Adjustment (054)	962,000		962,000
Other Discretionary Programs (054)	2,446,000		2,446,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**6,201,000**		**6,201,000**

BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Amounts Applicable to Request	House Change	Amounts Applicable to H.R. 5658
Total Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050)	**6,388,636**		**6,388,636**
National Defense Discretionary (050), Budget Authority Implication			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	515,444,919	-232,660	515,212,259
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	16,118,471	232,660	16,351,131
Defense-Related Activities (054)	6,201,000		6,201,000
Total National Defense Discretionary (050), Budget Authority Implication /2	**537,764,390**		**537,764,390**
FY 2009 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H.Con.Res. 312)			
2/ Recommended Level for National Defense Discretionary			**537,769,000**
Implied Level compared with Budget Resolution Allowance			**-4,610**
National Defense Mandatory Programs			
FY 2009 CBO Estimates (Current Law unless noted as Direct Spending)			
Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund	3,901,000		3,901,000
Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory	1,135,000		1,135,000
Offsetting receipts	-1,780,000		-1,780,000
Direct Spending in H.R. 5658		-38,000	-37,000
Sec. 501, Alternative Mandatory Separation Date for Warrant Officers		[1,000]	
Sec. 503, Extension of Authorityto Reduce Minimum Service Required for Retirement as an Officer		*	
Sec. 511, Authority to Defer Mandatory Separation of Military Technicians (Dual Status)		[-5,000]	
Sec. 514, Increase in Mandatory Retirement Age for Certain Reserve Officers		[-1,000]	
Sec. 544, Entitlement of Educational Assistance for Reserve Component Members		[-1,000]	
Sec. 592, Payment of Interest on Claims Paid by the US in Connection with the Correction of Military Records		[1,000]	
Sec. 641, Equitable Calculation of Retired Pay for Members of the Reserve Component Wounded in Action		*	
Sec. 644, Active Duty Survivors in the SBP-DIC Survivor Indemnity Allowance		[3,000]	
Sec. 702, Prohibit TRICARE Pharmacy Fees		[75,000]	

BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Amounts Applicable to Request	House Change	Amounts Applicable to H.R. 5658
Sec. 815, Acquisition Workforce Expedited Hiring Authority			
Sec. 1004, Temporary Reduction in Payments from DOD Miltiary Retirement Fund		[-40,000]	
Sec. 1011, Proceeds of Sale of Floating Drydock		[-1,000]	
Sec. 1412, Additional Receipts from National Defense Stockpile Sales		[-70,000]	
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**3,256,000**	**-38,000**	**3,219,000**
Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other	1,155,000		1,155,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**1,155,000**		**1,155,000**
Radiation exposure compensation trust fund	38,000		38,000
Payment to CIA retirement fund and other	279,000		279,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	317,000		317,000
Total National Defense Mandatory (050)	4,728,000	-37,000	4,691,000
National Defense (050), Discretionary and Mandatory Budget Authority Implication			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	518,700,919	-270,660	518,430,259
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	17,273,471	232,660	17,506,131
Defense-Related Activities (054)	6,518,000		6,518,000
Total National Defense (050), Discretionary and Mandatory Budget Authority Implication /3	**542,492,390**	**-38,000**	**542,454,390**
FY 2009 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H.Con.Res. 312)			
3/ Recommended Level for National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory			**542,497,000**
Implied Level compared with Budget Resolution Allowance			**-42,610**
National Defense (050), Discretionary and Mandatory Budget Authority Implication With War-Related Authorization	**612,492,390**		**612,454,390**

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, is a key mechanism through which the Congress of the United States fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides jurisdiction over the Department of Defense generally, and over the military application of nuclear energy, to the House Committee on Armed Services. The committee includes in this Act the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from its oversight activities in the current year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

The committee remains steadfast in its continued and unwavering support for the men and women of the armed forces, the civilian employees of the Department of Defense (DOD), and the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration. The armed forces continue to be deeply engaged in a number of ongoing military operations around the world, most significantly, the wars in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq. The committee is deeply committed to including in this Act a full authorization for the funding required to restore the readiness of our military; sustain and improve the armed forces; enhance the quality of life of military service members; and properly safeguard the national security of the United States.

The committee's recommendations for H.R. 5658 are focused first and foremost on readiness, as was the case with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008. After more than six years at war and with the recent increase in operational tempo associated with the surge of military forces to Iraq, the strain of ongoing military operations is taking an especially heavy toll on the Department of Defense. DOD's reports on the state of readiness of our ground forces remain highly concerning, especially those of the National Guard but increasingly also those of units in the active duty force slated for near-term deployment. Recent tours of duty of an extended length in addition to the harsh environments in which military operations occur have led to exceptional wear and tear on military service members and their families, and on the equipment of the Army and Marine Corps. In this Act, the committee attempts to address the near-term needs of the armed forces first, while remaining mindful of the longer-term needs of the Department of Defense.

Restoring Readiness

The committee directs nearly $2.0 billion towards unfunded readiness initiatives requested by the military services, including $932.0 million towards key readiness needs within the base defense budget, and over $1.0 billion more for additional readiness initiatives in the budget for ongoing military operations. The committee focuses these increased authorizations on unfunded depot maintenance requirements.

Taking Care of Service Members and Their Families

The committee authorizes a pay raise of 3.9 percent, an increase of 0.5 percent above the budget request. This increase further reduces the gap in pay between the uniformed services and the private sector to 2.9 percent. The committee extends the prohibition on increasing premiums and co-pays for TRICARE recipients and continues to prohibit increasing user fees for the TRICARE retail pharmacy program. These recommendations will save beneficiaries $1.2 billion in healthcare costs. The committee continues to reject the philosophy that the only way to control health care cost growth is to dramatically raise fees in order to discourage beneficiaries from seeking care or participating in TRICARE.

Increasing Capabilities for Operations in Afghanistan

The committee believes that Afghanistan is the primary front in the war on terror and must remain a top priority. To that end, the committee authorizes several provisions to increase our military and civilian capabilities in that country. The committee requires a report on possible modifications to the command and control structure for Afghanistan to better coordinate military operations and achieve unity of command. The committee also requires the Department to clearly display any funding requested for U.S. operations and other activities in Afghanistan in future budget requests, a central recommendation of the Afghanistan Study Group that will enable the committee to conduct the necessary level of oversight of funding for Afghanistan.

Requiring Burden Sharing in Iraq

The committee believes that the time has come to begin shifting the burden for funding for many reconstruction activities that have been primarily paid for by the Department of Defense out of the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) and the Iraq Security Forces Fund (ISFF) to the Government of Iraq. The Government of Iraq is unlikely to build the capacity to perform these tasks until at least some portion of the work, and the responsibility for funding it, has been shared. For this reason, the committee requires the Department to submit a report detailing how Iraq's increasing revenue is being included in calculating the funding request for CERP, and also requires more burden-sharing with Iraq by tying amounts for reconstruction under CERP to Iraqi contributions. Additionally, the Committee authorizes $1 billion, half of the original budget request, for training and support of the Iraqi Security Forces and prohibits any of those funds from being used for the construction or renovation of infrastructure.

Improving Interagency Coordination

The committee believes that the way the federal government currently sets, coordinates, and executes its national security policy suffers from a lack of dependable cooperation among federal agencies. There are many efforts across the federal government to improve the interagency system, but the committee believes the task cannot be accomplished in a single year. In this bill, the committee takes steps towards improving that cooperation, particularly as it pertains to stability operations, Provincial Reconstruction Teams, and strategic communications. The committee further intends to

work with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to pass significant legislation enhancing the ability of the Department of Defense and the Department of State to better coordinate in the fulfillment of their joint responsibilities for matters of national security.

Oversight and Accountability

Oversight of contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan remains a central activity of the committee. The committee includes several recommendations of the Commission on Army Acquisition and Program Management in Expeditionary Operations, commonly known as the Gansler Commission, in this Act. These recommendations primarily relate to the composition, quantity, and quality of the acquisition workforce and the committee is committed to continuing recent efforts to enhance funding and authorities for this workforce. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 included the Acquisition Improvement and Accountability Act of 2007. In addition to providing oversight to the implementation of that Act within the Department of Defense, the committee intends to work with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to extend many acquisition reforms enacted for the Department of Defense to all federal agencies.

Balancing Near and Longer-Term Military Capabilities

The committee made significant adjustments in the areas of procurement and research, development, test, and evaluation in an effort to balance the urgent near-term requirements of the Department of Defense against longer-term requirements. Adjustments that the committee made in this area were focused on delays in programs, or portions of programs, not scheduled to field equipment for five or more years, while transferring funding to the highest priority warfighting priorities in the ground forces, such as funding for combatant commander requirements and for procurement for the National Guard and for the reserves. The committee took steps to reverse the decline in the Navy's fleet by adding funding for construction of the tenth San Antonio class LPD–17 ship and adding funding to begin construction of two Virginia class submarines per year starting in 2010. Additionally, the committee took steps to address concerns about aging aircraft and the operational tempo of the Department's strategic mobility aircraft fleet by adding funding for 15 additional C–17 aircraft.

HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 results from hearings that began on January 17, 2008, and that were completed on April 24, 2008. The full committee conducted 16 sessions. In addition, a total of 27 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 2009 contained $102.7 billion for procurement. This represents no change from the amount authorized for fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends authorization of $102.7 billion, and increase of $17.6 million from the fiscal year 2009 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 procurement program are identified in the table below. Major issues are discussed following the table.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
FY 2009 Procurement Program						
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		5,009,835		-97,100	141	4,912,735
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		2,211,460		-10,000	8,680	2,201,460
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		3,687,077		-147,900		3,539,177
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		2,275,791		19,000		2,294,791
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		11,367,926		-166,050	483	11,201,876
JIEDDO		496,300		-496,300		
TOTAL Department of the Army		**25,048,389**		**-898,350**	**9,304**	**24,150,039**
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		14,716,774		-89,500	206	14,627,274
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		3,575,482			2,513	3,575,482
CORPS		1,122,712			169	1,122,712
SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		12,732,918		185,001	12	12,917,919
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		5,482,856		-20,930	8	5,461,926
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		1,512,765		-216,438	7	1,296,327
TOTAL Department of the Navy		**39,143,507**		**-141,867**	**2,915**	**39,001,640**
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		12,676,496		-57,831	94	12,618,665
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		894,478		40,000	5,026	934,478

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		5,536,728			4,076	5,536,728
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		16,128,396		6,500		16,134,896
TOTAL Department of the Air Force		**35,236,098**		**-11,331**	**9,196**	**35,224,767**
MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND						
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		3,164,228		321,200	15	3,485,428
JOINT RAPID ACQUISITION CELL		102,045		-52,045		50,000
NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIP				800,000		800,000
DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES		[36,365]				
TOTAL Defense-Wide		**3,266,273**		**1,069,155**	**15**	**4,335,428**
GRAND TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE		**102,694,267**		**17,607**	**21,430**	**102,711,874**

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $5.0 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $4.9 billion, a decrease of $97.1 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 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 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIRCRAFT						
	FIXED WING						
001	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA)	7	264,160			7	264,160
002	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT						
	ROTARY WING						
003	ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELICOPTER	28	358,841	-13	-129,800	15	229,041
	Program Profile Adjustment				[-129,800]		
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		80,010		-36,200		43,810
	Program Decrease				[-36,200]		
005	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	36	224,518			36	224,518
006	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	63	925,852	3	59,400	66	985,252
	Additional HH-60 Aircraft - USAR				[59,400]		
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		137,175				137,175
008	CH-47 HELICOPTER (MYP)	16	443,519			16	443,519
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
010	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING	1	2,381			1	2,381
011	DRUG INTERDICTION						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
012	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)		119,057				119,057
013	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)(ARL)		23,297				23,297

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
014	AH-64 MODS		607,969				607,969
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		29,373				29,373
016	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS		674,586				674,586
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		49,619				49,619
018	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		14,921				14,921
019	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS		577				577
020	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS		10,866		7,000		17,866
	UH-60A to UH-60L helicopter upgrade				[5,000]		
	UH-60 Weapons Armament Mission B Kit				[2,000]		
021	KIOWA WARRIOR		13,722				13,722
022	AIRBORNE AVIONICS		174,978				174,978
023	GATM (Global Air Traffic Management)		79,223				79,223
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
024	SPARE PARTS (AIR)		6,875				6,875
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
025	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		56,906				56,906
026	ASE INFRARED CM		433,941				433,941
	OTHER SUPPORT						
027	AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL						
028	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,028				5,028

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
029	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		103,882		2,500		106,382
	Compact Aircraft Support Cart - ARNG				[2,500]		
030	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		40,697				40,697
031	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		122,775				122,775
032	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		2,536				2,536
033	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		2,442				2,442
034	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS		109				109
	TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**151**	**5,009,835**	**-10**	**-97,100**	**141**	**4,912,735**

Items of Special Interest

Armed reconnaissance helicopter

The budget request contained $358.8 million for procurement and $80.0 million for advance procurement of the Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter (ARH).

The committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, cited ARH program execution difficulties, noted a projected doubling of aircraft unit costs, and recommended that the ARH program be terminated and a new source selection initiated, to allow more competitors to compete for a new ARH program.

The ARH program was subsequently restructured, with $174.6 million being authorized and appropriated for the procurement of 10 ARH aircraft for fiscal year 2008. The committee notes that:

(1) The unit cost estimate for the 28 ARH aircraft requested in fiscal year 2009 has increased 97 percent over the unit cost estimate for fiscal year 2009 included in the fiscal year 2008 budget request;

(2) The current cost estimate has not been validated by the Defense Acquisition Board;

(3) The production decision for 10 ARH aircraft in fiscal year 2008 has not been made;

(4) No testing has been accomplished on a production representative ARH;

(5) A Limited User Test has been added to the program for March 2009, nine months after the currently scheduled production decision;

(6) A year-over-year production rate increase of 50 percent over the prior year's production rate is standard acquisition practice;

(7) The fiscal year 2009 request of 28 aircraft is 180 percent greater than the fiscal year 2008 program of 10 aircraft; and

(8) The production decision will be delayed from June 2008, until at least April 2009.

The committee believes that a budget request for 28 aircraft is not warranted and recommends $229.0 million for procurement and $43.8 million for advance procurement, a reduction of $129.8 million and $36.2 million, respectively, for procurement of 15 ARH aircraft and advance procurement of 23 ARH aircraft. The committee also recommends a provision, section 114 of this Act, that limits fiscal year 2009 expenditures pending the results of the Limited User Test.

Compact aircraft support cart for Army National Guard rotorcraft

The budget request contained $28.1 million for aviation ground power units, but the request did not contain funds for compact aircraft support carts for Army National Guard (ARNG) aviation units.

The ARNG must provide emergency domestic and homeland security support in addition to supporting ARNG overseas operations. Availability of lightweight, compact ground power units would provide the ARNG with important dual-use capability, which is currently too heavy and immobile to be quickly deployed.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million for compact aircraft support carts for ARNG rotorcraft.

UH–60A to UH–60L helicopter upgrade

The budget request contained $10.9 million for utility helicopter modifications, but the request did not contain funds for recapitalization and conversion of UH–60A to UH–60L helicopters as part of a UH–60A upgrade program.

The committee notes the prior year funding to complete the nonrecurring engineering for a UH–60A to UH–60L upgrade, which would primarily apply to Army National Guard helicopters, resulting in significantly increased reliability, reduction in operating costs, and increased capability.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for the upgrade of UH–60As to the UH–60L configuration.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $2.2 billion for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $2.2 billion, a decrease of $10.0 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 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 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	OTHER MISSILES						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
001	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	108	512,086			108	512,086
002	PATRIOT/MEADS CAP SYSTEM SUMMARY		31,049				31,049
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (SLAMRAAM)		40,468				40,468
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
004	HELLFIRE	372	48,629			372	48,629
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM						
005	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	605	259,326			605	259,326
006	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	1,586	85,988			1,586	85,988
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
008	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	1,938	247,213		-10,000	1,938	237,213
	Program Reduction				[-10,000]		
009	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	4,014	25,300			4,014	25,300
010	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS	57	246,041			57	246,041
011	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM						
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
	MODIFICATIONS						
012	PATRIOT MODS		524,500				524,500

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
013	JAVELIN MISSILE MODS						
014	ITAS/TOW MODS		137,109				137,109
015	MLRS MODS		1,872				1,872
016	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		16,408				16,408
017	HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
018	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		24,901				24,901
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
019	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		6,442				6,442
020	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)		10				10
021	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		4,118				4,118
	TOTAL - MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**8,680**	**2,211,460**		**-10,000**	**8,680**	**2,201,460**

Item of Special Interest

Guided multiple launch rocket system

The budget request contained $247.2 million for procurement of 1,938 rockets for the guided multiple launch rocket system (GMLRS).

The committee notes that there are several significant pending foreign military sales contracts for this system that should allow for savings due to increased quantities of rockets in production.

The committee recommends $237.2 million, a decrease of $10.0 million, for procurement of GMLRS rockets.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $3.7 billion for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $3.5 billion, a decrease of $147.9 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 Procurement of 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 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS & TRACKED COMBAT						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD						
002	BRADLEY PROGRAM	21	171,989			21	171,989
003	BRADLEY TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)		4,386				4,386
004	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES						
005	STRYKER VEHICLE	119	1,174,947		-155,800	119	1,019,147
	Stryker Mobile Gun System Production Delay				[-155,800]		
006	FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS: (FCS)	6	128,419			6	128,419
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		26,164				26,164
008	FCS SPIN OUTS		161,879				161,879
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		14,788				14,788
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
010	CARRIER, MOD						
011	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	6	33,426			6	33,426
012	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		311,925				311,925
013	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		28,913				28,913
014	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	39	132,701			39	132,701
015	ARMORED BREACHER VEHICLE	11	34,713			11	34,713
016	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)						
017	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	11	40,464			11	40,464

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	MODIFICATION OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT						
037	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS		7,654				7,654
038	M4 CARBINE MODS		16,796				16,796
039	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS						
040	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		7,088				7,088
041	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		21,128				21,128
042	PHALANX MODS						
043	M119 MODIFICATIONS		964				964
044	M16 RIFLE MODS		1,181				1,181
045	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M		3,763		5,900		9,663
	Stryker Situation Awareness Soldier Protection Package				[5,900]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
046	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		2,187		2,000		4,187
	M1A1 Transmission Dynamometer				[2,000]		
047	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		6,545				6,545
048	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		3,104				3,104
049	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		1,250				1,250
050	REF SMALL ARMS						
051	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF WTCV, ARMY		**3,687,077**		**-147,900**		**3,539,177**

Items of Special Interest

Army vehicle modernization plans

The committee is concerned that the Army's current plan to field, maintain, and continuously modernize three separate fleets of ground combat vehicles, in addition to replacing much of its wheeled vehicle fleet, is unaffordable in the near- and mid-term and could greatly increase operational support costs in the long-term.

Today, the Army supports two families of ground combat vehicles: the heavy mechanized force with M1 Abrams tanks, M2 Bradley fighting vehicles, and M113 support vehicles; and the separate Stryker family of vehicles. In addition, the Army is designing a third set of ground combat vehicles for the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program that would begin fielding in fiscal year 2015. While the Army plans to replace some heavy brigade combat team sets of equipment with FCS vehicles, its current plan would only replace 15 of 31 heavy brigade sets by 2029, requiring a long-term effort to continuously upgrade the M1/M2 fleet and the Stryker family of vehicles, both of which would remain in the Army's inventory for an indefinite period.

The committee notes that based on historic examples, plans to modernize and procure new versions of any one of these fleets will prove expensive. The cost of doing so for all three fleets at the same time could require funding far in excess of likely Army procurement funding in the fiscal year 2010 to fiscal year 2020 period. The committee notes that during this same time period, the Army also plans to procure major elements of a new tactical wheeled vehicle fleet, including replacement of the high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicle with the joint light tactical vehicle. In addition to procurement costs, the committee is concerned that the cost to the Army of the equipment, personnel, repair parts, and industrial base maintenance necessary to support three families of ground combat vehicles, in addition to the wheeled vehicle fleet, will further reduce Army funding available for other priorities.

The committee supports the Army's overall transformation goals and the desired ground vehicle capabilities promised by the FCS program. Although the committee encourages the Army to accelerate mature capabilities when practical, acceleration efforts or program restructures should not pose additional risk to efforts to improve current force platforms. Upgrades to existing ground vehicles should continue until replacement vehicles are properly tested and proven to be more lethal and survivable than the vehicles they are intended to replace.

The committee supports low-risk approaches to increasing the capability of ground combat systems, such as upgrading the M1 Abrams tank, M2 Bradley fighting vehicle, M109A6 Paladin, and Stryker families of vehicles. The committee is less inclined to support a plan that would significantly reduce funding for these platforms (in the expectation of their replacement) with FCS vehicles in the near- to mid-term, which the committee believes would be a high-risk approach given the technological and integration challenges faced by the FCS program. However, the committee notes that some current vehicles, such as the M113 family of vehicles, have requirements significantly less demanding than the M1

Abrams, M2 Bradley, and M109A6 Paladin in terms of combat capability, therefore the committee could support replacement of the M113 family with FCS or Stryker vehicles.

The committee urges the Army, as part of its fiscal year 2010 budget review and the upcoming quadrennial defense review, to reexamine the proper mix of brigade combat teams and ground combat vehicles to ensure that the Army can adequately modernize and support its future family of ground combat systems under realistic future budget assumptions.

Small arms acquisition strategy

The committee expects the military services to work through the joint acquisition process to develop and adequately resource a joint long-term competitive acquisition strategy for small arms. The committee expects that any future acquisition program for a next-generation handgun and next-generation carbine would be conducted through a full and open competitive process. The committee strongly encourages the Department to acquire the technical data rights for any approved and contracted solution.

The committee is also aware the Air Force is in the process of generating a requirement for a next-generation, modular handgun system. The committee would discourage any obligation of funds towards this program until the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) has approved this requirement as part of a joint service small arms acquisition strategy. The committee understands the Army is the executive agent for small arms procurement and should maintain that executive agency. The committee believes the military services should work closely together in developing new small arms requirements and would encourage the JROC to expeditiously review these requirements.

Stryker mobile gun system production delay

The budget request contained $1.2 billion for 119 new Stryker vehicles and upgrades to existing Stryker vehicles. Of this amount, $445.8 million was requested for procurement of 79 Stryker mobile gun system (MGS) vehicles.

The committee notes that obligation of funds to procure Stryker MGS vehicles is restricted by section 117 the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Army has not provided the certification required by section 117 to lift the restriction on obligation of funds, and that the Secretary of Defense has not exercised the waiver authority provided in the same section. The committee understands that failure to provide the required certification or exercise of the waiver will delay the production and delivery of Stryker MGS vehicles, requiring adjustment of requested funding. In addition, the committee notes that due to denial of a reprogramming request that the Army has identified $33.0 million of the requested fiscal year 2009 funding as excess.

The committee recommends $1.0 billion, a decrease of $155.8 million, for Stryker vehicle procurement. The committee expects the Army to only reduce funding for Stryker MGS production and to prioritize Stryker vehicle survivability upgrades with the funds provided.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $2.3 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $2.3 billion, an increase of $19.0 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 Procurement of Ammunition, 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 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	AMMUNITION						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION						
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		197,130				197,130
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		59,181				59,181
003	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		6,276				6,276
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		183,813				183,813
005	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES						
006	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		14,742				14,742
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		79,066				79,066
008	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		293,322				293,322
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
009	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		17,055				17,055
010	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		58,521				58,521
011	CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES		117,601				117,601
	TANK AMMUNITION						
012	CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES		15,829				15,829
013	CTG, TANK, 120MM, ALL TYPES		151,015				151,015
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
014	CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES		2,741				2,741

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
015	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES		42,153				42,153
016	CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES		85,030				85,030
017	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982		34,220		15,000		49,220
	Excalibur XM982 Extended Range Artillery Projectile				[15,000]		
018	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T		43,338				43,338
	ARTILLERY FUZES						
019	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES		19,969				19,969
	MINES						
020	MINES, ALL TYPES		4,846				4,846
021	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES		2,606				2,606
022	ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES		52,000				52,000
	ROCKETS						
023	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		28,020				28,020
024	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		142,521				142,521
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		28,886				28,886
026	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		71,608				71,608
027	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		89,357				89,357
028	CARTRIDGE, IMPULSE, BBU-35/B						
029	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		20,027				20,027
030	SIMULATOR, HOSTILE FIRE, XM34						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
031	SIMULATOR, TARGET HIT, XM35 (WHITE STAR)						
032	FLARE, AIRCRAFT, COUNTERMEASURE, XM216						
033	ALL OTHER (AMMO)						
	MISCELLANEOUS						
034	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		15,228				15,228
035	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		21,193				21,193
036	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		2,806				2,806
037	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,996				6,996
038	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		10,598		4,000		14,598
	Outloading Module-McAlester Army Ammunition Plant				[4,000]		
039	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		12,564				12,564
040	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		100				100

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
041	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		187,388				187,388
042	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		5,085				5,085
043	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES		5,619				5,619
044	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL		144,327				144,327
045	ARMS INITIATIVE		3,014				3,014
	RE-ESTIMATE OF GUARANTEED LOAN						
046	RE-ESTIMATE OF GUAR LOAN						
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**2,275,791**		**19,000**		**2,294,791**

Item of Special Interest

XM982 precision guided extended range artillery projectile

The budget request contained $34.2 million for Excalibur XM982 precision guided extended range artillery projectiles.

The committee notes the Excalibur I–A projectile has been successfully fielded in limited quantities to Operation Iraqi Freedom in response to an urgent operational need from theater and is exceeding expectations. The committee believes that additional funds would allow for the acceleration of production of this critical high demand/low density projectile, as well as to help stabilize the future procurement strategy which in turn should create cost savings based on economies of scale. The committee recommends the realignment of $15.0 million from PE 64814A to increase low-rate initial production of Excalibur XM982 projectiles.

Therefore, the committee recommends $49.2 million, an increase of $15.0 million, to continue to accelerate production and fielding of Excalibur XM982 projectiles.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $11.4 billion for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $11.2 billion, a decrease of $166.1 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 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 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		88,428				88,428
002	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:		62,345				62,345
003	SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS		47,476				47,476
004	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)		946,734				946,734
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)		944,687				944,687
006	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN		19,378				19,378
007	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		923,348				923,348
008	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	202	195,385			202	195,385
009	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY		182,367				182,367
010	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916		14,870				14,870
011	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV P		213,341				213,341
012	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM						
013	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		32,219		5,000		37,219
	Passive Fuel Tank Fire Suppression Kits - FMTVs				[5,000]		
014	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)		511				511
015	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL	3	218			3	218
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
016	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	3	595			3	595

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
017	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	8	280			8	280
018	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		3,380				3,380
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMM-JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
019	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM						
020	JOINT COMBAT IDENTIFICATION MARKING SYSTEM		12,910				12,910
021	WIN-T - GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK		287,605		-45,012		242,593
	WIN-T Increment 2 Reduction				[-45,012]		
022	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		4,114				4,114
	COMM-SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
023	SECOMP-I						
024	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS		88,286				88,286
025	SHF TERM		298				298
026	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)		807				807
027	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)		92,311		5,000		97,311
	Defense Advanced GPS Receivers (DAGR)				[5,000]		
028	SMART-T (SPACE)		85,286				85,286
029	SCAMP (SPACE)		993				993
030	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS		35,385				35,385
031	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		6,075				6,075

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	COMM-C3 SYSTEM						
032	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		33,513				33,513
	COMM-COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS						
033	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (EPLRS)		36,077				36,077
034	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		8,570				8,570
035	SINCGARS FAMILY		84,888		-84,888		
	Program Reduction				[-84,888]		
036	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS - OPA2		4,073				4,073
037	MULTI-PURPOSE INFORMATIONS OPERATIONS SYSEMS		7,801				7,801
038	BRIDGE TO FUTURE NETWORKS						
039	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING		7,828				7,828
040	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT	125	18,000			125	18,000
041	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		7,545				7,545
042	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)		16,155				16,155
043	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY		48,436				48,436
044	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)		38,281				38,281
	COMM-INTELLIGENCE COMMUNICATIONS						
045	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,500				1,500
	INFORMATION SECURITY						
046	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)		34,774				34,774
047	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP		76,570				76,570

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	COMM-LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
048	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		9,167				9,167
049	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		35,120				35,120
050	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)						
051	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		28,736				28,736
	COMM-BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
052	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		278,999		-5,000		273,999
	Network Enterprise Technology Command Unjustified growth				[-5,000]		
053	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		6,726				6,726
054	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM(		231,336				231,336
055	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM		33,317				33,317
	ELECT EQUIP-NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)						
56	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)		[ ]				[ ]
57	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)		[ ]				[ ]
058	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (MIP)		58,333				58,333
059	JTT/CIBS-M (MIP)		11,377				11,377
060	PROPHET GROUND (MIP)		114,085				114,085
061	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYS (TUAS)MIP		316,598				316,598
062	SMALL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (SUAS)		30,023				30,023
063	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (MIP)		26,802				26,802
064	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP)						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
065	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (MIP)						
066	DCGS-A (MIP)		177,973				177,973
067	TROJAN (MIP)		10,409				10,409
068	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)		2,423				2,423
069	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)		37,632				37,632
070	SEQUOYAH FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYS		6,358				6,358
071	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP)		27,731				27,731
	ELECT EQUIP-ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
072	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR		46,397				46,397
073	WARLOCK	38				38	
074	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY		993				993
075	CI MODERNIZATION (MIP)		1,297				1,297
	ELECT EQUIP-TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
076	SENTINEL MODS		33,142				33,142
077	NIGHT VISION DEVICES		465,592				465,592
078	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE	41	210,766			41	210,766
079	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT		416,866				416,866
080	RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS		3,440				3,440
081	COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR (C-RAM)						
082	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP		447				447
083	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS)				1,000		1,000

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	Retrofit 30th HBCT Radios With Embedded SAASM GPS				[1,000]		
084	ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SE		2,579				2,579
085	PROFILER	8	12,517		-7,500	8	5,017
	Profiler Meteorological System				[-7,500]		
086	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		16,342				16,342
087	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)		231,651				231,651
088	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD		150,094				150,094
089	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32		2,269				2,269
090	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		21,037				21,037
091	COUNTERFIRE RADARS		107,061		-46,700		60,361
	Program Reduction				[-46,700]		
092	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - MIP						
093	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM		1,987				1,987
	ELECT EQUIP-TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
094	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS		196,245		-49,000		147,245
	Program Reduction				[-49,000]		
095	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY		53,908				53,908
096	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM		36,829				36,829
097	FAAD C2		7,489				7,489
098	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD		57,674				57,674
099	KNIGHT FAMILY		100,709				100,709

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
100	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		2,101				2,101
101	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY		83,530				83,530
102	TC AIMS II		31,879				31,879
103	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS)		11,059				11,059
104	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER		4,809				4,809
105	DATA PRODUCTS		30,077				30,077
106	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		123,009				123,009
107	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)		67,960		-5,000		62,960
	Logistics Post Production Software Support Unjustified				[-5,000]		
108	MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE (MBCOTM)		25,869				25,869
	ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION						
109	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM		30,137				30,137
110	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		13,481				13,481
111	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		105,343		1,000		106,343
	Interoperable Radios - TX ARNG				[1,000]		
	Joint Incident Scene Communication Capability				[3,000]		3,000
112	CSS COMMUNICATIONS		36,744				36,744
113	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		42,462				42,462
	ELECT EQUIP-AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)						
114	AFRTS						
115	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)		6,677				6,677

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
116	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)		12,613				12,613
	ELECT EQUIP-MODS TACTICAL SYS/EQ						
117	WEAPONIZATION OF UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (UAS)		15,124				15,124
	ELECT EQUIP-SUPPORT						
118	ITEMS UNDER $5M (SSE)		6,517		2,000		8,517
	SAASM PPS GPS Upgrade				[2,000]		
119	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		514				514
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
120	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	35	1,085			35	1,085
121	MASK, ACFT						
122	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION		58,426				58,426
123	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)		16,814				16,814
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
124	TACTICAL BRIDGING	19	93,930			19	93,930
125	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON		147,270				147,270
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
126	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-HST		46,007				46,007
127	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS		46,783				46,783
128	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)		58,437				58,437
129	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT		3,192				3,192

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
130	AERIAL DETECTION		12,773				12,773
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
131	HEATERS AND ECU'S		12,996				12,996
132	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES		7,002				7,002
133	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		9,898				9,898
134	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)						
135	LAND WARRIOR				20,000		20,000
	Program Increase				[20,000]		
136	FORCE PROVIDER						
137	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		70,847		2,200		73,047
	Multi-Temp Refrigerated Container System (MTRCS)				[2,200]		
138	PARACHUTE & AERIAL DEL SYS		63,420				63,420
139	MOBILE INTEGRATED REMAINS COLLECTION SYSTEM:		17,803				17,803
140	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)		32,602				32,602
141	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CSS EQ)						
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
142	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		1,285				1,285
143	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		61,545				61,545
	WATER EQUIPMENT						
144	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS		51,164				51,164

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
145	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		62,336				62,336
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
146	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS		57,994				57,994
147	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)		1,329				1,329
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
148	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		37,698				37,698
149	SKID STEER LOADER (SSL) FAMILY OF SYSTEM		19,943				19,943
150	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING						
151	DISTR, WATER, SP MIN 2500G SEC/NON-SEC		6,555				6,555
152	MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING		31,525				31,525
153	LOADERS		27,988				27,988
154	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR		9,565				9,565
155	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED		33,727				33,727
156	CRANES						
157	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING		7,906				7,906
158	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) FOS		54,508				54,508
159	CONST EQUIP ESP		44,703				44,703
160	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)		17,030				17,030
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT						
161	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	1	168,846			1	168,846

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
162	HARBORMASTER COMMAND AND CONTROL CENTER		17,615				17,615
163	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS						
164	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		7,803				7,803
	GENERATORS						
165	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		217,749				217,749
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
166	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)		45,000				45,000
167	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM		48,981				48,981
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
168	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT		16,508				16,508
169	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		218,614		28,400		247,014
	Call for Fire Trnr II - Jnt Forces and Effects Trainer Sys				[4,000]		
	Combat Skills Simulation Systems - OH ARNG				[4,650]		
	Immersive Group Sim Virtual Training System HI ARNG				[4,500]		
	Virtual Interactive Combat Environment - NJ ARNG				[2,000]		
	Ft Bragg Range 74 Comb Arms Collective Tng Facility I				[4,000]		
	Future Soldier Training System - TX ARNG				[3,000]		
	Instrumentation for Urban Assault Course - TN ARNG				[1,750]		
	Virtual Convoy Operations Trainer - KY ARNG				[1,500]		
	Combat Skills Marksmanship Trainer				[3,000]		
170	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER		60,676		3,450		64,126

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	Mobile Digital Target System - Army Infantry Set				[450]		
	Abrams Mobile Conduct of Fires Trainer Upgrades				[3,000]		
171	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVCA		23,106				23,106
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)						
172	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT		9,689				9,689
173	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)		46,296				46,296
174	GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIPMENT (GP		22,377				22,377
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
175	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		20,190				20,190
176	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		104,774		6,000		110,774
	Battlefield Anti-Intrusion System				[6,000]		
177	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT		4,123				4,123
178	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)		45,741				45,741
179	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		3,107				3,107
180	BUILDING, PRE-FAB, RELOCATABLE						
181	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		24,201				24,201
182	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3		10,826				10,826
183	MA8975		2,624				2,624

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	OPA2						
184	INITIAL SPARES - C&E		36,334				36,334
	OPA3						
185	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP						
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,636				2,636
	TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**483**	**11,367,926**		**-166,050**	**483**	**11,201,876**

Items of Special Interest

Army enterprise resource planning systems

The committee is concerned about duplication of effort within the Army regarding implementation of multiple enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems. The committee believes that the Army should work towards consolidating their business and logistics transformation efforts to create an integrated business environment. These programs should focus on identifying and eliminating redundancy among programs to reduce costs and accelerate fielding.

The committee believes the Army needs to establish a strong governance structure based on well-defined metrics of success. This governance structure should identify elements that are common across the programs and enforce a single coherent strategy with a synchronized master schedule. The programs should be restructured to allocate functionality in a manner that provides seamless integration of end-to-end business processes within a single ERP. The financial processes and data should be implemented in the same instance as the associated business practices. Asset accountability and financial accounting for an item should exist only in one ERP instantiation, otherwise there is no value-added to having an enterprise solution. The emphasis should be on adoption of common process configurations across the multiple numbers of ERP systems, aimed at eliminating the maximum number of legacy systems.

The committee recognizes that taking such actions will have an impact on the ability of these programs to execute funds in a timely fashion. The committee supports any associated pause in these programs that may be necessary in order for a solution that achieves the goals outlined above.

Counterfire radars

The budget request contained $107.1 million for 14 EQ–36 counterfire radar systems.

The committee notes that the amended fiscal year 2008 budget request for ongoing military operations contained $174.0 million for 12 EQ–36 systems to meet part of a theater operational needs statement. As a result, the full amount requested in fiscal year 2009 is not needed to complete the theater requirement for EQ–36 systems.

The committee recommends $60.4 million, a decrease of $46.7 million, for EQ–36 counterfire radar systems.

Defense Advanced GPS Receivers

The budget request contained $72.1 million for acquisition of 30,051 Defense Advanced GPS Receivers (DAGRs).

The committee is aware that the Army has an unfunded requirement for additional DAGRs beyond those currently programmed in the budget request for Army National Guard units deployed in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Additional funding for DAGR procurement should reduce the cost of each unit and increase the number of units available for deployment to warfighters.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for procurement of an additional 3,000 DAGRs.

Interoperable radios for Texas Army National Guard disaster response

The budget request contained $105.3 million for automated data processing equipment.

The committee notes that standard two-way radios are a critical asset for the Army National Guard in domestic emergency response situations. The committee also notes that this equipment could improve interagency coordination and synchronization in such situations while assuring that the Army National Guard can better command and control units when operating in support of civilian agencies.

The committee recommends $106.3 million, an increase of $1.0 million, for procurement of standard two-way radios for the Texas Army National Guard.

Multi-temperature refrigerated container system

The budget request contained $70.8 million for field feeding equipment, but contained no funds to procure additional Multi-Temperature Refrigerated Container Systems (MTRCS).

MTRCS is a next generation refrigeration system that would provide the capability to transport and store both refrigerated and frozen products in a single container. The committee recognizes this capability would minimize transportation requirements and improve upon space utilization. The committee notes this capability would benefit subsistence units and medical units.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.2 million to procure additional MTRCS.

Non-system training device program

The budget request contained $218.6 million to continue the non-system training device (NSTD) program, but included no funds to procure the following NTSD programs: Call for Fire II/Joint Fires and Effects Trainer Systems (JFETS), combat skills simulation systems for the Ohio National Guard (ARNG), combined arms collective training facility instrumentation upgrades, Future Soldier Trainer training systems for the Texas ARNG, immersive group simulation virtual training systems for the Hawaii ARNG, Virtual Interactive Combat Environment (VICE) systems for the New Jersey ARNG, urban assault course instrumentation upgrades for the Tennessee ARNG, virtual convoy operation trainers for the Kentucky ARNG, and combat skills marksmanship trainers.

The Army's NTSD program is an initiative to introduce realistic and effective training devices into individual and unit training settings. The committee understands there is an emphasis on training military personnel in urban operations and asymmetric tactical situations similar to those being experienced by soldiers in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. The committee supports this initiative and believes these programs could improve soldier survivability.

The committee recommends $247.0 million for non-system training devices for a total increase of $28.4 million, including: an increase of $4.0 million for JFETS; $4.7 million for combat skills

training systems for the Ohio ARNG; $4.0 million for combined arms collective training instrumentation upgrades; $3.0 million for Future Soldier Trainer training systems for the Texas ARNG; $4.5 million for immersive group simulation virtual training systems for the Hawaii ARNG; $2.0 million for VICE systems for the New Jersey ARNG; $1.8 million for urban assault course instrumentation upgrades for the Tennessee ARNG; $1.5 million for virtual convoy operation trainers for the Kentucky ARNG; and $3.0 million for combat skills marksmanship trainers.

Operations center technology

The committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 contained an item of special interest urging the Army, Navy and Marine Corps to seek common opportunities among the services to procure, where possible, common command post equipment in order to reduce the unit cost of each system and to improve interoperability.

The committee recognizes the potential success of the Navy's Deployable Joint Command and Control (DJC2) system which provides two additional networks, one top secret and one unclassified for use by non-governmental organizations, which are not provided by the Army and Marine Corps command and control tools. Furthermore, the DJC2 system is fully certified for interoperability, information assurance, transportability, and has completed security, environmental and electromagnetic interference testing.

The committee encourages the Army and Marine Corps to assess the potential for DJC2 to meet their requirements for tactical operations centers and report back to the committee on those findings.

Profiler meteorological system

The budget request contained $12.5 million for eight Profiler meteorological systems.

The committee notes that funding for the Profiler program increased from $24.7 million in fiscal year 2007 to $88.8 million in fiscal year 2008. Due to limited production capacity available, the committee is concerned that the full amount requested in fiscal year 2009 will face production challenges.

The committee recommends $5.0 million, a decrease of $7.5 million, for Profiler systems. The committee expects the Army to fully fund the necessary fielding support activities with the remaining funding, and defer procurement of the eight systems to fiscal year 2010.

Single channel ground and airborne radio system

The budget request contained $84.9 million for Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System (SINCGARS) radios and fielding support.

The committee notes that the Army significantly reduced its acquisition objective for SINCGARS radios after the budget request was received, and that $175.0 million of remaining fiscal year 2007 funding and fiscal year 2008 requested funding of $649.6 million is sufficient to procure the Army's revised acquisition objective and provide radio fielding support.

The committee also notes that, while the SINCGARS program is currently an Acquisition Category (ACAT) III program, funding

provided for SINCGARS procurement over the past four fiscal years is well above the Department of Defense threshold for classification of a program as an ACAT I activity. The committee urges the Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, to review the status of the SINCGARS program and determine whether or not it should be managed as an ACAT I program if the Army intends to continue to acquire SINCGARS radios beyond fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends no funding for SINCGARS procurement, a decrease of $84.9 million.

Tactical operations centers

The budget request contained $196.2 million for tactical operations center (TOC) equipment and fielding support.

The committee notes that funding for the TOC program increased from $237.6 million in fiscal year 2007 to $557.6 million in fiscal year 2008. Due to limited production capacity available, the committee is concerned that the full amount requested in fiscal year 2009 will face production challenges.

The committee recommends $147.2 million, a decrease of $49.0 million, for TOC equipment and fielding support.

Tactical wheeled vehicle acquisition strategy

The committee understands the Army is requesting large amounts of funding through emergency supplemental appropriations to address immediate, near-term, and future tactical wheeled vehicle needs without having articulated a long-term acquisition strategy for the composition of the tactical wheeled vehicle (TWV) fleets. In addition to the thousands of light, medium, and heavy trucks and hundreds of armored security vehicles, the committee is aware the Army would purchase over 12,000 mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicles by the end of fiscal year 2008 and almost 2,000 additional Stryker vehicles through fiscal year 2013. Concurrently, the Army and the Marine Corps continue to develop the joint light tactical vehicle (JLTV), which would perform many of the same missions that current up-armored high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWV) and MRAP vehicles now perform.

The committee is aware the Army also plans to procure an improved HMMWV, called the evolutionary concept vehicle (ECV), that would provide for improvements in payload and protection over current up-armored HMMWVs. The committee also understands the HMMWV ECV could have only 30 percent commonality with current up-armor HMMWVs. The committee supports investments in product improvements for TWVs, however, the committee is concerned that this lack of commonality could potentially categorize the HMMWV ECV as a "new start" program and would subject the program to full and open competition as required by federal acquisition regulations. The committee is concerned over whether there could be a potential to prematurely accelerate "point solutions" for the JLTV program. The committee commends the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics for his competitive prototyping strategy. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army, as executive agent for the JLTV program, to apply this policy to JLTV.

Given the increasing diverse mix of vehicle configurations, fleet composition requirements, potential fiscal constraints and competing priorities in Future Year Defense Programs the committee strongly encourages the Army to articulate a long-term acquisition and sustainment strategy for its TWV fleet that would maximize resources and capability, as well as minimize duplication of effort. The committee encourages the Army to reference the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) and work jointly with the Marine Corps in developing this strategy and consider cost reduction strategies, reliability, and maintainability improvement initiatives.

The committee is concerned that currently planned single-year contract awards could be extremely costly for the Army, given the large quantity requirements that continue to exist within the modular force and for "resetting the force" to include the reserve component quantities. The committee notes that multi-year procurement contracts could potentially assure favorable cost-effective prices for more advanced configurations of current TWVs that would incorporate lessons learned from Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), as well as ensure stability in the industrial base.

Warfighter information network—tactical

The budget request contained $287.6 million for procurement of Warfighter Information Network—Tactical (WIN–T) equipment. Of this amount, $179.8 million was requested for procurement of WIN–T Increment 2 low-rate initial production.

The committee notes that the requested WIN–T Increment 2 funding procures significantly more sets of equipment than are needed for WIN–T Increment 2 testing activities in fiscal year 2009 and does not account for possible delays or modification of WIN–T Increment 2 equipment subsequent to testing.

The committee recommends $242.6 million, a decrease of $45.0 million, for procurement of WIN–T equipment. The committee expects the Army to fully fund WIN–T elements, other than Increment 2 equipment, requested in this procurement line.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $496.3 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund. The committee recommends transfer of this funding to title XV of this Act.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK						
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT						
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		196,300		-196,300		
	Transfer to Title XV				[-196,300]		
	FORCE TRAINING						
003	TRAIN THE FORCE						
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
004	OPERATIONS		300,000		**-300,000**		
	Transfer to Title XV				[-300,000]		
	TOTAL - JOINT IED DEFEAT FUND		**496,300**		**-496,300**		

Items of Special Interest

Explosives signatures database

Improvised explosive devices (IED) continue to be the primary cause of American casualties in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee recognizes that the constantly evolving nature of this threat makes it difficult to develop technical solutions to counter the IED threat. However, since all IEDs make use of explosives, a highly desirable but currently elusive goal is the ability to chemically detect these explosives from a safe stand-off distance. Stand-off detection is a complex problem due, in part, to the variety of the explosives used (including homemade compositions) and to the changes to chemical signatures that occur with exposure to different environments. Although the benefits of developing such a detection capability are obvious, there is no single database of explosive chemical signatures for use by those who are expert in detection technologies. The committee believes that the ongoing efforts to characterize high-explosive signatures are neither well-coordinated nor adequately funded.

The Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) has the responsibility to lead, coordinate, and advocate for all Department of Defense activities to defeat IEDs and is the appropriate organization to lead an effort to develop an explosives signatures database. Within funds contained, the committee directs the Director of JIEDDO to fund from its science and technology budget, at a level no less than $10.0 million, the following activities:

(1) Development of a standardized database of explosive signatures;

(2) Development of standard test methods for characterizing explosive signatures;

(3) Collection of existing reliable explosive signature data from all national sources; and

(4) Characterization of explosive signatures for which there is no existing data.

The committee further directs the Director of JIEDDO to report to the congressional defense committees on the actions taken, including funding, to fulfill these requirements, by March 15, 2009.

Unfunded counter-improvised explosive device requirements and needs

The committee supports the Department of Defense's (DOD) efforts to defeat the threat posed by improvised explosive devices (IED), which continue to be the primary cause of casualties in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom and have been used as a weapon of asymmetric warfare and terror in other parts of the world. To date, Congress has provided over $10.0 billion for the Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) to lead, advocate for, and coordinate all DOD counter-IED efforts. Despite the magnitude of this effort, the committee understands that there may be useful IED countermeasures that have not been funded for a number of reasons: some IED countermeasures may currently be a low priority for the U.S. Central Command; there may be insufficient funding; or the technologies may be immature. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of JIEDDO to submit a report by March 15, 2009, to the congressional defense committees that de-

scribes in detail unfunded counter-IED requirements and needs, including any plans to address the unfunded requirements and needs in future budgets.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $14.7 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $14.6 billion, a decrease of $89.5 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 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 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
001	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)		3,401				3,401
002	EA-18G	22	1,604,800		-45,000	22	1,559,800
	EA-18G				[-45,000]		
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		46,831				46,831
004	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	23	1,868,688		-40,500	23	1,828,188
	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)				[-45,000]		
	BRU-55 Smart Rack				[4,500]		
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		42,616				42,616
006	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER	8	1,602,084			8	1,602,084
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		258,814				258,814
008	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	30	2,133,401			30	2,133,401
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		87,000				87,000
010	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	20	474,141			20	474,141
011	MH-60R	18	470,455			18	470,455
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		79,215				79,215
013	MH-60S (MYP)	31	1,045,004		-10,000	31	1,035,004
	Excess Engineering Change Orders				[-10,000]		
014	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		140,759				140,759
015	MMA ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		110,568				110,568

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
016	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	3	496,374			3	496,374
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		92,749				92,749
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
018	C-40A	2	154,994			2	154,994
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
019	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK						
020	JPATS	44	289,253			44	289,253
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
021	KC-130J	2	119,545			2	119,545
022	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		33,932				33,932
023	F-5						
024	VTUAV	3	55,337			3	55,337
025	OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
026	EA-6 SERIES		33,436				33,436
027	AV-8 SERIES		51,093				51,093
028	ADVERSARY						
029	F-18 SERIES		450,909				450,909
030	H-46 SERIES		34,636				34,636
031	AH-1W SERIES		6,375				6,375
032	H-53 SERIES		56,381				56,381

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
033	SH-60 SERIES		72,493				72,493
034	H-1 SERIES		8,901				8,901
035	EP-3 SERIES		72,370				72,370
036	P-3 SERIES		297,896				297,896
037	S-3 SERIES						
038	E-2 SERIES		11,489				11,489
039	TRAINER A/C SERIES		26,160				26,160
040	C-2A		22,120				22,120
041	C-130 SERIES		6,468				6,468
042	FEWSG		671				671
043	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		17,952				17,952
044	E-6 SERIES		88,894				88,894
045	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		31,819				31,819
046	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		14,113				14,113
047	T-45 SERIES		67,666				67,666
048	POWER PLANT CHANGES		28,219				28,219
049	JPATS SERIES		8,892				8,892
050	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		7,190				7,190
051	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		66,425		6,000		72,425
	ALQ-214 Organic Depot Development				[6,000]		
052	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		148,940				148,940

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
053	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		10,786				10,786
054	ID SYSTEMS		12,032				12,032
055	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		41,473				41,473
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
056	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,229,135				1,229,135
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
057	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		442,390				442,390
058	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		11,068				11,068
059	WAR CONSUMABLES		62,256				62,256
060	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		27,870				27,870
061	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		36,539				36,539
062	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,756				1,756
063	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**206**	**14,716,774**		**-89,500**	**206**	**14,627,274**

Items of Special Interest

Electronic warfare system core depot development

The budget request contained $66.4 million for common electronic counter-measures equipment (ECM), but contained no funds for establishing a core depot maintenance capability for the ALQ–214 ECM system employed on Navy and Marine Corps tactical aircraft.

The committee notes that depot maintenance for the ALQ–214 ECM system is experiencing a 180- to 240-day repair turnaround time. Establishing an organic depot maintenance capability should reduce the turnaround time to 30 to 45 days. The committee understands that section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, provides that a core depot maintenance capability must be established no later than four years after initial operational capability (IOC) is achieved for mission-essential weapons systems designated by the Secretary of Defense. The committee understands that IOC was achieved for the ALQ–214 ECM system in March 2006, and that core depot maintenance capability should be established by March 2010.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for common electronic counter-measures equipment to begin establishment of core depot maintenance capability for the ALQ–214 ECM system.

F/A–18E/F and EA–18G

The budget request contained $1.6 billion for procurement of 22 EA–18G aircraft and $1.9 billion for procurement of 23 F/A–18E/F aircraft. The EA–18G is an electronic attack aircraft designed to replace the EA–6B, and the F/A–18E/F is a strike fighter designed for fighter escort, fleet air defense, interdiction, and close air support missions. The EA–18G and F/A–18E/F are produced on the same production line.

The committee notes that a foreign military sales customer has committed to the procurement of 24 F/A–18E/F aircraft in fiscal years 2009 and 2010. The committee understands that this increase in production will lower unit costs and generate a total savings of $182.0 million for the 85 EA–18Gs and F/A–18E/Fs to be procured in fiscal years 2009 and 2010. The committee believes that $90.0 million in savings in fiscal year 2009 exceeds requirements for the procurement of EA–18Gs and F/A–18E/Fs in fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends $1.6 billion, a decrease of $45.0 million, for procurement of 22 EA–18G aircraft; and $1.8 billion, a decrease of $45.0 million, for procurement of 23 F/A–18E/F aircraft.

Navy helicopter force structure

The committee believes that vertical lift remains an essential capability for the Navy to meet the unique demands of operations in the maritime environment. However, with the retirement of the MH–53E beginning in 2016, the Navy will lose all vertical lift capability beyond that provided by the MH–60 series. Moreover, the committee notes that the aging MH–53E remains one of the most expensive aircraft to operate and maintain in the Navy inventory

and is undergoing engine upgrades to improve operational availability.

Further, the committee is aware of several mission areas in which a heavy medium-lift or light heavy-lift helicopter could provide substantial utility, such as airborne mine countermeasures, combat search and rescue, special operations, vertical onboard delivery, airborne re-supply/logistics for sea basing, maritime homeland defense or humanitarian relief missions.

The committee notes that in testimony before the committee on March 6, 2008, the Chief of Naval Operations stated that U.S. Fleet Forces Command is currently performing a study of the Navy's vertical lift requirements to inform planning for the fiscal year 2010 budget request. The committee supports this effort and requests that the Secretary of the Navy include an assessment of the potential benefits of a new type/model/series helicopter that is larger than the H–60 in such an analysis. The committee recommends that the Secretary include consideration of the mission areas referenced above and such factors as range, payload, time on station, manpower, and operation and maintenance costs. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a copy of this study to the congressional defense committees by November 30, 2008.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $3.6 billion for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $3.6 billion, the requested amount, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 Weapons Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
001	TRIDENT II MODS	24	1,093,168			24	1,093,168
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
002	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,496				3,496
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
003	TOMAHAWK	207	281,096			207	281,096
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
004	AMRAAM	147	146,830			147	146,830
005	SIDEWINDER	205	57,497			205	57,497
006	JSOW	496	149,144			496	149,144
007	SLAM-ER						
008	STANDARD MISSILE	70	227,958			70	227,958
009	RAM	90	74,287			90	74,287
010	HELLFIRE	1,068	95,358			1,068	95,358
011	AERIAL TARGETS		83,313				83,313
012	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		9,478				9,478
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
013	ESSM	86	85,061			86	85,061

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
014	HARM MODS		42,735				42,735
015	STANDARD MISSILES MODS		77,360				77,360
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
016	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,266				3,266
017	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON		479,680				479,680
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		27,776				27,776
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
019	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		43,708				43,708
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.						
020	SSTD						
021	ASW TARGETS		8,929				8,929
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
022	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	120	77,782			120	77,782
023	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS		61,545				61,545
024	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		3,506				3,506
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
025	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		36,002				36,002
026	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		9,872				9,872
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
027	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,442				3,442

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	OTHER WEAPONS						
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
028	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		13,619				13,619
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
029	CIWS MODS		167,967				167,967
030	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		21,082				21,082
031	GUN MOUNT MODS		60,061				60,061
032	LCS MODULE WEAPONS		2,786				2,786
033	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS		45,168				45,168
034	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		8,618				8,618
	OTHER						
035	MARINE CORPS TACTIAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM		20,532				20,532
036	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
037	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		53,360				53,360
	TOTAL - WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**2,513**	**3,575,482**			**2,513**	**3,575,482**

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $1.1 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1.1 billion, the requested amount, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps program are identified in the table below.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE						
	PROC AMMO, NAVY						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		168,437				168,437
002	JDAM	169	9,306			169	9,306
003	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		32,250				32,250
004	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		18,916				18,916
005	PRACTICE BOMBS		39,419				39,419
006	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		46,644				46,644
007	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS						
008	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		79,805				79,805
009	JATOS		3,178				3,178
010	MK 258 MOD 1		967				967
011	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		20,959				20,959
012	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		15,780				15,780
013	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		35,111				35,111
014	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		45,129				45,129
015	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		10,464				10,464
016	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,207				3,207

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	PROC AMMO, MC						
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
017	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		108,436				108,436
018	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES						
019	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES						
020	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		17,677				17,677
021	.50 CALIBER						
022	40 MM, ALL TYPES		60,433				60,433
023	60MM, ALL TYPES		44,846				44,846
024	81MM, ALL TYPES		54,879				54,879
025	120MM, ALL TYPES		87,500				87,500
026	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		2,300				2,300
027	9 MM ALL TYPES						
028	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		39,038				39,038
029	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		26,087				26,087
030	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		117,213				117,213
031	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE						
032	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		18,974				18,974

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
033	FUZE, ALL TYPES		3,460				3,460
034	NON LETHALS		2,158				2,158
035	AMMO MODERNIZATION		5,644				5,644
036	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,495				4,495
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS	**169**	**1,122,712**			**169**	**1,122,712**

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $12.7 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $12.9 billion, an increase of $185.0 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 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 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY						
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
001	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM		2,712,251				2,712,251
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		1,214,188				1,214,188
003	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	1	2,107,040			1	2,107,040
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		1,316,548		722,000		2,038,548
	VA Advance Procurement				[722,000]		
005	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	1	606,561			1	606,561
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		21,389				21,389
007	SSN ERO						
008	SSBN ERO	1	221,823			1	221,823
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		39,363				39,363
010	DDG 1000	1	2,502,803	-1	-2,502,803		
	Program Reduction				[-2,502,803]		
011	DDG 1000 Advance Procurement		50,980		349,020		400,000
	Surface Ship Advanced Procurement				[349,020]		
012	DDG-51						
013	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	2	920,000	-1	-80,000	1	840,000
	Program Reduction				[-80,000]		
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
014	LPD-17		103,216	1	1,696,784	1	1,800,000

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	LPD-17				[1,696,784]		
015	LPD ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
016	LHA REPLACEMENT						
017	INTRATHEATER CONNECTOR	1	174,782			1	174,782
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COSTS						
018	SPECIAL PURPOSE						
019	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS						
020	OUTFITTING		429,587				429,587
021	SERVICE CRAFT		36,317				36,317
022	LCAC SLEP	6	110,918			6	110,918
023	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		165,152				165,152
	TOTAL - SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY	**13**	**12,732,918**	**-1**	**185,001**	**12**	**12,917,919**

Items of Special Interest

Aircraft carrier force structure

The committee notes that section 5062 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Department of Defense to maintain 11 active aircraft carriers. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense requested legislative relief to waive this statutory requirement for the period between the proposed decommissioning of the USS *Enterprise* (CVN–65) and the initial operating capability of the USS *Ford* (CVN–78). The committee is concerned with the position of the Department of Defense, especially since the Department recently reached a compromise with Congress to reduce the statutory requirement from 12 aircraft carriers to 11 in section 1011 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). Moreover, the committee notes that the period between the proposed decommissioning of CVN–65 and the initial operating capability of CVN–78 will be a minimum of 33 months and may be more than 4 years, depending on the construction progress of the first-of-class CVN–78 and its post-commissioning testing and evaluation period.

Consequently, the committee rejects the request of the Department to allow a waiver to section 5062 of title 10, United States Code, for the purpose of retiring CVN–65 in fiscal year 2013. However, the committee understands that there are significant schedule and cost implications associated with a depot maintenance period which would be necessary to maintain CVN–65 in active service after fiscal year 2013 and that, even with an overhaul, the CVN–65 has limited nuclear fuel life.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the cost and potential schedule implications of either returning USS *Kennedy* (CV–67) to service or retaining USS *Kitty Hawk* (CV–63) in service during the period between the scheduled retirement of CVN–65 and the commissioning of CVN–78. The committee directs the Secretary to include in the report the number and location of dry-docks in United States shipyards, both public and private, which have the capacity to dock and make repairs to either CV–63 or CV–67.

The report should be submitted within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, but in any event not later than February 3, 2009.

Attack submarine force structure requirements

The committee directs the Secretary of the Defense to assess the total number of attack submarines required to fulfill the missions of the Department of Defense and to support the national defense strategy, as part of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) conducted in fiscal year 2009 pursuant to section 118 of title 10, United States Code. Such an assessment should be based upon an analysis and prioritization of unconstrained attack submarine requirements, sorted by mission, provided by the combatant commanders. The committee further directs that results of such an assessment be included in the report on the quadrennial defense review, submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and

the House Committee on Armed Services in accordance with section 118(d) of title 10, United States Code.

Service-life extension of SSN–688 Los Angeles class hulls

The committee understands that the Secretary of the Navy has conducted an assessment of the feasibility of extending the service life of certain SSN–688 *Los Angeles* class submarines in order to mitigate the projected shortfall in the Navy's attack submarine force structure. The committee is encouraged by this effort, but notes that the assessment did not explore options that would increase the number of attack submarines above 48, in the long-term. The committee also notes that the assessment did not explore options for limiting deployments or other actions that could limit hull fatigue in the near term, in order to conserve service life of more *Los Angeles* class submarines over the long-term.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report which includes an assessment of the feasibility and cost of extending the service life of all current *Los Angeles* class submarines. This report should explore the options in the near term which would fully utilize all available hull life and maximize the total number of attack submarines available after 2016. The committee directs the Secretary to submit this report within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

U.S. Navy shipbuilding plan

The committee remains concerned with the totality of the Navy shipbuilding plan. The committee is not confident that the current mix of planned ship procurement is the most effective way to balance the need for quantity versus capability across the spectrum of naval requirements. Considering likely budget constraints for shipbuilding procurement, it is evident that the long-range plan is unaffordable.

The committee is also concerned with short-term affordability. The key to efficient shipbuilding is stability in programs and commonality between programs. With stability, the shipbuilder can reasonably invest in infrastructure improvements for increased efficiency. Commonality allows savings in order quantity across programs as well as life-cycle savings in maintenance and repair parts. The goal of a 313-ship fleet will never be achieved until very difficult decisions are made concerning quantity, capability, affordability, and stability.

The committee remains committed to building a capable naval force in sufficient quantity to protect the nation's interests. This force must consist of major combatant vessels with multiple warfighting capabilities. It must also include ships with specific roles and missions, from operations in the littoral regions, to the projection of power ashore from a sea-base. The balance of capabilities within this force and the affordability of sustaining this force is the key task before both the Navy and Congress throughout the foreseeable future.

The committee disagrees with the submitted Future Years Defense Plan and budget request for: canceling the Amphibious Landing Ship-Dock (LPD 17) program at 9 ships; canceling the procurement of the 13th and 14th Dry Cargo Ammunition Ships (T–AKE); not requesting funding to increase the build rate of *Virginia* class

submarines to 2 ships per year starting in 2010; and the failure to deliver a coherent strategy for Littoral Combat Ship acquisition.

The committee authorizes a reallocation of funding in the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy account and the National Defense Sealift Fund. The committee recommends: full funding for the 10th ship of the LPD 17 class; an increase in advance procurement funding for the *Virginia* class submarine program, necessary for the procurement of 2 ships in fiscal year 2010; advance procurement for the final 2 ships of the T–AKE class; and advance procurement for the construction of DDG 51 class destroyers or DDG 1000 class destroyers. The committee notes that due to the overall delay in the DDG 1000 destroyer program, the Navy would be unable to execute the full funding request in fiscal year 2009 for the third ship of the planned seven ship class. Additionally, the committee is concerned with potential significant cost overruns in the DDG 1000 program and considers it prudent to pause the program until technological challenges are completely understood.

The committee authorizes these programs without prejudice to any specific program. The committee also understands the Navy is strongly considering re-starting the DDG 51 class destroyer upgraded with an improved radar system to fill an urgent need in ballistic missile defense. The committee would only support that decision if the industrial base for surface combatant construction is not affected. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense, subject to the availability of appropriations, to enter into advance procurement and advance construction contracts for the construction of surface combatants balanced between the two current surface combatant shipyards, taking into account workforce challenges still in effect on the Gulf Coast due to the lingering economic effects of Hurricane Katrina.

The committee expects the budget submission for fiscal year 2010 to contain a funding request for the 11th ship of the LPD 17 class, a two-one-two build strategy (two ships in 2010, one ship in 2011, and two ships in 2012 and following years) for the *Virginia* class submarine program, the balance of full funding for the 13th T–AKE, and a comprehensive decision on the acquisition plan for surface combatants including the plan for the Littoral Combat Ship class.

The committee expects the Navy to solve the capacity and capability issues of the surface combatant, amphibious warfare, and submarine combatant forces before beginning multiple new starts in programs to field the maritime prepositioning force (future) (MPF(F)). The committee is supportive of the requirement to constitute a seabase with a flotilla of vessels from which both combatant and non-combatant operations ashore could be launched. However, the committee is not convinced the seabase should be composed of non-combatant vessels such as the planned MPF aviation ship (MPF LHA) and the MPF landing platform ship (MPF MLP). The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, along with the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, to report to the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on the size and composition of the naval amphibious force necessary (without the MPF LHA and MPF MLP vessels) to conduct operations from a seabase, with a force comprising two marine expeditionary brigades (MEB).

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $5.5 billion for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $5.5 billion, a decrease of $20.9 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 Other Procurement, Navy programs 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 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
001	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE		7,973				7,973
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		9,405				9,405
003	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT		38,800				38,800
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
004	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		47,549				47,549
	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
005	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
	PERISCOPES						
006	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP		69,078				69,078
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
007	DDG MOD		165,496				165,496
008	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		8,293				8,293
009	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		6,345				6,345
010	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		27,923				27,923
011	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		22,686				22,686
012	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		199,904				199,904
013	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		41,132				41,132
014	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		9,953				9,953

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
015	DSSP EQUIPMENT		5,733				5,733
016	CG MODERNIZATION		232,370				232,370
017	LCAC		174				174
018	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT		11,991				11,991
019	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		136,156		12,000		148,156
	JP-5 Electric Valves				[3,000]		
	Canned Lube Pumps (CLP) LSD-41/49 Class Amphibious				[4,000]		
	CVN Propeller Replacement Program				[5,000]		
020	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS		6,598				6,598
021	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM		15,212				15,212
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT						
022	REACTOR POWER UNITS						
023	REACTOR COMPONENTS		236,693				236,693
	OCEAN ENGINEERING						
024	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		6,549				6,549
	SMALL BOATS						
025	STANDARD BOATS		17,839				17,839
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
026	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		5,689				5,689
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT						
027	OPERATING FORCES IPE		51,631				51,631

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
028	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		70,694				70,694
029	LCS MODULES		131,241		-50,000		81,241
	LCS Mission Modules				[-50,000]		
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT						
030	LSD MIDLIFE		90,675		1,670		92,345
	Boat Davit System Improvement				[1,670]		
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
031	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP RADARS						
032	RADAR SUPPORT	2	10,503			2	10,503
	SHIP SONARS						
033	SPQ-9B RADAR		9,281		5,400		14,681
	Radar Improvements				[5,400]		
034	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	3	117,685			3	117,685
035	SSN ACOUSTICS		284,153				284,153
036	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3	15,578			3	15,578
037	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		13,858				13,858
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
038	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		20,857				20,857

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
039	SSTD		10,058				10,058
040	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		44,997				44,997
041	SURTASS		26,675				26,675
042	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER		25,188				25,188
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
043	AN/SLQ-32		29,280				29,280
044	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS						
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
045	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		83,408				83,408
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
046	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		103,597				103,597
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
047	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM						
048	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY		34,561				34,561
049	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT		25,923				25,923
050	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)		31,283				31,283
051	ATDLS		14,206				14,206
052	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		49,024				49,024
053	SHALLOW WATER MCM		7,355				7,355
054	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)		10,893				10,893
055	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV		4,178				4,178

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
056	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		4,106				4,106
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
057	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT		29,791				29,791
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
058	MATCALS		17,409				17,409
059	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		7,944				7,944
060	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM		18,787				18,787
061	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM		29,066				29,066
062	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		8,238				8,238
063	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM		10,799				10,799
064	FACSFAC						
065	ID SYSTEMS		34,560				34,560
066	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)		9,512				9,512
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
067	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT		9,031				9,031
068	TADIX-B		5,309				5,309
069	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE		6,209				6,209
070	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS		67,133				67,133
071	RADIAC		9,840				9,840
072	GPETE		5,521				5,521
073	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY		4,558				4,558

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
089	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SONOBUOYS						
090	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES		112,603				112,603
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
091	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		64,396				64,396
092	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		8,308				8,308
093	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		12,761				12,761
094	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT		46,362				46,362
095	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		24,742				24,742
096	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		1,603				1,603
097	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		17,673		8,000		25,673
	Multi-Climate Protection System				[8,000]		
098	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		39,363				39,363
099	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		35,117				35,117
100	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,335				13,335
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
101	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM		1,695				1,695
102	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT		8,244				8,244

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
119	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		33,583				33,583
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
120	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		1,966				1,966
121	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		829				829
122	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		12,167				12,167
123	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		16,289				16,289
124	TACTICAL VEHICLES		29,686				29,686
125	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		14,041				14,041
126	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		5,418				5,418
127	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		22,379				22,379
128	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES		1,116				1,116
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
129	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		14,971				14,971
130	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		9,247				9,247
131	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		6,216				6,216
132	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		74,103				74,103
	PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	TRAINING DEVICES						
133	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		16,764				16,764
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
134	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		43,175				43,175

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	High Performance Computing				[2,000]		2,000
135	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,018				2,018
136	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,493				6,493
137	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,646				1,646
138	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		[ ]				[ ]
139	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,116				13,116
140	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		13,510				13,510
141	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		24,244				24,244
142	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		144,863				144,863
143	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		35,600				35,600
144	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
145	SPECIAL PROGRAM		[ ]				[ ]
	PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS						
146	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT						
	OTHER						
147	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
148	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		251,765				251,765
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		18,314				18,314
	TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**8**	**5,482,856**		**-20,930**	**8**	**5,461,926**

Items of Special Interest

Boat davit system improvements

The budget request contained $90.7 million for landing ship dock (LSD) mid-life logistics support, but contained no funds for modifications to the LSD–41 and LSD–49 ship-class boat davit system.

The committee understands the mid-life replacement for the original electro-mechanical double-armed strong back davit has been plagued by electronic and mechanical control problems which caused the Navy to limit use to only the manual mode. Because these ships form the core amphibious assault echelon, the operational reliability of the boat davit system is imperative for mission success.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.7 million for LSD mid-life logistics support to design and implement modifications to existing LSD–41 and LSD–49 boat davit systems.

CVN propeller replacement program

The budget request contained $136.2 million in the category of items less than $5.0 million, but contained no funds for the aircraft carrier propeller replacement program.

The committee understands that the original propellers on the *Nimitz* class aircraft carriers suffer from significant blade erosion caused by cavitation and require refurbishment every three to six years. The newly designed propeller is resistant to erosion by cavitation and only requires refurbishment every 12 years which most closely approximates major dry-docking availabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in the category of items less than $5.0 million, for the aircraft carrier propeller replacement program.

Jet fuel electric valve actuators

The budget request contained $136.2 million in the category of items less than $5.0 million, but contained no funds for jet fuel electric valve actuators for aircraft carriers.

The committee understands the Navy has authorized an upgrade to the jet fuel distribution system on *Nimitz* class aircraft carriers with electric valve actuator technology. The committee notes that upgrading jet fuel valves from motor-operated to electric-operated valves should improve fuel service system safety, improve the reliability of the aircraft carrier aviation fueling system, and should reduce excessive maintenance costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in the category, items less than $5.0 million, for installation of jet fuel electric valve actuators for aircraft carriers.

Multi-climate protection system

The budget request contained $17.7 million for aviation life support equipment, but only contained $1.0 million for procurement of 621 multi-climate protection (MCP) systems.

The committee understands the MCP system is an abbreviated acquisition program intended to develop a modular protective clothing system which provides flame protection, thermal protection, and sufficient insulation while reducing heat stress and bulk commonly associated with cold weather clothing systems. The com-

mittee notes that the Navy requirement is for 25,000 MCP systems but only procured and fielded 6,250 MCP systems to date.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million, for aviation life support equipment to procure additional MCP systems.

Surface ship SPQ–9B radar improvements

The budget request contained $9.3 million for SPQ–9B radars, but contained no funds to upgrade the radar to detect sea-skimmer missiles and low observable threats.

The committee understands that the SPQ–9B radar provides early warning for threats near the horizon during surveillance missions and complements the capabilities of the Aegis SPY–1 radar system. The committee notes there are radar upgrades available, but not currently installed, that can: increase the probability of the SPQ–9B radar detecting low-observable, sea-skimmer missiles; increase the tracking ability for gunfire control against surface targets; assist ship control in restricted waters; and complement the Aegis SPY–1 radar system during surveillance missions.

The committee recommends $14.7 million, an increase of $5.4 million, to upgrade the SPQ–9B surface ship radar.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $1.5 billion for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1.3 billion, a decrease of $216.4 million, for fiscal year 2009.

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

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	OTHER SUPPORT						
014	MODIFICATION KITS		4,925				4,925
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS						
015	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		14,883		-7,000		7,883
	Unit Operations Center Reduction				[-7,000]		
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
016	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		35,188				35,188
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
017	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		34,665				34,665
018	MODIFICATION KITS						
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
019	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		9,661				9,661
020	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		77,978				77,978
	RADAR AND EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
021	RADAR SYSTEMS		32,516				32,516
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
022	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,654				2,654
023	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		49,838				49,838
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
024	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		24,868				24,868

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
025	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		106,499				106,499
026	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		15,816				15,816
027	RADIO SYSTEMS		95,845		-47,900		47,945
	Radio Systems Reduction				[-47,900]		
028	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		40,639				40,639
029	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		15,527				15,527
	SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
030	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		1,201				1,201
031	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		13,691				13,691
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
032	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	7	2,666			7	2,666
033	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS						
034	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT		944				944
035	LIGHTWEIGHT PRIME MOVER						
036	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP		324,578		-178,038		146,540
	Transfer to Title XV				[-178,038]		
037	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		27,619				27,619
038	TRAILERS		8,424				8,424
	OTHER SUPPORT						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
039	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,046				4,046
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
040	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		5,131		3,000		8,131
	GATEWAY System				[3,000]		
041	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		9,571				9,571
042	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		19,067		1,500		20,567
	Nitrile Rubber Collapsible Storage Units				[1,500]		
043	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		16,501				16,501
044	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,239				13,239
045	EOD SYSTEMS		28,568				28,568
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
046	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		12,589				12,589
047	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		11,813				11,813
048	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		30,758				30,758
049	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		5,867				5,867
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
050	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		6,623		4,000		10,623
	Combat Casualty Care Equipment Upgrade Program				[4,000]		
	Chemical Biological Incident Response Force equipment				[8,000]		8,000
051	TRAINING DEVICES		57,476				57,476
052	CONTAINER FAMILY		4,050				4,050

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
053	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		22,461				22,461
054	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)		7,987				7,987
055	BRIDGE BOATS						
056	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		2,907				2,907
	OTHER SUPPORT						
057	MODIFICATION KITS						
058	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		8,114				8,114
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
059	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		14,460				14,460
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**7**	**1,512,765**		**-216,438**	**7**	**1,296,327**

Items of Special Interest

Abrams tank total integrated engine revitalization program strategy for Marine Corps Abrams tanks

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee encouraged the Army to adopt the total integrated engine revitalization (TIGER) program for Army and Army National Guard M1 Abrams tanks. The TIGER program for the M1 Abrams tank is an integrated engine maintenance program that leverages manufacturing improvements, supply chain management efficiencies, and condition-based maintenance initiatives to increase the service life of the M1 Abrams tank engine from 700 to 1,400 hours. The committee notes that the Army is currently working towards modernizing the Army and Army National Guard Abrams fleet with TIGER engines.

Accordingly, the committee encourages the Commandant of the Marine Corps to coordinate with the Chief of Staff of the Army to develop and fund a plan that utilizes the TIGER integrated engine maintenance program to modernize the entire Abrams engine tank fleet, including Marine Corps Abrams tanks, with TIGER engines by 2010.

Chemical biological incident response force

The budget request contained $6.6 million for the procurement of field medical equipment, but contained no funds to provide for new command and control or personal protective equipment for the Chemical and Biological Incident Response Force (CBIRF).

The committee is concerned that the proliferation of new response capabilities for chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) events is occurring in an enthusiastic but uncoordinated fashion. This is particularly disconcerting as the committee believes that this has happened to the detriment of the CBIRF, a superb capability within the Marine Corps that has existed and matured over the past 10 years.

The committee reiterates its strong support for section 1815 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) and urges the Department to also include:

(1) A description of all of the units within the active, reserve, and guard that would have a role in responding to CBRN attack;

(2) Specific roles and capabilities for each of these units; and

(3) Current status of each of these units, including manpower and equipping.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for the procurement of three Emergency Response Vehicles, as well as additional personal protective equipment to replace aging systems.

Marine Corps radio systems

The budget request contained $95.8 million for Marine Corps radio systems.

The committee supports continued improvements in Marine Corps tactical communications capability. However, the committee notes that funding for Marine Corps radio systems in fiscal year 2007 was $826.1 million and $518.5 million in fiscal year 2008, and

that funding provided through 2008 will procure the Marine Corps identified requirements. The committee also notes that there are significant unobligated balances for both fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2008 due to contract delays and production limitations.

The committee recommends $47.9 million, a decrease of $47.9 million, for Marine Corps radio systems. The committee urges the Marine Corps to pursue any additional needed funding in fiscal year 2010.

Unit operations centers

The budget request contained $14.9 million for procurement of Marine Corps unit operations center equipment.

The committee notes that $151.1 million was provided for unit operations center equipment in fiscal year 2008, and that current projections show execution of less than half that funding by the end of fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends $7.9 million, a decrease of $7.0 million, for unit operations center procurement.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $12.7 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $12.6 billion, a decrease of $57.8 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 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 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
001	F-35	8	1,673,787			8	1,673,787
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		136,904		31,000		167,904
	JSF Competitive Engine				[31,000]		
003	F-22A	20	3,054,197			20	3,054,197
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
005	C-17A (MYP)		367,554		-48,766		318,788
	Transfer to APAF-34				[-8,766]		
	Excess Spare Parts Requirements				[-40,000]		
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
006	C-130J						
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		96,000				96,000
008	HC/MC-130 RECAP	6	507,677			6	507,677
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		80,000				80,000
010	KC-X ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		61,660		-61,660		
	Unjustified Request				[-61,660]		
011	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT		5,439				5,439

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
012	JPATS		33,196				33,196
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	HELICOPTERS						
013	CSAR-X ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		15,000		-15,000		
	Program Delay				[-15,000]		
014	V22 OSPREY	6	409,027			6	409,027
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		14,266				14,266
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
016	C-29A FLIGHT INSPECTION ACFT	1	31,877			1	31,877
017	C-40			1	88,000	1	88,000
	Additional Aircraft				[88,000]		
018	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C		2,435				2,435
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
019	TARGET DRONES		70,576				70,576
020	GLOBAL HAWK	5	658,319			5	658,319
021	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		53,832				53,832
022	MQ-1	38	378,703			38	378,703
023	MQ-9	9	161,439			9	161,439

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
024	B-2A		330,392		-31,300		299,092
	Transfer from RDAF-61				[18,500]		
	Transfer to APAF-24A				[-49,800]		
24A	B-2 Advance Procurement				49,800		49,800
025	B-1B		71,774				71,774
026	B-52		41,699				41,699
027	F-117						
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
028	A-10		144,077				144,077
029	F-15		12,326				12,326
030	F-16		273,694				273,694
031	F-22A		327,046				327,046
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
032	C-5		485,484		-60,000		425,484
	Excess to Requirements				[-60,000]		
033	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		97,600		-26,671		70,929
	Excess to Requirements				[-26,671]		
034	C-17A		331,535		8,766		340,301
	Transfer from APAF-5				[8,766]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
035	C-21		11,001				11,001
036	C-32A		11,373				11,373
037	C-37A		2,407				2,407
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
038	GLIDER MODS		121				121
039	T-6		21,122				21,122
040	T-1		25				25
041	T-38		59,934				59,934
042	T-43		2,269				2,269
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
043	KC-10A (ATCA)		1,899				1,899
044	C-12		468				468
045	C-20 MODS		1,535				1,535
046	VC-25A MOD		60,875				60,875
047	C-40		9,911				9,911
048	C-130		422,814		5,000		427,814
	Podded Reconnaissance, Scathe View				[5,000]		
049	C130J MODS		59,350				59,350
050	C-135		134,188				134,188
051	COMPASS CALL MODS		24,605				24,605
052	DARP		106,989				106,989

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
053	E-3		86,468				86,468
054	E-4		28,098				28,098
055	E-8		30,657				30,657
056	H-1		13,200				13,200
057	H-60		17,250				17,250
058	GLOBAL HAWK MODS		103,939				103,939
059	OTHER AIRCRAFT		151,932		3,000		154,932
	ANG RC-26B Modernization				[3,000]		
060	MQ-1 MODS		148,532				148,532
061	MQ-9 MODS		24,590				24,590
062	CV-22 MODS		22,621				22,621
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
063	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		257,001				257,001
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIP						
064	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP		104,861				104,861
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
065	B-1						
066	B-2A						
067	B-2A		36,783				36,783
068	B-52						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
069	C-5		18,210				18,210
070	C-21		19,025				19,025
071	C-130						
072	EC-130J		5,382				5,382
073	F-15		20,189				20,189
074	F-16		13,623				13,623
075	T-6		8,841				8,841
076	OTHER AIRCRAFT		48,593				48,593
077	T-1						
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
078	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		24,380				24,380
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
079	WAR CONSUMABLES		80,622				80,622
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
080	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		521,357				521,357
081	DEPOT MODERNIZATION						
82	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
83	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
84	OTHER SPECIAL PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	CLASSIFIED PGMS						
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES SOF						
085	CANCELLED ACCT ADJUSTMENTS						
	DARP						
086	DARP		21,028				21,028
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		10,913				10,913
	TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**93**	**12,676,496**	**1**	**-57,831**	**94**	**12,618,665**

Items of Special Interest

Air National Guard RC–26B modernization

The budget request contained $151.9 million for other aircraft modifications, but contained no funds to design, install, and test one RC–26B aircraft with the block 20 software and hardware modifications and the beyond-line-of-sight (BLOS) data link modification.

The RC–26B is a low-density, high-demand intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platform that can be rapidly deployed for operations in the United States and overseas. The block 20 hardware and software modifications would allow the RC–26B's mission equipment to fully utilize accurate position information and the BLOS data link modification would add a capability to pass real-time data to ground terminals. The committee notes that the Chief of the National Guard Bureau has included both the block 20 software and hardware modifications and the BLOS data link among his essential 10 equipment requirements for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends $154.9 million for other aircraft modifications, an increase of $3.0 million, to design, install, and test one RC–26B with the block 20 software and hardware modifications and the BLOS data link modification.

KC–45 aerial refueling aircraft program

The budget request contained $893.5 million to initiate systems design and demonstration to begin replacement of the KC–135 aerial refueling fleet, a fleet that averages 47 years old. The committee notes that the Air Force has prior year appropriations of $421.7 million available for the KC–45 program.

The committee supports the Air Force's number one acquisition program of tanker recapitalization and understands that the ability to aerially refuel aircraft during military operations is a critical capability in meeting national military strategy objectives.

The committee includes three provisions in title I of this Act, sections 132, 133, and 134. Section 132 would require the Secretary of the Air Force to maintain a minimum of 46 KC–135E aircraft in Type-1000 storage to alleviate the challenges of maintaining the current fleet of KC–135R aircraft due to parts obsolescence issues and diminishing manufacturing sources of supply. Section 133 would repeal section 135 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), associated the KC–X tanker lease program, which was not executed and no longer applies. Section 134 would require the Air Force Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2008, that examines the processes used to determine KC–X requirements and provides an evaluation of very large tanker aircraft as a potential Air Force aerial refueling platform.

The committee also recommends, without prejudice to the KC–45 program, a decrease of $61.7 million for advanced procurement funding, because advanced procurement funding is not required for KC–45 program execution.

Mission support aircraft

The budget request contained no funding for C–40 aircraft. The Air Force unfunded requirements list contained $370.0 million for procurement of three C–40 aircraft.

The committee notes the Air Force has a validated operational requirement to provide worldwide air transportation for executive branch officials and high-ranking U.S. dignitaries as well as other operational support missions. The committee understands that in fiscal year 2007, one-third of all requests for special mission airlift support aircraft went unfilled due to current fleet limitations and performance characteristics of the C–9 aircraft. The committee notes that the C–9 will be retired from the Air Force inventory in fiscal year 2011 and that no planned replacement aircraft exists.

The committee recommends $88.0 million for procurement of one C–40C aircraft to replace one C–9C aircraft, currently at Scott AFB, scheduled for retirement in fiscal year 2011.

Special Operations Command aircraft recapitalization

The budget request contained $507.7 million for HC–130J and MC–130J recapitalization, and $80.0 million for advanced procurement for HC–130J and MC–130J in fiscal year 2010. The budget request also contained $36.3 million to modify MC–130J aircraft to meet requirements for Special Operations Command's (SOCOM) MC–130J aircraft to conduct operations in low-visibility conditions. The MC–130J will replace Special Operations Command's MC–130E and MC–130P fleets.

The committee notes that the average age for the MC–130E and MC–130P fleet is 43 and 40 years, respectively. The committee understands that SOCOM has a requirement to field 11 MC–130J aircraft prior to fiscal year 2012 to maintain adequate mission capability. The committee further understands that all 11 MC–130Js must be funded no later than fiscal year 2010 to meet the SOCOM requirement.

The committee notes that the current MC–130J acquisition plan includes a total of eight MC–130J aircraft for Special Operations Command in fiscal years 2009 and 2010. The committee is concerned, however, that this plan may fail to adequately meet SOCOM's warfighting requirement, since a total of 11 MC–130Js may not be planned for acquisition by fiscal year 2010.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the Department of the Air Force's and SOCOM's plan to recapitalize the MC–130E and MC–130P fleets with the MC–130J as it relates to meeting the SOCOM MC–130J force structure requirement. The report shall be provided to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009.

Strategic airlift aircraft programs

The budget request contained $561.9 million for C–5 aircraft modernization programs. The Air Force Chief of Staff included $3.9 billion on the Air Force unfunded priority list for procurement of 15 additional C–17 aircraft.

The committee notes that on September 27, 2007, the Secretary of the Air Force notified Congress that the C–5 Reliability Enhancement and Re-engining Program (RERP) experienced a critical

Nunn-McCurdy cost growth breach of 48 percent above the current program acquisition unit cost (PAUC), and 68 percent above the original PAUC established in fiscal year 2000. The committee notes that on February 14, 2008, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) certified the C–5 RERP program to Congress during the Nunn-McCurdy process. The committee understands that USD(AT&L) concluded that a program to perform RERP on only 52 C–5B/C aircraft and perform only the Avionics Modernization Program on the remaining 59 C–5A aircraft is the most cost-effective solution to meet airlift requirements contained in the 2005 Mobility Capabilities Study (MCS).

In written testimony to the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces on March 11, 2008, USD(AT&L) stated that the 2005 MCS concluded that a "fleet of 112 modernized C–5s, provided sufficient strategic airlift capacity" to meet the Department's future airlift requirements. However, the committee notes that the 2005 MCS actually stated that a fleet of "112 modernized and reliability improved C–5s" meets the Department's strategic airlift requirements. The committee is extremely concerned that the newly certified RERP program conflicts with the recommendations of the 2005 Mobility Capabilities Study that USD(AT&L) states was used as the analytical basis for determining C–5 inventory requirements.

The committee's concern is validated by written testimony of the Commander, Air Mobility Command to the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces on April 1, 2008, that states "the current program for 190 C–17s, 52 RERP modified C–5s, and 59 legacy C–5As will not quite provide the organic strategic airlift capacity of 33.95 million ton miles per day specified by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council. Therefore, we remain concerned and vigilant that given the dynamic nature of our world and the increasing imperative for rapid warfighter response, coupled with the fact that our current strategic airlift baseline is based upon a three-year old MCS, that we have the correct balance."

The committee is extremely concerned by the shortsightedness of the MCS used by the Department to make critical decisions concerning the C–17 production line because the MCS did not: take into account the end strength increases of 92,000 personnel for the Army and Marine Corps; consider any mobility requirements of the Army's Future Combat Systems and modularity concepts of employment; consider the fact that the Army Manned-Ground Vehicle is too large to be transported by a C–130 aircraft; consider the 159 percent over-utilization rate of the current fleet of C–17 aircraft; consider the use of C–17s in multi-use roles for which the C–17 is being used extensively in current operations; have or use historical mobility forces operational data in its analysis to verify actual mobility requirements and operations.

The committee understands that the Department is conducting the 2008 Mobility Capabilities and Requirements Study (MCRS) to determine the appropriate inventory requirements for airlift and sealift to meet the National Defense Strategy. The committee notes that the estimated completion date of the 2008 MCRS is May 2009. The committee is extremely disappointed by the Department's decision to set a completion date for the study one month prior to delivery of the final production C–17 in June 2009. The committee also

notes that the Department's 2008 MCRS will not be completed in time to inform the President's fiscal year 2010 budget request to Congress.

To compensate for the Department's decision-making and planning process concerning strategic airlift production and force structure requirements, the committee recommends $3.9 billion in title XV of this Act for procurement of 15 additional C–17s. Additionally, the committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to program funding for additional C–17 aircraft in subsequent budget requests if the Department determines during the 2008 MRCS execution process that procuring additional C–17 aircraft is required to meet the National Defense Strategy. The committee also recommends a decrease of $86.7 million to RERP funding due to the Department's stated inability to execute this amount in fiscal year 2009.

The committee also includes a provision, section 131, in title I of this Act that would allow the Secretary of the Air Force to retire C–5 aircraft from the inventory and replace the capability with C–17 aircraft if the cost analysis performed is prudent in meeting strategic airlift requirements and does not significantly increase overall costs above those already planned in the out-years.

The committee understands that the Air Force should have a minimum of 299 strategic airlift aircraft in the inventory with delivery of the 189th C–17 in June 2009. Consequently, the committee understands that no C–5A retirements will occur before the delivery of the 189th C–17. Additionally, the committee understands that after section 8062(g) of title 10, United States Code, was implemented with the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the C–17 delivery schedule changed due to additional C–17 foreign military sales which will impact the Secretary of the Air Force complying with section 8062(g) of title 10, United States Code.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $894.5 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $994.5 million, an increase of $40.0 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force program are identified in the table below.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
001	ROCKETS		29,436				29,436
	CARTRIDGES						
002	CARTRIDGES		150,815				150,815
	BOMBS						
003	PRACTICE BOMBS		24,590				24,590
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		149,695				149,695
005	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON						
006	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	3,647	105,719	1,379	40,000	5,026	145,719
	JDAM Kits				[40,000]		
007	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER						
	FLARE, IR MJU-7B						
008	CAD/PAD		38,190				38,190
009	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		3,246				3,246
010	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		4,618				4,618
011	MODIFICATIONS		1,235				1,235
012	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		2,477				2,477
	FUZES						
013	FLARES		304,159				304,159

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
014	FUZES		72,133				72,133
	WEAPONS						
	SMALL ARMS						
015	SMALL ARMS		8,165				8,165
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**3,647**	**894,478**	**1,379**	**40,000**	**5,026**	**934,478**

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $5.5 billion for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $5.5 billion, the requested amount, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT-BALLISTIC						
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		26,658				26,658
	OTHER MISSILES						
	TACTICAL						
002	JASSM	260	240,295			260	240,295
003	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	275	77,223			275	77,223
004	AMRAAM	281	294,746			281	294,746
005	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	642	63,585			642	63,585
006	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	2,612	133,209			2,612	133,209
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
007	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION		2,408				2,408
	MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE MISSILES						
	CLASS IV						
008	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		42				42
009	AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15						
010	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC						
011	MM III MODIFICATIONS		296,354				296,354
012	AGM-65D MAVERICK		256				256
013	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		10,150				10,150

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	MISSILES AND REPAIR PARTS						
014	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		26,923				26,923
	OTHER SUPPORT						
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
015	ADVANCED EHF		16,564				16,564
016	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
017	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)		22,492				22,492
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
019	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		17,407				17,407
020	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		108,043				108,043
021	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		2,400				2,400
022	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM		1,250				1,250
023	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		99,788				99,788
024	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)						
025	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE)						
026	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	4	1,205,278			4	1,205,278
027	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)		5,756				5,756
028	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	2	1,664,043			2	1,664,043
029	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		54,000				54,000

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
030	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS						
031	DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM		158,966				158,966
32	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
033	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		212,515				212,515
34	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM		[ ]				[ ]
35	OTHER PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		796,377				796,377
	TOTAL - MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**4,076**	**5,536,728**			**4,076**	**5,536,728**

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $16.1 billion for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $16.1 billion, an increase of $6.5 million, for fiscal year 2009.

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

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS						
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT (COMSEC)						
013	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		137,914				137,914
014	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		1,557				1,557
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
015	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2,671				2,671
016	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		15,441				15,441
	Force Protection Surveillance System				[4,000]		4,000
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
017	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS		9,832				9,832
018	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		47,224				47,224
019	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMEN		68,502				68,502
020	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		29,377				29,377
021	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		53,739				53,739
022	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		13,662				13,662
023	DRUG INTERDICTION SPT		950				950
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
024	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		100,052		4,000		104,052
	IMPACT				[2,000]		
	SELDI				[2,000]		
	ANG Combat Communications on the Move				[3,500]		3,500

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
025	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS		16,148				16,148
026	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		10,475				10,475
027	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		57,728				57,728
028	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		55,315				55,315
029	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N		1				1
030	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		7,754				7,754
031	GCSS-AF FOS		55,783		-5,000		50,783
	Expeditionary Combat Support System Unjustified growth				[-5,000]		
032	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM		22,525				22,525
033	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS		35,050				35,050
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
034	BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE		337,190				337,190
035	USCENTCOM		42,677				42,677
	DISA PROGRAMS						
036	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE		80,405				80,405
037	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE		25,526				25,526
038	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE		27,626				27,626
039	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE		65,383				65,383
040	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE		101,983				101,983
041	MILSATCOM SPACE		106,323				106,323
042	SPACE MODS SPACE		23,121				23,121

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
043	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM		29,232				29,232
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
044	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		293,153				293,153
045	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER		26,878				26,878
046	RADIO EQUIPMENT		13,463				13,463
047	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)						
048	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		7,423				7,423
049	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		135,808				135,808
050	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000						
	MODIFICATIONS						
051	COMM ELECT MODS		33,258				33,258
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP						
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIPMENT						
052	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		18,626				18,626
	DEPOT PLANT AND MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP						
053	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		21,573				21,573
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
054	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		17,038				17,038
055	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT						
056	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		6,483				6,483
057	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT		3,021				3,021

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
058	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		26,459				26,459
059	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (BASE S)		14,237				14,237
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
60	PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
061	DARP RC135		22,924				22,924
062	DISTRIBUTED GROUND SYSTEMS		251,805				251,805
63	SELECTED ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
064	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		410,370				410,370
065	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		15,805				15,805
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
066	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		25,616				25,616
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		13,041,085				13,041,085
	TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**16,128,396**		**6,500**		**16,134,896**

Item of Special Interest

General information technology

The budget request contained $100.1 million for general information technologies, but contained no funds for the science and engineering lab data integration (SELDI) program, or for information modernization for processing with advance coating technologies (IMPACT).

The Air Force Material Command's science and engineering lab captures, analyzes, and disseminates lab test data to the Department of 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. The SELDI program also provides accident investigators with immediate access to lab results of failed components, enables component failure trend analysis, and implements a new acoustic signature sensor to ensure the proper chemical composition of materials and equipment. The committee understands that the SELDI program has provided quantifiable benefits including cost avoidance in spare parts configuration discrepancies and elimination of unnecessary landing gear overhaul process operations. In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee recommended increases for the SELDI program and continues to believe its implementation would improve operational aircraft readiness, increase flight safety, and reduce support costs. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for this purpose.

The IMPACT program is working to calibrate, validate, and certify the existing thermal spray equipment used in the advanced coating systems process and to identify candidate parts that could be overhauled with this process. As a result of much more stringent permissible exposure limits to chemical byproducts of chrome plating processes, Warner Robins Air Logistics Center will be required to migrate to a new process known as advanced coating systems. In addition to reduced chemical exposure, the committee understands that the advanced coating systems process will offer improved durability of 40 to 50 percent, lower life-cycle costs for those components treated with this process, and reduced repair processing times by 20 to 40 percent. In the committee report (H. Rept 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee recommended an increase for the IMPACT program and continues to believe it will help to reduce hazardous exposure, improve component durability, and lower life-cycle costs. To accelerate the IMPACT program, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million.

The committee recommends $104.1 million, an increase of $4.0 million, for general information technology.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $3.2 billion for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authoriza-

tion of $3.5 billion, an increase of $321.2 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2009 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Defense-Wide request are discussed following the table.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS						
001	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		105,946		3,000		108,946
	Domestic Production of Polycrystalline Laser Gain Materials				[3,000]		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
2	INTEL SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPS		[ ]				[ ]
3	CYBER SECURITY -- CCP		[ ]				[ ]
4	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		[ ]				[ ]
5	CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM		[ ]				[ ]
006	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		4,505				4,505
7	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM		[ ]				[ ]
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS						
008	WHS MOTOR VEHICLES						
009	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		26,649				26,649
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
010	INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
011	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		54,934				54,934
012	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM						
013	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM		10,973				10,973
014	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,788				2,788
015	TELEPORT PROGRAM		15,062				15,062

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
016	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		121,296				121,296
017	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		36,765				36,765
018	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK (DISN)		90,328				90,328
019	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE		1,894				1,894
020	SR. LEADERSHIP CMD CONT						
021	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM		7,952				7,952
022	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		19,100				19,100
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA						
23	DIA SUPPORT TO CENTCOM INTELIGENCE ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
24	INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS		[ ]				[ ]
25	COMBATANT COMMAND OPERATIONS		[ ]				[ ]
26	DIA SUPPORT TO SOUTHCOM INTEL ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
27	DIA SUPPORT TO PACOM MANAGEMENT HQ		[ ]				[ ]
28	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFO OPS		[ ]				[ ]
29	DIA SUPPORT TO PACOM INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
30	DIA SUPPORT TO EUCOM INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
31	INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES		[ ]				[ ]
32	DEFENSE HUMINT INTELLIGENCE		[ ]				[ ]
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
033	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		8,789				8,789
	Combat Rations Surge production Capacity Requirements				[5,000]		5,000

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
034	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,523				1,523
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
035	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		25,897				25,897
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA						
036	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		19,214				19,214
	NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY						
37	NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL - INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM						
38	DEFENSE GEOSPATIAL - INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM						
	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						
039	VEHICLES						
040	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		5,621				5,621
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS						
041	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA						
042	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,498				1,498
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA						
043	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		2,149				2,149
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DTSA						
044	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		436				436
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
045	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA		689				689
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT						
046	A - WEAPON SYSTEM COST	3	11,158			3	11,158
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
047	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		51,950				51,950
048	MC-130H AIR REFUELING SYSTEM						
049	MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM		63,667				63,667
050	MH-60 SOF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		98,163				98,163
051	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	6	39,172			6	39,172
052	SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION		36,286				36,286
053	SOF U-28		7,659				7,659
054	MC-130H, COMBAT TALON II						
055	CV-22 SOF MOD	6	162,971			6	162,971
056	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION						
057	C-130 MODIFICATIONS		47,018				47,018
058	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		1,347				1,347
	SHIPBUILDING						
059	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)		5,760				5,760
060	MK8 MOD1 SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE		7,061				7,061

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
061	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT		67,083				67,083
062	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION		5,540		6,000		11,540
	Remote Activated Munitions				[6,000]		
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
063	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS		67,220				67,220
064	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		54,122		20,800		74,922
	SOCOM Intelligence Equipment Package				[20,800]		
065	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		15,689		6,000		21,689
	Mk47 Advanced Lightweight Grenade Launcher				[6,000]		
66	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		[ ]				[ ]
067	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS		1,265				1,265
068	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES		12,484				12,484
069	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		18,795		3,600		22,395
	Special Operations Craft - Riverine				[3,600]		
070	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		3,272				3,272
71	SPECIAL PROGRAM		[ ]				[ ]
072	TACTICAL VEHICLES		3,702				3,702
073	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS		34,151				34,151
074	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS		21,593				21,593
075	MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT		11,722				11,722

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
076	UNMANNED VEHICLES		27,194				27,194
77	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM GDIP		[ ]				[ ]
078	SOF AUTOMATION SYSTEMS		55,248				55,248
079	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES		15,862				15,862
080	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE		25,892				25,892
081	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS		15,455		1,200		16,655
	SOCOM Personal Equipment Advanced Requirements				[1,200]		
082	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SY		30,201		15,400		45,601
	SOCOM Visual Augmentation Systems Hand Held Imagers				[15,400]		
083	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS		33,966				33,966
084	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT		13,450				13,450
085	DRUG INTERDICTION						
086	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		15,331				15,331
087	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		315,443		9,200		324,643
	SOCOM High Performance Sniper Scope				[9,200]		
088	PSYOP EQUIPMENT		64,778				64,778
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
	CBDP						
089	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION		88,565				88,565
090	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION		80,211				80,211
091	DECONTAMINATION		22,299				22,299

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
092	JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM		38,702				38,702
093	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION		37,784				37,784
094	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE		199,610				199,610
95	STANDARD MISSILE-3 INTERCEPTORS				111,000		111,000
	Transfer from PE 63892C				[56,000]		
	Facility upgrades				[20,000]		
	Long-lead procurement				[35,000]		
96	TERMINAL HIGH ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE				140,000		140,000
	Transfer from PE 63881C				[65,000]		
	Long-lead procurement				[75,000]		
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		671,379				671,379
	TOTAL - PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**15**	**3,164,228**		**321,200**	**15**	**3,485,428**
	RAPID ACQUISITION FUND						
001	JOINT RAPID ACQUISITION CELL		102,045		-52,045		50,000
	Transfer to Title XV				[-102,045]		
	Program Increase				[50,000]		
	TOTAL - RAPID ACQUISITION FUND		**102,045**		**-52,045**		**50,000**

Items of Special Interest

Standard Missile-3 interceptors

The budget request contained no funds for advanced procurement of Standard Missile-3 (SM–3) interceptors.

Consistent with the findings of the Joint Capabilities Mix Study II, which indicated that the combatant commanders require, at minimum, twice as many SM–3 interceptors than the 133 now planned, the committee strongly supports efforts to increase production of SM–3 interceptors to counter the threat from short- and medium-range ballistic missiles.

In accordance with section 223 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), the committee recommends the transfer of $56.0 million of the funds from PE 63892C for advanced procurement of SM–3 interceptors to be executed by the Missile Defense Agency.

Furthermore, the committee recommends an additional increase of $55.0 million for SM–3 production. Of this amount, $20.0 million is for facility upgrades that will increase the capacity to manufacture 4 or more SM–3 missiles per month in fiscal year 2010, and $35.0 million is for long-lead procurement of an additional 12 SM–3 missiles.

Therefore, the committee recommends a total increase of $111.0 million for procurement of SM–3 interceptors.

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense procurement

The budget request contained no funds for advanced procurement for Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) Fire Units #3 and #4.

Consistent with the findings of the Joint Capabilities Mix Study II, which indicated that the combatant commanders require twice as many THAAD interceptors than the 96 now planned, the committee recommends an increase of funds for THAAD production.

In accordance with section 223 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), the committee recommends the transfer of $65.0 million of the funds in PE 63881C for the procurement of advanced components for THAAD Fire Units #3 and #4 to be executed by the Missile Defense Agency.

Furthermore, the committee recommends an additional $75.0 million to begin long-lead procurement of additional THAAD interceptors and the ground segments.

Therefore, the committee recommends a total increase of $140.0 million for advanced procurement of THAAD Fire Units #3 and #4.

Rapid Acquisition Fund

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $102.0 million for Rapid Acquisition Fund. The committee recommends authorization of $50.0 million and a transfer of $102.0 million to title XV of this Act.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2009 contained $8.9 billion for National Guard and Reserve Equipment. The committee recommends authorization of $9.7 billion, an increase of $800.0 million, for fiscal year 2009.

The committee notes that the events of September 11, 2001, Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) have caused dramatic changes in how national guard and reserve components are used to support overseas operational missions and domestic security and preparedness tasks. The national guard and reserve forces are no longer a strategic reserve component but are now considered an operational reserve force. Further, the committee notes that many non-deployed national guard and reserve units have significant equipment shortages compared to required equipment levels, caused by a combination of increases in required equipment, the need to prioritize equipment going to deployed forces, and changes in Army standards for substitute equipment. While the Army has articulated a plan to address this issue, the committee is concerned that the current timelines for doing so are too long and pose too much risk in the event of a large-scale national emergency or unanticipated overseas deployment requirement. As a result, the committee authorizes additional funding for equipment.

The committee is aware the budget request provides a significant increase in procurement funding for national guard and reserve component equipment from previous budget requests; however, the committee notes that despite this increase in funds, significant equipment shortfalls will continue for some national guard and reserve component units. In addition, the committee notes that in past budget years, despite plans to provide significant equipment to the National Guard and reserves, that the promised funding and equipment has not actually reached national guard and reserve units due to changes in Army priorities. The committee urges the Army to create better audit and tracking procedures for funds provided by Congress for reserve component equipment to ensure that the equipment needs of the national guard and reserves are appropriately addressed.

The committee is aware that equipment items on the Army's unfunded priority list for fiscal year 2009 are considered to be critical dual-purpose unfunded equipment programs for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve. The committee expects funds authorized in this section would be used in some capacity to address funding shortfalls for these unfunded programs. The committee strongly believes the National Guard and reserve components should receive an equitable share of funding and equipment distribution and that reserve components should be better integrated into the equipping process.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2009 Request Qty	FY 2009 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	RESERVE EQUIPMENT				800,000		800,000
	ARMY RESERVE						
001	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	NAVY RESERVE						
002	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	MARINE CORPS RESERVE						
003	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	AIR FORCE RESERVE						
004	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT						
	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
005	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
006	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	TOTAL - NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT				**800,000**		**800,000**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT		**102,694,267**		**17,607**		**102,711,874**

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sections 101–104—Authorization of Appropriations

These sections would authorize the recommended fiscal year 2009 funding levels for all procurement accounts.

Section 105—National Guard and Reserve Equipment

This section would authorize $800.0 million for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, wheeled and tracked combat vehicles, tactical wheeled vehicles, ammunition, small arms, tactical radios, non-system training devices, logistic automation systems, and other critical procurement items for the national guard and reserve forces.

Section 106—Rapid Acquisition Fund

This section would authorize $50.0 million for the Rapid Acquisition Fund. The committee expects these funds would be made available as part of a U.S. Central Command Rapid Acquisition Fund that would be used by the Commander, U.S. Central Command, to rapidly address unforeseen, joint urgent operational needs. The committee notes that additional funding for the Rapid Acquisition Fund is authorized in title XV of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Section 111—Separate Procurement Line Items for Future Combat Systems Program

This section would require, beginning with the Fiscal Year 2010 President's Budget Request, separate procurement lines for five classes of equipment planned for procurement under the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program. These classes would be FCS manned ground vehicles, FCS unmanned ground vehicles, FCS unmanned aerial vehicles, FCS unattended ground systems, and other FCS elements.

Section 112—Restriction on Contract Awards for Major Elements of the Future Combat Systems Program

This section would prohibit the Army from awarding a contract for low-rate production or full-rate production for major elements of the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program to entities serving in the role of a lead systems integrator for the FCS program.

Section 113—Restriction on Obligation of Funds for Army Tactical Radio Pending Report

This section would require a report from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Networks and Information Integration, regarding Army tactical radio fielding plans and whether they are properly aligned to create the future battlefield network envisioned by the Army, as well as the future role of joint tactical radios in such a network. The report would be due to Congress by March 30, 2009. This section would prohibit obligation of 25 percent of the funds for tactical radios until the required report is received.

Secton 114—Restriction on Obligation of Procurement Funds for Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter Program Pending Certification

This section would limit the obligation of funding for the Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter (ARH) for fiscal year 2009 to not more than 20 percent of the authorized funding until 30 days after the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD/AT&L) certifies to the congressional defense committees that the ARH has satisfactorily completed a Limited User Test and has been approved by the USD/AT&L to enter production.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—Refueling and Complex Overhaul of the U.S.S. "Theodore Roosevelt"

This section would authorize the refueling and complex overhaul (RCOH) of the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Theodore Roosevelt* to commence in fiscal year 2009 and would authorize the first of three increments of funding planned for the RCOH.

Section 122—Applicability of Previous Teaming Agreements for "Virginia"-Class Submarine Program

This section would modify the multi-year procurement authority granted in the Fiscal Year 2008 National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 110–181) to include the requirement that any multi-year contract entered into between the Navy and the shipbuilders must specify that the previous teaming agreements for submarine construction between the two shipbuilders shall remain in effect.

Section 123—Littoral Combat Ship Program

This section would amend section 124 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) as amended by section 125 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) by allowing costs associated with economic inflation to exceed the cost cap of $460.0 million per vessel, provided that the increase for economic inflation does not exceed $10.0 million per vessel. The provision would also allow costs associated with the introduction of new technology, not fielded on the first two ships of the class, provided that the insertion of new technology would reduce life-cycle cost of the vessel, or the new technology is required to meet an emergent warfighting threat.

Section 124—Report on F/A–18 Procurement Costs, Comparing Multi-year to Annual

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on F/A–18 procurement to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009. The report would include the following:

(1) The number of F/A–18E/F and EA–18G aircraft programmed for procurement for fiscal years 2010 through 2015;

(2) The estimated procurement costs for those aircraft, if procured through annual procurement contracts;

(3) The estimated procurement costs for those aircraft, if procured through a multiyear procurement contract;

(4) The estimated savings that could be derived from the procurement of those aircraft through a multiyear procurement contract, and whether the Secretary considers the amount of those savings to be substantial;

(5) A discussion comparing the costs and benefits of obtaining those aircraft through annual procurement contracts with the costs and benefits of obtaining those aircraft through a multiyear procurement contract; and

(6) The recommendations of the Secretary as to whether Congress should authorize a multiyear procurement contract for those aircraft.

This section would also require the Secretary to submit the certifications required by section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, if the Secretary recommends that Congress authorize a multiyear procurement contract for F/A–18 aircraft. Additionally, this section would authorize the Secretary to obligate up to $100.0 million of the amount authorized for procurement of F/A–18E/F or EA–18G aircraft for cost reduction initiatives in fiscal year 2009, subject to the availability of appropriations.

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Section 131—Limitation on Retiring C–5 Aircraft

This section would allow the Secretary of the Air Force to retire C–5A aircraft from the inventory and replace the capability with C–17 aircraft if the cost analysis demonstrates such action is prudent in meeting strategic airlift requirements and does not significantly increase overall costs above those already planned. Before C–5A retirement can commence, the Secretary must submit to the congressional defense committees a cost analysis performed by a federally funded research and development center that concludes that retiring C–5A aircraft and procuring C–17 aircraft is more prudent in meeting strategic airlift mobility requirements than performing the Avionics Modernization and the Reliability Enhancement and Re-engining Programs on C–5A aircraft, and certify that operational risk will not increase in meeting the National Defense Strategy by retiring C–5A aircraft and procuring additional C–17 aircraft.

Section 132—Maintenance of Retired KC–135E Aircraft

This section would require the Air Force to maintain a minimum of 46 retired KC–135Es in Type-1000 storage.

Section 133—Repeal of Multi-Year Contract Authority for Procurement of Tanker Aircraft

This section would repeal the multi-year procurement contract authority provided in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) during the KC–X tanker-lease program.

Section 134—Report on Processes Used for Requirements Development for KC–X

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2008, that: examines the processes used to determine KC–X requirements; outlines why the KC–135R aircraft was established as the comparative baseline aircraft for KC–X; provides an evaluation of very large tanker aircraft as a potential Air Force aerial refueling platform; and, examines aerial refueling aircraft range, fuel offload at range and passenger/cargo carrying capabilities.

SUBTITLE E—JOINT AND MULTI-SERVICE MATTERS

Section 141—Body Armor Acquisition Strategy

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an executive agent for individual body armor and associated components and establish a procurement budget line item for body armor and personnel protection enhancements.

This section would also require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to report to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2009, detailing:

(1) The U.S. body armor industrial base;

(2) The strategic plan for sustaining the body armor industrial base, to include critical component suppliers; and

(3) The objective body armor system level of protection, weight, and manufacturing productivity and the research and development path for achieving the objective system.

The committee is aware that none of the military services have programmed funds in the Future Year's Defense Plan for the fielding of the latest generation of body armor and the military services continue to rely on supplemental funding for long-term sustainment. The committee is concerned this lack of planning and programming is adversely impacting the capability of the body armor industrial base and could potentially impact the industrial base's ability to rapidly respond to new threats or requirements.

Section 142—Small Arms Acquisition Strategy and Requirements Review

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States Government Accountability Office to audit the Department of Defense small arms requirements generation process and report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2009, on any statutory, regulatory, or procedural barriers that may affect the ability of the military services to rapidly field small arms.

This section would also require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act that details:

(1) The current inventory, acquisition objective, operational, and budgetary status of current small arms programs to include pistols, carbines, rifles, light, medium, and heavy machine guns;

(2) A plan for a joint acquisition strategy for small arms modernization with emphasis on a possible near-term competition for a new pistol and carbine;

(3) Analysis of current small arms research and development programs; and

(4) An analysis of any ongoing small arms capability gap assessments being pursued by the individual military services.

Section 143—Requirement for Common Ground Stations and Payloads for Manned and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a policy and acquisition strategy for manned and unmanned vehicle intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance payloads and ground stations, to be applicable through the Department of Defense, to achieve integrated research, development, test and evaluation, and procurement commonality.

Payloads included within the policy and acquisition strategy, by vehicle class, would be: signals intelligence; electro-optical; synthetic aperture radar; ground moving target indicator; conventional explosive detection; foliage penetrating radar; laser designator; chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, explosive detection; and national airspace operations avionics and sensors.

This section would also seek: commonality of ground systems by vehicle class; common management of vehicle and payloads; ground station interoperability standardization; open source software code; acquisition of technical data rights in accordance with section 2320 of title 10, United States Code; and acquisition of vehicles, payloads, and ground stations through competitive procurement.

Classes of vehicles for the purpose of this section are defined as:

(1) Tier II class: vehicles such as Silver Fox and Scan Eagle;

(2) Tactical class: vehicles such as RQ–7;

(3) Medium altitude class: vehicles such as MQ–1, MQ–1C, MQ–5, MQ–8, MQ–9, and Warrior Alpha; and

(4) High Altitude class: vehicles such as RQ–4, RQ–4N, unmanned airship systems, Constant Hawk, Angel Fire, Special Project Aircraft, Aerial Common Sensor, EP–3, Scathe View, Compass Call, and Rivet Joint.

Finally, this section would require a report be provided to the congressional defense committees, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the policy and acquisition strategy established for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance payloads and ground station to achieve integrated research, development, test and evaluation, and procurement commonality for manned and unmanned systems.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $79.6 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E). The committee recommends $79.7 billion, an increase of $109.5 million to the budget request.

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized	Conference House
TITLE II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION				
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	10,524,085	159,610	10,683,695	10,683,695
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	19,337,238	432,500	19,769,738	19,769,738
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	28,066,617	171,732	28,238,349	28,238,349
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	21,499,229	-654,350	20,844,879	20,844,879
Operational Test & Evaluation	188,772	0	188,772	188,772
TOTAL RDT&E AUTHORIZATIONS	**79,615,941**	**109,492**	**79,725,433**	**79,725,433**

ARMY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $10.5 billion for Army research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $10.7 billion, an increase of $159.6 million to the budget request.

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	19,832		19,832
0601102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	176,959	4,980	181,939
		Functionally Integrated Reactive Surface Technologies		[2,500]	
		Nanostructured Materials for Photovoltaic Applications		[2,000]	
		Solid State Shelter Lighting System		[480]	
		Nanocrystal Source Display		[1,500]	1,500
0601103A	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	76,980	5,500	82,480
		Science, Tech, Engineering, Mathematics at Coppin State		[1,000]	
		Program Increase		[4,500]	
0601104A	4	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	105,622		105,622
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, ARMY	**379,393**	**11,980**	**391,373**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602105A	5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	26,985	4,700	31,685
		Aircraft Skin Repair-Cold Spray		[3,000]	
		Ultrasonic Consolidation for Armor Applications		[1,700]	
0602120A	6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	46,147	9,330	55,477
		Dismounted Soldier Millimeter Wave BTID RF Tag		[2,000]	
		Command, Control, Communications and Computer Module		[1,500]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Electromagnetic Geolocation		[2,830]	
		Semi-Autonomous or Unattended PsychOp and Recon Tool		[3,000]	
		Cyber Forensics and Tracking Capability Tool		[1,000]	1,000
0602122A	7	TRACTOR HIP	18,192		18,192
0602211A	8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	42,013	1,200	43,213
		Intensive Quenching for Advanced Weapons Systems		[1,200]	
0602270A	9	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	16,611	7,000	23,611
		Silver Fox and Manta UAS		[4,000]	
		Knowledge Integration & Management Center of Excellence		[3,000]	
0602303A	10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	48,174	2,500	50,674
		Micro Safe and Arm Device for DOD Rocket Systems		[2,500]	
0602307A	11	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	19,664		19,664
0602308A	12	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	17,048		17,048
0602601A	13	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	55,234	34,000	89,234
		DOD Hydrogen PEM Fuel Cell Medium		[8,000]	
		Nano-Based, Rust Corrosion-UV Protection System		[300]	
		Fire Resistant Fuels		[4,800]	
		Dual Stage Variable Energy Absorber (DSVEA)		[3,000]	
		Glass Ceramic ArmorTechnology for Vehicle Survivability		[6,000]	
		Rapid Up-Armor Synthesis and Crashworthiness Design		[2,000]	
		Torque-Vectoring Rollover Prevention Technology		[1,400]	
		Nanofluids for Advanced Mobility		[2,200]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Tactical Metal Fabrication		[6,300]	
0602618A	14	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY / ROBOTICS	71,550	5,000	76,550
		Unmanned Rotorcraft for Risk Reduction - BIRRRD		[1,500]	
		Globally Accessible Manufacturing and Maintenance Activity		[3,500]	
0602622A	15	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECH	2,295		2,295
0602623A	16	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,531		7,531
0602624A	17	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	30,576	3,000	33,576
		Compact Automated Mechanical Clearance Platform		[3,000]	
0602705A	18	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	45,278		45,278
0602709A	19	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	25,647	10,650	36,297
		Power Efficient Microdisplay Development		[4,650]	
		Multi-Threat Detection Initiative MTDI		[3,000]	
		Miniaturized Sensors for Small and Tactical UAV		[3,000]	
0602712A	20	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	21,815	5,000	26,815
		Hawaii Undersea Chem Military Munitions Assessment Plan		[5,000]	
0602716A	21	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	17,348	25,000	42,348
		LWI Training based Collaborative Initiative		[25,000]	
0602720A	22	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	16,064	6,250	22,314
		Range Scrap Disposal		[1,250]	
		Integrated Enviro Control Sys and Cryogenic Agent Removal		[5,000]	
0602782A	23	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	24,014		24,014
0602783A	24	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	5,495		5,495

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0602784A	25	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	52,066		52,066
0602785A	26	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	16,412		16,412
0602786A	27	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	21,948	5,100	27,048
		Advanced Thermal Processing of Packaged Combat Rations		[2,100]	
		Wearable Personal Area Network Technology		[3,000]	
0602787A	28	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	75,395	25,500	100,895
		Bio-Engineering for Enhancement of Soldier Survivability		[3,000]	
		Adv Functional Nanomaterials for Biological Processes		[2,500]	
		Depression and Mood Disorders Research		[1,000]	
		Pharmacologic Agents to Reduce Hearing Loss		[1,600]	
		Measuring and Protecting Against Traumatic Brain Injury		[3,000]	
		Minimizing Health Effects of Air Toxics		[1,200]	
		Neuropsychiatric and Post Traumatic Stress Treatment		[1,200]	
		Orthopedic Implant Design and Manufacturing		[2,000]	
		Plasma Technology Laboratory		[1,000]	
		Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Attention Modification		[1,500]	
		Military Photomedicine Program		[6,000]	
		Program increase		[1,500]	
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, ARMY	**723,502**	**145,230**	**868,732**

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603001A	29	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	46,793	6,800	53,593
		Ballistic Precision Aerial Delivery System		[4,800]	
		Novel Flame Retardant Nylon Fabrics		[2,000]	
0603002A	30	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	59,043	89,150	148,193
		Center for Traumatic Injury to the Visual Sys and Brain		[5,000]	
		Controlled Release of Anti-Inflammatory and Tissue Repair		[6,000]	
		Corneal Wound Repair		[6,000]	
		Cardiac Surgery Robotic Computerized Telemanipulation		[2,000]	
		Chronic Tinnitus Treatment Program		[3,700]	
		Clinical Technology Integration for Military Health		[6,800]	
		Composite Tissue Allotransplantation Research		[5,000]	
		Emergency Department Preparedness Project		[2,000]	
		Magnetic Brain Stimulation for Traumatic Brain Injury Rehab		[1,000]	
		Jt Med. Logistics AIT Modernization Init: Navy Hospital Ships		[6,000]	
		Mild Traumatic Brain Injury and Triage Using Smart Sensors		[3,200]	
		Infectious and Inflammatory Disease Center		[2,000]	
		Institute of Surgical and Interventional Simulation		[3,000]	
		Locomotor Translational for Traumatic Brain Injury		[4,200]	
		National Trauma Institute		[3,000]	
		TeraStack Pilot for Army Telemedicine		[2,500]	
		Ultra-High Resolution Display		[5,200]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		USF College of Public Health		[5,000]	
		Digital Pen		[250]	
		Personal Status Monitor (Nightengale)		[2,500]	
		PTSD Telemedicine Support		[2,200]	
		Shock Trauma Center Operating Room Equipment		[2,100]	
		Telepharmacy Remote Medicine Device Unit		[3,000]	
		Smisson Cartledge Infuser		[2,000]	
		Ultra High-Speed MEMS Electromagnetic Cell Sorter		[5,500]	
		Program Increase		[2,800]	2,800
0603003A	31	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,277	29,900	87,177
		Polymer Matrix Technology for Rotorcraft Drive Systems		[5,000]	
		Mission Execution Technology Implementation		[10,000]	
		Non-Hazardous Infrared Anti-reflective Coatings for Sensors		[2,000]	
		Universal Control - Full Authority Digital Engine Control		[5,000]	
		Universal UAV-Resupply BURRO		[4,800]	
		Advanced Drive System Laser-Peening Technologies		[3,100]	
0603004A	32	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	73,697	9,900	83,597
		Lens-Less Micro Seeker Sys for Small Steerable Projectiles		[5,000]	
		Precision Molding ManTech for Large IR Aspheric Optics		[2,900]	
		Chemical Mechanical Self-Destruct Fuze		[2,000]	
0603005A	33	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE / FCS	107,992	42,950	150,942
		Fire Shield		[6,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Long Range Power Source for Unmanned Ground Vehicles		[4,000]	
		Comm. Viable Si/C power Semiconductors Using Superlattice		[3,200]	
		Li - Iron Phosphate Battery System for Army Hybrid HMMWV		[4,000]	
		Anitballistic Windshield Armor		[5,000]	
		Dynamometer Facility Upgrade Program		[4,250]	
		Heavy Duty Hybrid Electric Vehicle		[5,000]	
		Advanced Drivetrains for Enhanced Mobility and Safety		[2,500]	
		Tac. Wheeled Vehicle Condition Based Maintenance Tech		[4,000]	
		Composites for Light Weight, Low Cost Transportation Sys		[5,000]	
		User Evaluation of LASSO Vehicles		[2,000]	2,000
0603006A	34	C3 ADVANCED TECH	9,183		9,183
0603007A	35	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECH	6,853		6,853
0603008A	36	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	50,961		50,961
		Applied Communications and Information Networking		[7,000]	7,000
	36b	Maritime C4ISR System		[1,000]	1,000
0603009A	37	TRACTOR HIKE	14,562		14,562
0603015A	38	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	18,881	4,200	23,081
		Experiential Tech for Urban Warfare and Disaster Response		[4,200]	
		Joint Fires & Effects Training System		[6,500]	6,500
0603020A	39	TRACTOR ROSE	11,575		11,575
0603100A	40	IED DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	0		0
0603103A	41	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	10,564	2,000	12,564

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Unserviceable Ammunition Demil - Tooele Army Depot		[2,000]	
0603105A	42	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	7,116		7,116
0603125A	43	COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,064	2,000	15,064
		Army Field Test of Solar Power		[2,000]	
0603238A	44	GLOBAL SURV/AIR DEF/PRECISION STRIKE TECH DEMO	0		0
0603270A	45	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	23,996	1,500	25,496
		UWB-RWM for IED Countermeasures		[1,500]	
0603313A	46	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	63,998		63,998
0603322A	47	TRACTOR CAGE	12,372		12,372
0603606A	48	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECH	30,797		30,797
0603607A	49	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	8,809	1,500	10,309
		Integrated Fire Control System for Small Arms		[1,500]	
0603710A	50	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,916	16,100	56,016
		Hyperspectral Sensor for Improved Force Portection		[5,400]	
		Video Enhancement for Night Vision and Low-Light Video		[2,000]	
		Personal Miniature Thermal Viewer		[4,200]	
		Brownout Situational Awareness Sensor		[4,500]	
0603728A	51	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMOS	15,519		15,519
0603734A	52	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	7,654	7,600	15,254
		Enhanced Holographic Imager		[2,800]	
		Distributed Power from Wastewater		[2,800]	
		Synthetic Automotive Virtual Environments		[2,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603772A	53	ADV TAC COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECH	48,236	4,000	52,236
		Foliage Penetrating Radar (FORESTER)		[4,000]	
		Software Life Cycle Affordability Management		[2,500]	2,500
		SUBTOTAL, ATD, ARMY	**738,858**	**239,400**	**978,258**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
0603024A	54	UNIQUE ITEM IDENTIFICATION (UID)	649		649
0603305A	55	ARMY MISSILE DEF SYS INTEGRATION (NON SPACE)	14,005	6,500	20,505
		Compact Pulsed Power for Defense Applications		[4,000]	
		Composite Structure Design		[2,500]	
		Deployable Space and Electronic Warfare Analysis Tool		[4,000]	4,000
0603308A	56	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (SPACE)	19,986		19,986
0603327A	57	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	116,410	1,000	117,410
		Center for Defense Systems Research		[1,000]	
0603460A	58	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)			0
0603619A	59	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	29,234		29,234
0603627A	60	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS	3,840		3,840
0603639A	61	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION / FCS	45,866		45,866
0603653A	62	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	108,012	10,200	118,212
		Stryker Common Active Protection System (APS) Radar		[4,500]	
		Stryker family of vehicles research and development		[5,700]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603747A	63	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	30,716	6,000	36,716
		Headborne Energy Analysis and Diagnostic Sys (HEADS)		[2,000]	
		Net Shaped Direct-Sinistered Silicon Carbide Torso Plate		[4,000]	
0603766A	64	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	[12275]		
0603774A	65	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	2,588		2,588
0603779A	66	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	5,355	15,300	20,655
		Mobile Detection and Response System		[5,500]	
		LEAD Environmental, Energy, and Transp. Management		[500]	
		Renewable Energy Testing Center		[3,800]	
		Green Range and Impact Zone Pilot Program		[2,500]	
		Environmental Management Information Sys at Travis AFB		[500]	
		Internet-Based Environmental Compliance Management Sys		[2,500]	
0603782A	67	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL	414,357	-33,100	381,257
		WIN-T Increment 3 Reduction		[-33,100]	
0603790A	68	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	5,041		5,041
0603801A	69	AVIATION - ADV DEV	7,455		7,455
0603804A	70	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	44,141		44,141
0603805A	71	CSS CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	17,788		17,788
0603807A	72	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	26,308	1,500	27,808
		Leishmania Skin Test		[1,500]	
0603827A	73	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	36,558	-20,000	16,558
		Ground Soldier Systems		[-20,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603850A	74	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE			
		SUBTOTAL, ADV COMP DEV & PROTOTYPES, ARMY	**928,309**	**-8,600**	**919,709**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
0603808A	75	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM			
0604201A	76	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	71,562		71,562
0604220A	77	ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELOCOPTER (ARH)	135,652		135,652
0604270A	78	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT (MIP)	32,325	5,000	37,325
		Hostile Fire Indicator for Rotorcraft		[5,000]	
0604321A	79	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	[11000]		
0604328A	80	TRACTOR CAGE	16,807		16,807
0604329A	81	COMMON MISSILE	0		0
0604601A	82	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	42,414		42,414
0604604A	83	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,949		1,949
0604609A	84	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS	5,603		5,603
0604622A	85	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	2,901	3,000	5,901
		Multi-Purpose ISO Container Transporters		[3,000]	
0604633A	86	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	14,214		14,214
0604642A	87	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	0		0
0604645A	88	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-SDD	0		0
0604646A	89	NON-LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM	200,099		200,099

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0604647A	90	NON-LINE OF SIGHT CANNON	89,841		89,841
0604660A	91	FCS MANNED GRD VEHICLES & COMMON GRD VEHICLE	774,257	-101,000	673,257
		Program Reduction		[-101,000]	
0604661A	92	FCS SYSTEMS OF SYSTEMS ENGR & PROGRAM MGMT	1,413,945	-132,000	1,281,945
		Program Reduction		[-132,000]	
0604662A	93	FCS RECONNAISSANCE (UAV) PLATFORMS	34,379	15,000	49,379
		Program Increase		[15,000]	
0604663A	94	FCS UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLES	96,918	8,000	104,918
		Program Increase		[8,000]	
0604664A	95	FCS UNATTENDED GROUND SENSORS	12,967		12,967
0604665A	96	FCS SUSTAINMENT & TRAINING R&D	539,145		539,145
0604666A	97	MODULAR BRIGADE ENHANCEMENT	64,900	10,000	74,900
		Program Increase		[10,000]	
0604710A	98	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS	44,508		44,508
0604713A	99	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	2,499		2,499
0604715A	100	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - SDD	35,424		35,424
0604741A	101	AIR DEFENSE CZ AND INTELLIGENCE - (C-RAM)	22,415		22,415
0604742A	102	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	26,244		26,244
0604746A	103	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	23,582		23,582
0604760A	104	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)	16,095		16,095
0604780A	105	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	29,468		29,468
0604783A	106	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	676		676

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0604802A	107	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - SDD	52,140		52,140
0604804A	108	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT	37,718		37,718
0604805A	109	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	9,795		9,795
0604807A	110	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIO DEF EQUIPMENT - SDD	34,971	3,000	37,971
		Rotary Valve Pressure Swing Absorption Oxygen Generator		[3,000]	
0604808A	111	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER (FCS)	126,475	-62,200	64,275
		Landmine Warfare Barrier - SDD Reduction		[-62,200]	
0604812A	112	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM			
0604814A	113	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS / XM 982	78,197	-15,000	63,197
		Realign to Excalibur Projectile Procurement		[-15,000]	
0604817A	114	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	10,909		10,909
0604818A	115	ARMY TACTICAL C&C HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	67,535		67,535
0604820A	116	RADAR DEVELOPMENT			
0604822A	117	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	60,308		60,308
0604823A	118	FIREFINDER	47,845		47,845
0604827A	119	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - WARRIOR	15,790		15,790
0604854A	120	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS	42,300	5,000	47,300
		M109A6 Paladin Virtual Sys Development and Modernization		[5,000]	
0604869A	121	PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM	431,270		431,270
0604870A	122	NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL MONITORING SENSOR NET	6,260		6,260
0605013A	123	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	73,740	3,000	76,740
		Health informatics initiative		[3,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0605450A	124	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	118,517		118,517
		SUBTOTAL, SDD, ARMY	**4,964,559**	**-258,200**	**4,706,359**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0603808A	125	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM			
0604256A	126	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	21,416		21,416
0604258A	127	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,498		13,498
0604759A	128	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	64,618		64,618
0604812A	129	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM			
0605103A	130	RAND ARROYO CENTER	16,339	3,000	19,339
		Program Increase		[3,000]	
0605301A	131	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	174,601		174,601
0605326A	132	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	28,271	12,000	40,271
		Warfighting Study of Future Technologies and Tactics - Av		[3,000]	
		Gunfire Detection System for Unmanned Aerial Vehicles		[9,000]	
0605502A	133	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		5,000	5,000
		Electro-Magnetic Flak Impulse System		[5,000]	
0605601A	134	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	342,079		342,079
0605602A	135	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	74,624	3,000	77,624
		MOTS All Sky Imager (MASI)		[3,000]	
0605604A	136	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	41,066		41,066

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0605605A	137	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	2,835		2,835
0605606A	138	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	5,054		5,054
0605702A	139	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	8,289		8,289
0605706A	140	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	17,028		17,028
0605709A	141	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS			
0605712A	142	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	72,942		72,942
0605716A	143	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	63,382		63,382
0605718A	144	SIMULATION & MODELING FOR ACQ, RQTS, & TNG	5,325		5,325
0605801A	145	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	73,748		73,748
0605803A	146	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	42,905		42,905
0605805A	147	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECT. AND SAFETY	20,857		20,857
0605857A	148	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	5,125		5,125
0605898A	149	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	15,665		15,665
0909999A	150	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, ARMY	**1,109,667**	**23,000**	**1,132,667**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0603778A	151	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	59,749		59,749
0603820A	152	WEAPONS CAPABILITY MODIFICATIONS UAV	0		0
0102419A	153	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	356,434		356,434
0203726A	154	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	15,860	1,500	17,360

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Fire Support Technology Improvement Program		[1,500]	
0203735A	155	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	141,114	5,800	146,914
		Condition Based Maintenance for Military Vehicles		[1,000]	
		Ground Combat Systems Electronic Enhancements		[4,800]	
0203740A	156	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	37,151		37,151
0203744A	157	AIRCRAFT MOD/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	452,787		452,787
0203752A	158	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	332		332
0203758A	159	DIGITIZATION	9,534		9,534
0203759A	160	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW	38,418		38,418
0203764A	161	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	0		0
0203801A	162	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	37,871		37,871
0203802A	163	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	1,527	15,000	16,527
		Close Combat Missile Modernization (Javelin)		[10,000]	
		Program Increase		[5,000]	
0203808A	164	TRACTOR CARD	19,601		19,601
0208010A	165	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	920		920
0208053A	166	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	1,957	6,000	7,957
		JTAGS Preplanned Product Improvement		[6,000]	
0208058A	167	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	2,936		2,936

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0301359A	168	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM			
0303028A	169	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	0		0
0303140A	170	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	38,090		38,090
0303141A	171	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	104,934	-6,000	98,934
		Multi-Band Integrated SATCOM Terminal		[-6,000]	
0303142A	172	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	106,327	-40,000	66,327
0303150A	173	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	12,922		12,922
		Global Command and Control System Army		[-1,000]	-1,000
0303158A	174	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	15,203		15,203
0305204A	175	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	50,976		50,976
0305206A	176	AIRBORNE RECONNAISANCE SYSTEMS			
0305208A	177	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS		13,000	13,000
		Blast Damage Assess. Risk Analysis and Mitigation App		[4,000]	
		Constant Look Operational Support Environment (CLOSE)		[4,000]	
		Assymmetric Threat Response and Analysis (ATRAP)		[5,000]	
		Heuristic Internet Protocol Packet Inspection Engine		[3,500]	3,500
0702239A	178	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,023		1,023

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0708045A	179	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	69,084	9,000	78,084
		Vehicle Common Armor Manufacturing Process (VCAMP)		[4,000]	
		Composite Rotorcraft Airframe Development		[2,000]	
		Helicopter Vulnerability Reduction		[3,000]	
1001018A	180	NATO JOINT STARS	0		0
9999999A	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	105,047		105,047
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYS DEVELOPMENT, ARMY	**1,679,797**	**6,800**	**1,686,597**
		Total, RDT&E Army	**10,524,085**	**159,610**	**10,683,695**

Items of Special Interest

Advanced lithium iron phosphate battery system for light tactical vehicles

The budget request contained $107.9 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology, but contained no funds for advanced lithium iron phosphate battery systems for combat hybrid high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWV).

The committee understands that technology developed under a small business innovative research program uses advanced lithium iron phosphate battery systems for HMMWVs for demonstrations of "silent watch" missions. The committee notes this technology could provide a 5 to 10 times increase in capability over lead acid batteries that the military services currently use.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63005A for the advancement and demonstration of a lithium iron phosphate battery system for use on a combat hybrid HMMWV platform.

Antiballistic windshield armor

The budget request contained $107.9 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology, but contained no funds for antiballistic windshield armor (AWA) prototype demonstrations.

The AWA is a bolt-on device for tactical wheeled vehicles and is based on an oversized periscope concept using an upper and lower set of stainless mirrors backed by armor. The committee understands significant work is being performed to accelerate the development of the AWA design that could potentially provide improved blast protection and improved visibility for the warfighter during and following an enemy attack.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63005A for the continued development and future demonstration of AWA prototypes.

Army intelligent agent software programs

The budget request contained $3.4 million in PE 63006A for Vertical Integration of Space Technology Applications (VISTA). VISTA is an Army Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) sponsored program designed to use "intelligent agent" software to manage and distribute space-based capabilities to Army users operating at multiple echelons. The committee is aware of another SMDC program, Joint Awareness Warfighter-Space (JAWS), which is being developed to address many of the same operational needs that are used to justify the VISTA project. The committee is further aware that an operational prototype of JAWS is scheduled to be delivered to the Army Battle Lab for testing in January 2009, following three years of development.

The committee notes an opportunity to leverage these two efforts. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to examine the feasibility of merging the VISTA and JAWS projects to make optimal use of the Department's investment. The Secretary shall submit a report describing the results of this examination to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009.

Army missile modernization

The budget request contained $1.5 million in PE 23802A for Army missile product improvement research and development.

The committee notes with concern that the Army's fiscal year 2009 budget contains funds for neither upgrades to the Javelin and the ground launched version of the tube-launched, optically-tracked, wire-guided (TOW) missiles nor a development program for new missiles to replace the Javelin and TOW.

Given the rapid pace of counter-missile technologies, the committee believes it is imperative that the Army begin a research and development effort to upgrade or replace Javelin and TOW to ensure the United States maintains its technical superiority in battlefield missile systems. The committee urges the Army, as it considers its fiscal year 2010 budget, to fund a new research and development effort to address the need to upgrade or replace the successful Javelin and ground-launched TOW missile families.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 23802A for the Army to begin a missile upgrade or replacement research and development program for the Javelin and TOW missiles.

Chemical mechanical self-destruct fuze

The budget request contained $73.7 million in PE 63004A for weapons and munitions advanced technology, but contained no funds for chemical-mechanical self-destruct fuze demonstrations.

The committee is aware a chemical-mechanical self-destruct fuze device is currently under development and has progressed through an initial proof-of-principle ballistic test with positive results. The committee understands this technology could decrease the rate of unexploded ordnance on the battlefield.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63004A to support demonstration and qualification testing of a chemical-mechanical self-destruct fuze.

Common Missile Warning System

The committee is encouraged by the Army's fielding of the Common Missile Warning System, but remains concerned with the delay the Army is experiencing in the fielding of infra-red countermeasures (IRCM) laser-based systems on rotary aircraft. The Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasures (ATIRCM) system has been in development since the mid-1990s. The committee understands that the Department of Defense has fielded other laser-based countermeasures and is considering additional developing technologies that will significantly reduce the size and weight of this capability when compared to current systems. Given the delays in the fielding of ATIRCM, the committee believes that the Department of the Army should take immediate steps to accelerate the fielding of laser-based countermeasures for the protection of Army rotary aircraft in theater.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, a report on laser-based countermeasures across the Department of Defense. This report shall be submitted within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and shall include the Army's plan to consider technologies other

than the ATIRCM system to provide a functional laser-based IRCM for both fixed- and rotary-wing platforms.

Condition-based maintenance

The committee recognizes the efforts underway to integrate condition-based maintenance (CBM) in the Department of the Army's Future Combat Systems (FCS) vehicles and other Army platforms. The CBM development program within FCS seeks to provide diagnostic and prognostic capabilities aimed at performing maintenance based on the actual condition of a component or system versus predetermined, time-phased maintenance. The committee understands that the Department of the Army may be pursuing development of similar CBM software programs for Army vehicles outside the work being conducted within the FCS program. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2009, detailing all current and planned CBM software projects to include the cost of each project, expected maintenance cost savings, and requirements.

Data links aerial systems

The committee recognizes that a new radio software waveform, the high-band networking waveform (HNW), is intended to be the backbone line-of-sight communications data link for the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN–T) and Future Combat Systems (FCS) programs. HNW is being specifically designed to enable internet protocol net-centric operations, create a multi-point to multi-point network, and provide other advantages not previously available with the common data link (CDL) waveform, including the ability for radios to automatically establish communications with one another and form a robust network without operator intervention.

The committee is also aware that the Army is in the process of obtaining full government purpose rights for use of the HNW for the federal government. Once those rights are secured, the HNW would be available for use by all military services and maintained in Department of Defense libraries to ensure that future revisions or changes will be interoperable.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act detailing its legislative requirements (related to required communications data links for aerial systems), for the transmission and reception of communications, intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance data and other data, in support of service-unique and joint operations. The committee expects that the report will include joint service requirements as well as conclusions of previous related studies, including the WIN–T line-of-sight backbone study, the Navy joint-CDL working group report, and the Army's FCS network data link study.

Dynamometer facility upgrade program

The budget request contained $107.9 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology, but contained no funds for the Dynamometer facility upgrade program.

The committee recognizes current dynamometers used by the Army for combat and tactical vehicle powertrain assessments lack

modern technology upgrades. The committee understands improved dynamometers could improve the Army's ability to rapidly assess and evaluate conventional and hybrid electric powertrains and their associated components. The committee believes this capability could provide improved knowledge regarding powertrain subsystem reliability, durability, and safety, as well as help identify any potential power train problems at the earliest stage of development.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.3 million, in PE 63005A for the Dynamometer facility upgrade program.

Enhanced holographic imager

The budget request contained $7.7 million in PE 63734A for military engineering advanced technology, but contained no funds for the final phase of development for the enhanced holographic imager.

The holographic imager system is used to produce three-dimensional imagery for the Army's tactical battlefield visualization program. The committee notes that digital holographic images have proven to be an extremely useful capability for deployed Army and Special Operations Command warfighters. The committee further notes that over 1,700 holographic images were provided to soldiers in theater in calendar year 2007. Planned efforts for the final phase will be to develop a field-deployable imager and to improve the process to produce holograms three times faster than the current system.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.8 million in PE 63734A to complete the development of the enhanced holographic imager.

Future Combat Systems

The budget request contained $3.6 billion for the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee expressed its concern with the schedule delays, cost growth, and reduced scope of the FCS program since its inception in fiscal year 2003. The committee also notes that the Army's growing need for funding to achieve its many other priorities, including completion of modular unit conversions, growth in the size of the Army, reset of equipment used in combat, improving the capability of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve, and modernization of current Army equipment would eventually require the realignment of the FCS program to a more affordable and deliberate schedule. Over the past year, the committee's concerns have only grown more acute as additional information on the cost of achieving the Army's numerous major initiatives came into more specific relief and the FCS program continued to struggle with developing critical technology elements.

The committee continues to be concerned with specific aspects of the FCS program and its relationship to the Army's overall future needs. One element of concern includes the simultaneous development of the FCS communications network and FCS vehicles. It is the committee's understanding that FCS manned ground vehicles will depend upon a robust, pervasive, and high-performance communications network for much of their survivability. In addition,

the committee understands that some progress on development of the network has been made during the system development and demonstration phase. However, given the current lack of clear requirements, mature technology, and progress on vital complementary programs necessary to develop the network on schedule, the committee notes that there is significant risk that delays in achieving the FCS network could lead to fielding of FCS manned ground vehicles without the FCS network support the Army considers essential to achieve FCS vehicle survivability requirements.

A second area of concern is the current misalignment of FCS program testing events, knowledge points, and major program decisions. In its 2007 and 2008 reports on the FCS program, the Government Accountability Office noted that most major program and funding decisions occur before significant program test events intended to demonstrate progress on individual FCS program technologies and the ambitious FCS system of systems integration goals. One example is the program's current plan to request more than $1.2 billion in procurement funding in the fiscal year 2011 budget more than two years prior to the first significant FCS network demonstration in late 2012. The Army also intends to request $2.9 billion in FCS procurement funding in fiscal year 2012, which Congress would have to approve almost two years before the FCS milestone C low-rate initial production decision in fiscal year 2013. In addition, the committee notes that even some near-term elements of the FCS program, including the Non-Line of Sight Launch System, are scheduled for milestone C decisions on beginning low-rate initial production prior to completion of major testing events and required certifications. The committee believes that such contradictions of long-standing Department of Defense (DOD) procurement policies, including the concept of "fly before you buy," may lead to significant program delays and cost increases as additional development work occurs late in the program.

Overall, while the committee understands that the FCS program is an unprecedented development effort seeking to integrate 14 distinct elements, an entirely new battle command software system, and a complex wireless battlefield network, the committee does not believe that such an unusual and ambitious program structure obviates the need for the Army to follow established DOD acquisition policies. While some selected Army force protection programs have been permitted to bypass standard acquisition policies due to urgent combat needs, the committee does not believe that the FCS program meets that criteria, primarily due to its long delivery timelines for its major elements and the immaturity of many critical FCS technologies despite six years of system development and demonstration activities and an expenditure of $15.0 billion in development funding. However, should elements of the FCS program be deemed appropriate to fill theater operational needs, the committee would support fielding of selected FCS elements using rapid equipping or other expedited procurement procedures outside the FCS program.

Future Combat Systems manned ground vehicles

The budget request contained $774.3 million in PE 64660A for research and development of Future Combat Systems (FCS) manned ground vehicles.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for 2008, the committee noted its concern with the simultaneous nature of the development of FCS manned ground vehicles and the FCS communications network upon which the manned ground vehicles depend on to meet key survivability requirements. The committee notes that recent analysis by the Government Accountability Office points to likely delays to the FCS communications network development and continuing challenges with critical vehicle technology elements, including vehicle armor. In addition, the committee is concerned that the current program schedule will not provide Department of Defense and Army officials with adequate information at critical decision points related to FCS manned ground vehicles about the performance of the communications network. Absent such information, the committee remains concerned that the FCS vehicle designs could be based upon assumptions concerning the communications network that prove inaccurate, requiring significant vehicle design changes.

The committee recommends $673.3 million, a decrease of $101.0 million, in PE 64660A for FCS manned ground vehicle research and development. Within the amount provided, the committee expects the Army to prioritize common vehicle chassis work necessary to field the Non-Line of Sight Cannon.

Future Combat Systems modular brigade enhancement

The budget request contained $64.9 million in PE 64666A for Future Combat Systems (FCS) modular brigade enhancement research and development.

The committee notes that this program element is the primary source of funds for activities of the Army Evaluation Task Force (AETF), a unit tasked with evaluation and development of near-term FCS program equipment, including FCS spin out 1 equipment, the small unmanned aerial vehicle, and small unmanned ground vehicle. The committee is concerned that requested funding in fiscal year 2009 is not sufficient to accommodate the evaluation and test activities necessary to meet the spin out 1 fielding timeline.

The committee recommends $74.9 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 64666A for FCS modular brigade enhancement and AETF activities.

Future Combat Systems system of systems engineering and program management

The budget request contained $1.4 billion in PE 64661A for Future Combat Systems (FCS) system of systems engineering and program management.

The committee notes that this program element includes the management reserve for the FCS program, which has been approximately seven percent of total program funding during the past two program years. In addition, the committee notes that this program element includes the contractor fees for the FCS program, which are calculated on a fixed formula based upon total contractor funding in the FCS program. The committee further notes that both of these elements can be adjusted based on funding adjustments to

other elements of the FCS program recommended by the committee.

The committee recommends $1.3 billion, a decrease of $132.0 million, in PE 64661A for FCS system of systems engineering and program management.

Future Combat Systems unmanned aerial vehicles

The budget request contained $34.4 million for Future Combat Systems (FCS) unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV).

The committee notes that of the total $34.4 million requested for FCS unmanned aerial vehicles, only $14.3 million was requested for the FCS class I UAV, representing just four-tenths of one percent of total requested FCS funding. The committee notes that the Micro Air Vehicle, an early precursor to the FCS class I UAV, is already in use in Iraq by Navy explosive ordnance disposal teams, but that the FCS program's current schedule will not deliver a full-capability prototype class I UAV until the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2011. The committee supports additional funding for the FCS class I UAV in order to accelerate its readiness for fielding in an FCS spin out or directly to theater based on operational needs.

The committee recommends $49.4 million, an increase of $15.0 million, in PE 64662A for development of FCS unmanned aerial vehicles, in order to support accelerated development of the FCS class I UAV.

Future Combat Systems unmanned ground vehicles

The budget request contained $96.9 million in PE 64663A for Future Combat Systems (FCS) unmanned ground vehicles.

The committee notes that of the total $96.9 million requested for FCS unmanned ground vehicle development, only $8.2 million was requested for the FCS small unmanned ground vehicle (SUGV), representing just two-tenths of one percent of total FCS requested funding. The SUGV is an FCS element based on the PackBot robot system in use in Iraq and Afghanistan today. The committee supports additional funding for the FCS SUGV in order to accelerate its readiness for fielding in an FCS spin out or directly to theater based on operational needs.

The committee recommends $104.9 million, an increase of $8.0 million, in PE 64663A for FCS unmanned ground vehicles, in order to support accelerated development of the FCS SUGV.

Glass ceramic armor technology for vehicle survivability

The budget request contained $55.2 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but contained no funds to develop transparent ceramic armor through Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL).

The committee is aware that current transparent armor systems used on tactical and combat vehicles for protection against large improvised explosive devices and explosively formed penetrators are extremely heavy and impact vehicles' performance as well as decrease vehicles' life cycles. The committee notes that improvements in weight reduction without sacrificing survivability could benefit vehicle platforms that require improvements with balancing critical key performance parameters of payload, protection, and performance.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62601A for the advancement of glass ceramic armor technology for vehicle survivability.

Global Command and Control System-Army

The budget request contained $12.9 million in PE 33150A for the Global Command and Control System-Army.

The committee is concerned over a lack of commitment by the services to transition from service stove-piped command and control systems to a joint architecture, such as the Network Enabled Command and Control system. The services can no longer sustain a multitude of disparate systems, from a technical management or financial perspective. Yet there appears to be no clear strategy articulated to senior decision makers showing how the services will move from multiple independent systems, to a joint, federated approach. This approach does not necessarily entail adopting a single system, but until the services commit to a unified approach to commonality, the military services will continue to waste funds and inhibit the benefits accrued by jointness.

The committee recommends $11.9 million, a decrease of $1.0 million in PE 33150A.

Ground soldier systems concept development

The budget request contained $36.6 million in PE 63827A for soldier systems advanced development of which $25.5 million is for the ground soldier system, a "new start" development program.

The committee is concerned that the Army is proposing a "new start" system development and demonstration program for a soldier ensemble despite the service's limited resources and the success of the Land Warrior (LW) system. The committee is aware that LW has been deployed in response to urgent operational needs statements from units in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and has proven to increase combat capability of the individual soldier, as well as the efficiency of small units. The operational use of LW in OIF has yielded soldier-driven improvements, primarily in weight reduction and has increased LW's demand by deployed and "next-to-deploy" units. The committee notes the Army has requested $102.0 million in the amended fiscal year 2008 budget request for ongoing military operations to provide LW systems for the next-to-deploy Stryker Brigade Combat Team. The committee believes the proposed level of funding for a new start ground soldier system program is not justified. The committee believes that additional resources should be allocated to the LW program in current and future budget requests and encourages the Army to continue to leverage and apply lessons learned from LW systems for next-generation soldier systems.

The committee recommends $16.6 million, a decrease of $20.0 million, in PE 63827A for the ground soldier system development program and realigns this funding to Other Procurement, Army budget activities to procure additional LW systems in response to urgent operational needs statements.

Heavy duty hybrid electric vehicle demonstration

The budget request contained $107.9 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology, but contained

no funds for the demonstration of low-emission and fuel-efficient hybrid electric engine propulsion systems for heavy tactical wheeled vehicles.

The committee understands low emission and fuel efficient hybrid electric engine propulsion systems could be used to develop and demonstrate next generation hybrid electric powertrains on up to five heavy tactical wheeled vehicles. The committee notes these powertrains could operate on bio-diesel and could also demonstrate auxiliary power capability. The committee is aware that prior year funds have been appropriated for an Air Force first-generation hybrid electric heavy tactical wheeled vehicle program and the committee expects the Army to leverage results from the Air Force program.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63005A for the continued refinement of system development and demonstration of a low emission and fuel efficient hybrid electric engine propulsion system for the Army's heavy tactical wheeled vehicle fleet.

High mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicle bloc improvements

The budget request contained no funding in PE 64609A for light tactical vehicles to include the high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV) bloc improvement program.

The HMMWV bloc improvement program could provide the Army with the ability to conduct assessments of technologies to better meet requirements and to react to evolving threats in combat theaters of operation. The committee understands this program could support readily available product improvements in payload, power, protection, range, and reliability. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to provide the necessary resources to continue to develop and insert critical technology product improvements into the HMMWV fleet.

Integrated fire control system for small arms

The budget request contained $8.8 million in PE 63607A for the joint service small arms program, but contained no funds for an integrated fire control system for small arms.

The committee understands the joint service small arms capability assessment defined a list of 14 desired capabilities for existing small arms platforms in the relevant technology areas of technical fire control, tactical fire control in the small unit, and new concepts and applications. The committee recognizes an integrated fire control system could address 1 of these 14 desired capabilities and would enhance the warfighter's real-time cognition and decision-making ability especially in urban, counter-insurgent, and non-linear combat environments.

The committee recommends $10.3 million, an increase of $1.5 million, in PE 63607A, to further the development of an integrated fire control system for existing small arms platforms.

Joint Cargo Aircraft program

The Army budget request contained $267.2 million for procurement of seven Joint Cargo Aircraft (JCA).

The committee understands the Army plans to procure JCA to replace its C–23 and CH–47 fleets of aircraft that support the

Army's intra-theater time-sensitive cargo mission. The JCA sustainment strategy was completed in February 2007, but many details, such as core depot maintenance capabilities, distribution of depot maintenance funds between contractor logistics support and organic performance, and determination of public and private partnering will not be finalized until low-rate initial production.

The committee notes that the Secretary of the Army plans to fund procurement of initial spares, support equipment, training simulators, post-production modifications, and system engineering and management items through the Operations and Maintenance, Army (OMA) appropriation account. The committee is concerned by this approach because Congress has less oversight and more difficulty tracking obligations and expenditures for these items, and notes that these items are traditionally procured through research and development, or procurement appropriation accounts. Of further concern, the committee notes that the April 17, 2008, Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) acquisition program baseline documentation states that "operations and maintenance costs are not tracked and are not breachable."

The committee includes a provision, section 216, in title II of this Act that would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from funding initial spares, support equipment, training simulators, post-production modifications, and system engineering and management items through the O&M appropriations account.

Landmine Warfare/Barrier—system development and demonstration

The budget request contained $126.5 million in PE 64808A for Landmine Warfare/Barrier system development and demonstration.

The committee notes that $74.0 million of this amount is for continuing work on the Intelligent Munitions System (IMS), a system that the Army decided to remove from the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program, creating a reduced demand for the IMS system. The committee further notes that $52.5 million of the request is for the Ground Standoff Mine Detection System and the Airborne Surveillance, Target, Acquisition, and Minefield Detection System, two programs that are developing sensors for FCS platforms that will not be deployed until 2014. The committee is concerned that these sensor programs are not properly aligned with the development timelines of the FCS systems that will use them.

The committee recommends $64.3 million, a decrease of $62.2 million, in PE 64808A for Landmine Warfare/Barrier.

Multi-threat explosive detection initiative

The budget request contained $25.6 million in PE 62709A for night vision technology, but contained no funds for eye-safe standoff detection of multiple threat explosives technology.

The committee notes the continued need to accomplish standoff detection of multiple threat explosive devices, even at trace amounts.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62709A for the eye-safe standoff multiple threat explosive detection initiative.

Near-net shaped direct-sinistered silicon carbide torso plate technology

The budget request contained $30.7 million in PE 63747A for soldier support and survivability, but contained no funds for the expansion of near-net shaped direct-sinistered silicon carbide torso plate technology.

The committee understands near-net shaped direct-sinistered silicon carbide torso plate technology could expand alternate methods for manufacturing critical ceramic components used for vehicle and personnel protection programs. The committee notes these methods could provide for significant advances in life cycle costs, performance, and weight reduction.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63747A to evaluate near-net shaped direct-sinistered silicon carbide torso plate technology.

Platform soldier mission readiness system for tactical wheeled vehicles

The committee understands platform soldier mission readiness systems (PSMRS) is the central condition-based maintenance software solution for the Army's Future Combat Systems (FCS). Condition-based maintenance provides diagnostic and prognostic capabilities aimed at performing maintenance based on the actual condition of a component or system versus predetermined time-phased maintenance. The committee understands that PSMRS software could be spiraled from FCS into the tactical wheeled vehicle (TWV) fleet that would potentially achieve a 30 percent reduction in annual maintenance costs. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to develop a plan that would utilize a PSMRS program as part of the TWV fleet modernization effort. The committee understands this program could be implemented at the Army's Center of Industrial and Technical Excellence for Ground Combat and Tactical Systems.

Polymer matrix composites for rotorcraft drive systems

The budget request contained $57.3 million in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology, but contained no funds for the demonstration of structural composite rotorcraft drive system components.

The committee notes the opportunity to reduce costs of production, operations, and support of rotorcraft through the use of polymer matrix composite (PMC) technologies for major components such as rotorcraft drive system components.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63003A to demonstrate full-scale design, fabrication, and testing of PMC rotorcraft drive systems.

RAND Arroyo Center

The budget request contained $16.3 million in PE 65103A for the RAND Arroyo Center.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee expressed its concern about reductions in the Army's budget request for the RAND Arroyo Center, which is one of the Army's primary federally funded research and development centers. The

committee notes with concern that funding requested for fiscal year 2009 remained at the same level as fiscal year 2008. The committee continues to support stable funding for the RAND Arroyo Center and encourages the Army in its fiscal year 2010 budget submission to increase funding for this activity.

The committee recommends $19.3 million, an increase of $3.0 million, in PE 65103A for the RAND Arroyo Center.

Stryker family of vehicles research and development

The budget request contained $108.0 million in PE 63653A for research and development of upgrades to the Stryker family of vehicles.

The committee notes that, subsequent to the submission of the fiscal year 2009 budget request, the Army comptroller requested the committee move $38.7 million from Stryker program procurement to Stryker research and development to ensure full funding for the Stryker product improvement program (PIP). However, this request assumed committee approval of a fiscal year 2008 reprogramming that would have reduced Stryker research and development by $33.0 million. Because this reprogramming was not approved, only $5.7 million in additional funds for Stryker research and development are needed in fiscal year 2009 to fully fund the Stryker PIP.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.7 million in PE 63653A for Stryker vehicle research and development.

Torque-vectoring rollover prevention technology

The budget request contained $55.2 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but contained no funds for torque-vectoring rollover prevention technology.

The committee understands torque-vectoring allows active control of wheel speed ratio and torque distribution, typically through the application of multi-plate wet clutches coupled with advanced gear-train technology. The committee is aware domestic torque-vectoring technology could increase stability and performance in lightweight tactical wheeled vehicles.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.4 million in PE 62601A for the development of torque-vectoring rollover prevention technology in light tactical wheeled vehicles.

Warfighter Information Network—Tactical, increment 3, program

The budget request contained $414.4 million in PE 63782A for Warfighter Information Network—Tactical (WIN–T) research and development.

The committee notes that Increment 3 of the WIN–T program has not had an updated acquisition program baseline for more than two years. As a result, the committee is concerned that the $330.5 million in this program element for WIN–T Increment 3 is not based on a thorough understanding of program funding needs. In addition, the committee remains concerned that the WIN–T Increment 3 program has yet to complete the independent cost estimate or technology development validation required by the June 2007 Nunn-McCurdy program recertification.

The committee recommends $381.3 million, a decrease of $33.1 million, in PE 63782A for WIN–T research and development. The

committee expects the Army to fully fund WIN–T Increment 2 funding requested in this program element.

Weapon shot counter technology

The committee is aware that weapon shot counter technology for small arms weapons has been developed and tested by the Naval Surface Warfare Center and is being fielded by the United States Special Operations Command on the M4 carbine, MK11, and MK 12 sniper rifles. Rounds fired data allows weapons to be maintained at a high level of readiness with use-based technology rather than the antiquated calendar based maintenance. The committee notes preventive and predictive maintenance allows high wear parts such as barrels and bolts to be replaced prior to catastrophic failure and eliminates unnecessary weapon rebuilds and replacements. The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of the Army to evaluate the viability of fielding this technology for small arms weapons.

Wearable personal area network technology

The budget request contained $21.9 million in PE 62786A for warfighter technology, but contained no funds for wearable personal area network technology.

The committee understands wearable personal area network technology would develop clothing that could integrate electrical power distribution, data transmission, and communication networks to provide military personnel with the capability to operate and control a suite of miniature, personal communication systems. The committee notes this technology could provide critical weight reduction to the combat carrying load of the individual warfighter and improve combat effectiveness.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62786A for wearable personal area network technology.

NAVY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $19.3 billion for Navy research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $19.8 billion, an increase of $432.5 million to the budget request.

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601103N	1	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	103,707	7,000	110,707
		Ship Model Testing Facility		[7,000]	
0601152N	2	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	17,298		17,298
0601153N	3	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	407,271	3,000	410,271
		Energetics S&T Workforce		[3,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, NAVY	528,276	10,000	538,276
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602114N	4	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	79,913	3,900	83,813
		High Energy Conventional Energetics		[1,500]	
		Marine Mammal Hearing and Echolocation Research		[2,400]	
0602123N	5	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	131,310	15,200	146,510
		Optical Recognition Protocol for Biologics Detection		[3,200]	
		Composite Sea Lion Craft Project		[5,000]	
		Medium Voltage Distribution Employing High Fidelity Tech		[5,000]	
		Autonomous Superconducting Fault Current Limiting Sys		[2,000]	
0602131M	6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	36,480	4,000	40,480
		Warfighter Rapid Awareness Processing Technology		[4,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0602234N	7	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	0	3,000	3,000
		Infrared Materials Laboratories		[3,000]	
0602235N	8	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	77,054	4,500	81,554
		Test Environment for Adv Team Collaboration Missions		[2,000]	
		All-Weather Sense and Avoid for UAVs		[2,500]	
0602236N	9	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	93,862	2,000	95,862
		Remote Fuel Assessment System		[2,000]	
0602271N	10	RF SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	54,830	1,000	55,830
		Center for Hetero-Functional Materials		[1,000]	
0602435N	11	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	47,278	2,000	49,278
		Autonomous Undersea Vehicle Applications Center		[2,000]	
0602651M	12	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,084		6,084
0602747N	13	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	58,658		58,658
0602782N	14	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	47,869		47,869
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, NAVY	**633,338**	**35,600**	**668,938**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603114N	15	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	60,360	18,700	79,060
		Hyperspectral Targeting Sensor		[3,000]	
		Countermine Lidar UAV-based System (CLUBS)		[2,200]	
		Free Space Optical Communications Interrogator		[6,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Electromagnetic Railgun Program		[5,000]	
		High Speed Anti-Radiation Demonstrator		[2,500]	
0603123N	16	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	55,099	29,300	84,399
		Sea Fighter		[10,000]	
		High Strength Flame Resistant LCP Reinforced Netting		[3,000]	
		Superconducting DC Homopolar Motor		[2,000]	
		Multi-Fuel Combustor for Shipboard Fuel Cell Systems		[2,000]	
		Power Node Switching and Control Center		[3,000]	
		Repair Cell/Engineering Education Outreach Program		[1,000]	
		Integrated Ship and Motion Control Technology		[4,300]	
		Pure Hydrogen Supply from Logistic Fuels		[4,000]	
0603235N	17	COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	104,578		104,578
		High Integrity Global Positioning Systems (HIGPS)		[-61,200]	-61,200
0603236N	18	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	112,520	13,800	126,320
		Helo Ruggedized Avionics Displays		[6,800]	
		System for Intelligent Task Assignment & Readiness		[3,000]	
		Deployed ASW Sustainment Training		[4,000]	
0603271N	19	RF SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,058		37,058
0603640M	20	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	100,787	10,500	111,287
		Sniper Defeat and Combat Situational Awareness		[8,500]	
		Ballistic Helmet Development		[1,500]	
		New Class of Backpacks for Marine Electricity Independence		[500]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603651M	21	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEV	11,020		11,020
0603729N	22	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	12,129		12,129
0603747N	23	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	81,490	2,500	83,990
		Navy - Use of UNOLS Fleet		[2,500]	
0603758N	24	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMOS	70,216		70,216
0603782N	25	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECH	33,426		33,426
		SUBTOTAL, ATD, NAVY	**678,683**	**13,600**	**692,283**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
0603207N	26	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	66,133		66,133
0603216N	27	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	5,917	6,200	12,117
		Trigger and Alert Sonobuoy System		[2,500]	
		Port and Harbor Security Enhancement - AUV Platforms		[3,700]	
0603237N	28	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	5,905		5,905
0603254N	29	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	28,799	14,200	42,999
		Marine Mammal Awareness, Alert and Response Systems		[6,000]	
		Tactical E-Field Buoy Development		[7,000]	
		Holographic Optical Filters for LIDAR		[1,200]	
0603261N	30	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	4,298	5,000	9,298
		Peer-Reviewed Research Extremity War Injuries		[5,000]	
0603382N	31	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	4,367		4,367

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603502N	32	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE CM	119,164		119,164
0603506N	33	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	49,171		49,171
0603512N	34	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	120,511	3,000	123,511
		Improved Corrosion Protection for EMALS		[3,000]	
0603513N	35	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	4,003	10,500	14,503
		Power Conversion - High Density Power Generation Pckgs		[1,500]	
		Data Acquisition Reporting and Trending System (DARTS)		[3,000]	
		Diagnostic/Prognostic Pump System		[2,000]	
		High Temp Superconductor Propulsion Motor; DDG & CG(X)		[2,000]	
		IR LED Free Space Optics Communications Advancement		[2,000]	
0603525N	36	PILOT FISH	86,017		86,017
0603527N	37	RETRACT LARCH	93,078		93,078
0603536N	38	RETRACT JUNIPER	159,175		159,175
0603542N	39	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	1,094		1,094
0603553N	40	SURFACE ASW	29,574	3,900	33,474
		Connectory Expansion for Rapid ID of Tech Sources		[1,300]	
		Sonobuoy Flight Vehicle		[2,600]	
0603559N	41	SSGN CONVERSION	0		0
0603561N	42	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	141,720	28,500	170,220
		SSGN/Virginia Payload Tube Development		[15,000]	
		HBCU Applied Research Incubator		[3,500]	
		Sea Based Strategic Deterrent (UMLS)		[10,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603562N	43	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	10,212		10,212
0603563N	44	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	31,111	1,000	32,111
		Analytics for Shipboard Monitoring Systems (ASMS)		[1,000]	
0603564N	45	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	14,627	10,000	24,627
		Naval Ship Hydrodynamic Test Facilities, NSWC, Carderock		[10,000]	
0603570N	46	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	158,270		158,270
0603573N	47	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	0		0
0603576N	48	CHALK EAGLE	352,858		352,858
0603581N	49	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	371,008		371,008
0603582N	50	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	54,401		54,401
0603609N	51	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	8,124		8,124
0603611M	52	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES / EFV	316,052	-40,200	275,852
		Marine Corps Assault Vehicle Reduction		[-40,200]	
0603612M	53	USMC MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	0		0
0603635M	54	USMC GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM / JLTV	59,049	7,000	66,049
		Center for Geospatial Intelligence and Investigation		[1,000]	
		Urban Operations Laboratory		[6,000]	
0603654N	55	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	115,086		115,086
0603658N	56	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	38,316		38,316
0603713N	57	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,737		7,737
0603721N	58	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	19,632		19,632
0603724N	59	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,611		5,611

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603725N	60	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	4,086	16,200	20,286
		Critical Components for Ocean Alternate Energy Options		[2,500]	
		Wave Energy PowerBuoy Generating System		[3,500]	
		Swimmer Detection Sonar Network - PNS		[5,500]	
		Hydrokinetic Power Generator		[2,000]	
		Regenerative Fuel Cell Back-Up Power		[2,700]	
0603734N	61	CHALK CORAL	117,543		117,543
0603739N	62	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	2,846	1,000	3,846
		In Transit Visibility System		[1,000]	
0603746N	63	RETRACT MAPLE	138,091		138,091
0603748N	64	LINK PLUMERIA	60,444		60,444
0603751N	65	RETRACT ELM	139,139		139,139
0603755N	66	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	11,001		11,001
0603764N	67	LINK EVERGREEN	75,995		75,995
0603787N	68	SPECIAL PROCESSES	60,678		60,678
0603790N	69	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	10,129		10,129
0603795N	70	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	40,028	-23,800	16,228
		Affordable Weapons System		[15,000]	
		Extended Range Guided Munition Program Delay		[-38,800]	
0603851M	71	NONLETHAL WEAPONS	46,902		46,902
0603860N	72	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	99,929		99,929
0603879N	73	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE SYSTEM ENGINEER	41,807		41,807

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603889N	74	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS	0	1,500	1,500
		CRISSTL Ball		[1,500]	
0603925N	75	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS	0		0
0604272N	76	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED CM	63,244	4,500	67,744
		Compact Ultra-fast Laser System Development		[4,500]	
0604327N	77	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM	0		0
0604450N	78	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	0		0
0604707N	79	SEW ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	47,518		47,518
		SUBTOTAL, ACD & PROTOTYPES, NAVY	**3,440,400**	**48,500**	**3,488,900**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
0604212N	80	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	58,210		58,210
0604214N	81	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	29,924		29,924
0604215N	82	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	71,920	2,000	73,920
		Navy METCAL		[2,000]	
0604216N	83	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	70,329		70,329
0604218N	84	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	5,750		5,750
0604221N	85	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	3,589		3,589
0604230N	86	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	8,611	5,000	13,611
		Wireless Imaging and Sensor - AT Force Protection Initiative		[5,000]	
0604231N	87	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	128,742		128,742

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Global Command and Control System Maritime		[-1,000]	-1,000
0604234N	88	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	484,159		484,159
0604245N	89	H-1 UPGRADES	3,795		3,795
0604261N	90	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	45,790		45,790
0604262N	91	V-22A	68,763		68,763
0604264N	92	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,192		16,192
0604269N	93	EA-18	128,906		128,906
0604270N	94	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	106,932		106,932
0604273N	95	VH-71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	1,047,835		1,047,835
0604280N	96	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	834,650		834,650
0604300N	97	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	678,936		678,936
0604307N	98	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	188,500	3,000	191,500
		DDG-51 Class Permanent Magnet Hybrid Electric Propulsion		[3,000]	
0604311N	99	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	985		985
0604329N	100	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	19,574		19,574
0604366N	101	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	234,653		234,653
0604373N	102	AIRBORNE MCM	39,882		39,882
0604378N	103	INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL - COUNTER AIR SYS ENG	10,533		10,533
0604501N	104	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	153,558	5,000	158,558
		National RF R&D and Tech Transfer Center		[5,000]	
0604503N	105	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	143,453		143,453
0604504N	106	AIR CONTROL	8,191		8,191

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0604512N	107	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	42,843		42,843
0604518N	108	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	14,792		14,792
0604558N	109	NEW DESIGN SSN	167,357	2,000	169,357
		Large Scale Demonstration Item for VA-Class Bow Dome		[2,000]	
0604561N	110	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	0		0
0604562N	111	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	58,592		58,592
0604567N	112	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	72,932	73,200	146,132
		Automated Fiber Optic Manufacturing Initiative		[4,500]	
		MPF(F) Research and Development		[68,700]	
0604601N	113	MINE DEVELOPMENT	2,008		2,008
0604603N	114	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	0		0
0604610N	115	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	50,732		50,732
0604654N	116	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	10,858		10,858
0604703N	117	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIM, AND HUMAN FACTORS	5,263		5,263
0604727N	118	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	22,510		22,510
0604755N	119	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	35,999		35,999
0604756N	120	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	36,238		36,238
0604757N	121	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	57,574		57,574
0604761N	122	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	13,750		13,750
0604771N	123	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	7,833	7,000	14,833
		Reducing Operational Stress		[5,000]	
		U.S. Navy Pandemic Influenza Vaccine Program		[2,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0604777N	124	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	49,007		49,007
0604784N	125	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	0	2,000	2,000
		Augmentation for Force Protection at NAWCAD		[2,000]	
0604800N	126	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	1,532,748	262,500	1,795,248
		JSF Competitive Engine		[247,500]	
		F135 Technology Insertion		[15,000]	
0605013M	127	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	30,238		30,238
0605013N	128	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	72,497		72,497
0605172N	129	MULTINATIONAL INFORMATION SHARING (MNIS)	0		0
0605212N	130	CH-53K RDTE	570,484		570,484
0605430N	131	C/KC-130 AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM (AMP)	24,407		24,407
0605450N	132	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	62,324		62,324
0605500N	133	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	1,132,026		1,132,026
0304785N	134	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	16,678		16,678
		SUBTOTAL SDD, NAVY	**8,682,052**	**360,700**	**9,042,752**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0604256N	135	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	24,959		24,959
0604258N	136	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	80,337		80,337
0604759N	137	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	42,391	6,500	48,891
		Air Combat Enviro Test and Evaluation Facility Upgrades		[3,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Improved Interoperability to support NAVAIR and GWOT		[1,500]	
		SURETRAK Re-architecture and Sensor Augmentation		[2,000]	
0605152N	138	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	8,084		8,084
0605154N	139	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	49,745		49,745
0605155N	140	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	0		0
0605502N	141	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
0605804N	142	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	713		713
0605853N	143	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	51,568		51,568
0605856N	144	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,597		3,597
0605861N	145	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	69,913		69,913
0605862N	146	RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	0		0
0605863N	147	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	195,017		195,017
0605864N	148	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	356,254		356,254
0605865N	149	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	12,195		12,195
0605866N	150	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SUPPORT	2,708		2,708
0605867N	151	LINK CRIMSON	25,358		25,358
0605873M	152	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	24,687		24,687
0305885N	153	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	1,998		1,998
0804758N	154	SERVICE SUPPORT TO JFCOM, JNTC	5,148		5,148
0909999N	155	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, NAVY	**954,672**	**6,500**	**961,172**

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0603660N	156	ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS			
0604227N	157	HARPOON MODIFICATIONS	68,214		68,214
0604402N	158	UCAV PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT	275,823		275,823
0101221N	159	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	80,120	-5,600	74,520
		Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW)		[-23,300]	
		Arming, Fuzing, and Firing Systems		[13,300]	
		Advanced LINAC Facility		[4,400]	
0101224N	160	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	34,131		34,131
0101226N	161	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	7,384		7,384
0101402N	162	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	47,495		47,495
0203761N	163	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	34,469		34,469
0204136N	164	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	71,232		71,232
0204152N	165	E-2 SQUADRONS	54,096		54,096
0204163N	166	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	26,696		26,696
0204229N	167	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER	14,212	3,000	17,212
		Low-Cost Image-Based Navigation and Precision Targeting		[3,000]	
0204311N	168	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	20,565		20,565
0204413N	169	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	2,325		2,325
0204571N	170	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	28,017		28,017
0204574N	171	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,441		1,441

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0204575N	172	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	24,276		24,276
0205601N	173	HARM IMPROVEMENT	31,427	3,000	34,427
		Advanced Anti-Radiation Guided Missile Derivative		[3,000]	
0205604N	174	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	4,247		4,247
0205620N	175	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	21,720		21,720
0205632N	176	MK-48 ADCAP	15,879	1,000	16,879
		MK-48 Post Launch Comm System		[1,000]	
0205633N	177	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	122,906	3,200	126,106
		Ultraviolet-cure Structural Repair Adhesives		[2,000]	
		Helo Laminate Widescreen Development		[1,200]	
0205658N	178	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	3,625		3,625
0205675N	179	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	71,576		71,576
0206313M	180	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	273,696		273,696
0206623M	181	USMC GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	136,080	9,000	145,080
		Marine Corps Shotgun Modernization Program		[3,000]	
		Enhanced Military Vehicle Maintenance		[4,000]	
		Dev and Test Program for EMI Hardened Test Shelter		[2,000]	
0206624M	182	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	9,646		9,646
0207161N	183	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	6,679		6,679
0207163N	184	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	8,556		8,556

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0208058N	185	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	11,960		11,960
0301303N	186	MARITIME INTELLIGENCE			
0301323N	187	COLLECTION MANAGEMENT			
0301327N	188	TECHNICAL RECONNAISANCE AND SURVEILLANCE			
0301372N	189	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE - GDIP			
0303109N	190	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	652,463	6,000	658,463
		Joint-Integrated Sys Tech for Advanced Digital Networking		[6,000]	
0303140N	191	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	27,037		27,037
0303158M	192	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	2,000		2,000
0303158N	193	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	4,148		4,148
0305149N	194	COBRA JUDY	101,114		101,114
0305160N	195	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE	8,208		8,208
0305192N	196	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	4,614		4,614
0305204N	197	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	45,717		45,717
0305205N	198	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	480,098	-62,000	418,098
		BAMS Program		[-62,000]	
0305206N	199	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	55,719		55,719
0305207N	200	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,982		13,982
0305208N	201	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	44,540		44,540
0307207N	202	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS)	74,604		74,604

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0308601N	203	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	8,007		8,007
0702207N	204	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	21,130		21,130
0702239N	205	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,877		1,877
0708011N	206	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	56,681		56,681
0708730N	207	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	0		0
0909999N	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,309,385		1,309,385
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYS DEVELOPMENT, RDT&E	**4,419,817**	**-42,400**	**4,377,417**
		Total, RDT&E Navy	**19,337,238**	**432,500**	**19,769,738**

Items of Special Interest

Advanced anti-radiation guided-missile weapon data link program

The budget request contained $60.4 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology programs, but contained no funds for a flight demonstration of the advanced anti-radiation guided-missile (AARGM) weapon data link program.

The AARGM is a medium-range, supersonic, air-launched tactical missile designed to attack enemy radars. The AARGM weapon data link program demonstrates an ability to use a new data link program, developed by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, to replace the two data links currently used on the AARGM with one data link that also provides an expanded capability against moving targets while reducing data link costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63114N for the AARGM weapon data link flight demonstration. Subsequent to a successful flight demonstration, the committee expects the Department of the Navy to incorporate the AARGM weapon data link as part of its AARGM product improvement program.

Advanced electric motor development

The budget request contained a total of $256.5 million in PE 63513N, PE 64307N, and PE 63123N for advanced shipboard component development programs.

The committee strongly supports the Navy's research and technology efforts to design and develop the next generation of advanced electric motors. The committee understands that promising technologies exist in high temperature superconducting motors, permanent magnet motors, and direct current (DC) homopolar motors. The committee is committed to the concept of the all-electric integrated propulsion and distribution systems for future classes of naval vessels and recognizes that adequate funding for the testing of multiple promising technologies is in the best interest of the future naval force.

The committee recommends increases of $4.0 million in PE 63513N, $3.0 million in PE 64307N, and $4.0 million in PE 63123N for continued design, development, and testing of high temperature superconducting, permanent magnet, and DC homopolar advanced electric motors.

Affordable weapon system

The budget request contained $40.0 million in PE 63795N for land attack technology, but contained no funds for the affordable weapon system (AWS) project.

The committee understands that AWS is an advanced technology initiative intended to identify and mature capabilities that should lead to a precision guided weapon capable of kinetically engaging targets at stand-off ranges with a fly-away cost goal of less than $0.3 million per weapon. The committee notes the development of an affordable strike weapon against moving and urban targets has been identified by the Department of the Navy as a warfighting science and technology gap.

The committee notes the Tomahawk Land Attack Missile (TLAM), Block IV is an example of an increasingly expensive strike

weapon. The committee notes the Navy signed a five year, multi-year procurement contract in fiscal year 2004 for 2,200 TLAM Block IV missiles at a unit cost of $0.7 million per missile. The committee notes for fiscal year 2009, the Department of the Navy will not procure TLAM Block IV missiles using multi-year procurement contract authority but will use annual procurement contract authority. The committee is concerned by the Navy's approach to Tomahawk Block IV missile procurement and notes that the Navy plans to obligate $281.1 million for procurement of 207 missiles, resulting in a unit cost of $1.4 million per missile. The committee notes this is an 86 percent unit cost increase of $0.6 million per missile in fiscal year 2009, as compared to the unit cost of a missile procured under the previous multi-year procurement contract authority.

The committee commends the Naval Air Systems Command's decision to restructure the AWS project into 2, 12-month phases that, with the proper funding, allow the Navy to evaluate a broad scope of innovative industrial base ideas that could potentially meet the Department's requirements for an affordable weapon. The committee understands the results of the two-phased approach should support the development of an initial capabilities document, which may lead to a new start program for AWS beginning in fiscal year 2010, with a goal of first article delivery in fiscal year 2016. The committee notes that AWS phase two, scheduled to begin in September, 2008, would evaluate material approaches, further refine concept of operations and system architecture, and construct a comprehensive risk assessment of material solutions provided by industry.

However, the committee is concerned that the current budget request and prior year appropriations for AWS would only allow two concepts to be carried forward into phase two, instead of continuing to develop each concept found to have merit. The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of the Navy to maximize industry participation for the AWS project and understands that awarding more than two phase-two contracts would provide the Secretary additional system concepts and options to consider for AWS.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63795N for AWS. Additionally, the committee strongly encourages the Secretary of the Navy to examine more cost-effective alternative courses of action concerning the procurement of the TLAM Block IV.

All-weather sense-and-avoid system for unmanned aerial vehicles

The budget request contained $77.1 million in PE 62235N for common picture applied research, but contained no funds for continued development of the all-weather sense-and-avoid system for unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV).

The committee notes that UAVs operate in the national airspace, crowded theaters of operation, and in hazardous weather. Currently, UAVs lack adequate collision avoidance systems. The committee further notes that $2.4 million was appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 2008, and understands that additional funding in fiscal year 2009 would complete the development, prototype fabrication, and laboratory testing of the all-weather sense-and-avoid system for UAVs in a ground-based vehicle.

The committee recommends $81.6 million, an increase of $2.5 million, in PE 62235N for continued development of the all-weather sense-and-avoid system for UAVs.

Composite Sea Lion craft project

The budget request contained $131.3 million in PE 62123N for force protection applied research but contained no funds for the manufacture of a composite craft based on the aluminum Sea Lion craft developed by the Naval Surface Warfare Center for use in the special operations forces.

The committee understands that the manufacture of a composite craft based on the Sea Lion hull design will allow the Navy to determine which type of craft, aluminum or composite, best serves the needs of the special operations forces and the Navy Expeditionary Combat Command.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62123N for the manufacture of a composite craft using the Sea Lion hull form.

Extended range guided-munition

The budget request contained $40.0 million in PE 63795N for land attack technology.

The committee notes that $38.8 million of the funding requested in this program element was for the extended range guided munition (ERGM) program. However, this program is under a stop work order by the Navy pending a possible program cancellation by the Undersecretary of Defense, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. The committee further notes that as of early April 2008, only 15 percent of $51.1 million in fiscal year 2008 program funds were obligated due to the delay in the program.

The committee believes the Navy has justifiable concerns regarding the performance of ERGM, especially after expending over $600.0 million for research and development. Nevertheless, the Marine Corps still requires long-range precision fire support. The committee is concerned that the Navy is no closer to fulfilling the naval surface fire support requirement than it was at the inception of the ERGM program. However, Congress has previously supported significant funding to develop alternatives, such as the ballistic-trajectory extended range munition (B–TERM), that may prove to be promising approaches to addressing the requirement. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days from the date of enactment of this Act containing an assessment of appropriate alternatives, an estimate of necessary resources, and a suitable program schedule to field a capability to support the Marine Corps requirement for extended range munitions capability.

The committee recommends $1.2 million, a decrease of $38.8 million, in PE 63795N for land attack technology.

Global Command and Control System—Maritime

The budget request contained $128.7 million in PE 64231N for tactical command systems, including some funds for the Global Command and Control System—Maritime.

The committee is concerned over a lack of commitment by the services to transition from service stove-piped command and con-

trol systems to a joint architecture, such as the Network Enabled Command and Control system. The services can no longer sustain a multitude of disparate systems, from a technical management or financial perspective. Yet there appears to be no clear strategy articulated to senior decision makers showing how the services will move from multiple independent systems, to a joint, federated approach. This approach does not necessarily entail adopting a single system, but until the services commit to a unified approach to commonality, the military services will continue to waste funds and inhibit the benefits accrued by jointness.

The committee recommends $127.7 million, a decrease of $1.0 million in PE 64231N.

Helicopter windscreen laminate appliqués

The budget request contained $122.9 million in PE 25633N for aviation improvements, but contained no funds for development of helicopter windscreen laminate appliqués.

The committee understands that helicopter windscreens are subject to erosive effects of environmental conditions, which can lead to significant degradation of visibility for the aircrew, especially during low visibility and night missions. The committee notes that a multi-layered protective laminate appliqué could be developed and applied to helicopter windscreens that would allow maintenance personnel to quickly restore windscreen visibility for the aircrew prior to flight by peeling away degraded layers, thus increasing success of mission operations and safety for the aircrew.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.2 million in PE 25633N for aviation improvements and development of helicopter windscreen laminate appliqués.

High-Integrity Global Positioning Systems

The budget request contained $61.2 million in PE 63235N for High-Integrity Global Positioning Systems (HIGPS).

HIGPS is designed to develop the technology required to demonstrate the capability to use the existing Iridium satellite constellation to enhance current GPS navigation and timing capabilities. The benefits of this approach have not been sufficiently proven and the committee does not recommend funding for this request.

The committee recommends no funds in PE 63235N for High-Integrity Global Positioning Systems.

Hyper-spectral targeting sensor

The budget request contained $60.4 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology, but contained no funds to develop a hyper-spectral targeting sensor for unmanned aerial systems (UAS).

The committee notes that tactical UASs are being developed by the Department to provide intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance during military operations. The committee understands that a capability shortfall exists for an advanced technology sensor package that can operate on UASs from medium-to-long stand-off distances and at low-to moderate-grazing angles to mitigate exposure to defensive ground-fire and increase mission accomplishment. The committee also understands there is a requirement to collect and process specific wavelength-sensitive and high-quality image

data, suitable for use with advanced algorithms that can yield actionable data in real time.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology for development of a hyper-spectral targeting sensor for UASs.

Large-scale demonstration item for VA-Class bow dome

The budget request contained $167.4 million in PE 64558N for new design SSN, but contained no funds for development of a large-scale *Virginia* class submarine bow dome utilizing composite manufacturing technology.

The committee understands that certifying a composite process to manufacture bow domes for *Virginia* Class submarines has potential benefits of reduced cost and an expanded supply base compared to the current process of manufacturing rubberized bow domes with an auto-clave process.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 64558N for the manufacture of a large scale composite bow dome as a proof of concept demonstration model.

Marine Corps assault vehicles

The budget request contained $316.1 million in PE 63611M for expeditionary fighting vehicle (EFV) research and development.

The committee is concerned that plans to begin fabrication of new EFV prototypes in fiscal year 2009 have not sufficiently addressed the need to enhance protection of the EFV from mines and improvised explosive devices in some operational scenarios.

The committee recommends $275.9 million, a decrease of $40.2 million, in PE 63611M for EFV research and development.

Marine Corps shotgun modernization program

The budget request contained $136.1 million in PE 26623M for Marine Corps ground combat/supporting arms systems, but contained no funds for the Marine Corps shotgun modernization program.

The Marine Corps shotgun modernization program transitions LTLX–7000 technology into current M1014 combat shotgun platforms through a series of spiral developments. The committee understands LTLX–7000 technology uses a simple and robust sighting system, as well as a unique gas bleeding system to adjust the muzzle velocity of less than lethal (LTL) projectiles so that the LTL projectile hits desired targets at any range with the desired effect. The committee is aware that certain LTL projectiles can be lethal when fired at close range. The committee is aware LTLX–7000 technology could provide the user with flexibility to adjust muzzle velocity to address any situation and prevent unnecessary casualties.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 26623M to accelerate the Marine Corps shotgun modernization program.

Marine mammal awareness, alert and response systems

The budget request contained $28.8 million in PE 63254N for anti-submarine warfare (ASW) systems development but contained

no funds for the marine mammal awareness, alert and response systems.

The committee is concerned with both the need to protect marine mammals from adverse effects of mid-frequency sonar and the need for the Navy to train using mid-frequency sonar in a realistic environment. The committee understands that development of the marine mammal awareness, alert and response system would significantly increase the Navy's ability to monitor marine mammal activity in the vicinity of training exercises using mid-frequency sonar.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63254N for the development of the marine mammal awareness, alert and response system.

MK–48 torpedo technology development

The budget request contained $15.9 million in PE 25632N for MK–48 torpedo advanced capability (TADCAP) development, but contained no funds for a post-launch communication system for use in the littorals.

The committee understands that the Chief of Naval Operations has stressed that successful operations in shallow water is a critical necessity to counter submarine threats. Torpedo testing in shallow water has demonstrated that in-service MK–48 TADCAP has less than full capability in a shallow water engagement environment. The committee notes that traditional weighted and hollow flexible-hose and guidance wire communications technologies can not satisfy future operating environment requirements, and that a high bandwidth post-launch communications system is needed to ensure the MK–48 TADCAP is capable of meeting requirements in the littoral environment.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 25632N for development of a post-launch communication system for the MK–48 TADCAP.

Naval Ship Hydrodynamic Test Facilities, NSWC, Carderock

The budget request contained $14.6 million in PE 63564N for ship preliminary design and feasibility studies but contained no funds to replace the wave makers at the Naval Ship Hydrodynamic Test Center, Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC).

The committee understands the wave makers at the NSWC are essential for assessing current and future naval ship designs. Also, the current wave makers are unable to produce consistent test waves and are in need of replacement.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63564N for the replacement of the wave makers at the Naval Ship Hydrodynamic Test Center, Naval Surface Warfare Center.

Navy strategy for maritime domain awareness

The committee applauds the Navy for working to accelerate the deployment of a capability for achieving maritime domain awareness (MDA), which is vital for homeland protection and the projection of naval power. The committee is concerned at the lack of a clearly articulated Navy strategy for achieving both the near-term capabilities and long-range vision laid out in the "National Plan to Achieve Maritime Domain Awareness" issued by the Department of Homeland Security, in October 2005.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on his strategy for continued development of MDA capability within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This strategy shall address, at minimum, the following issues:

(1) The definitions for spirals one and two (including descriptions of the capabilities to be delivered and the funding needed for these capabilities) and how are they linked to the "National Plan to Achieve Maritime Domain Awareness;"

(2) Capabilities planned for inclusion in future spirals for MDA;

(3) A certification that current and future spirals will integrate into the enterprise Naval Networking Environment, as well as proposed future iterations;

(4) An explanation of how technologies being developed in the science and technology community spin into future MDA spirals;

(5) Supporting capabilities being provided by international or interagency partners (including funding levels), and a description of how these capabilities will be integrated into current and future spirals; and

(6) The governance structure for determining program management oversight.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee recommends the budget requested funding levels for the procurement and research and development programs necessary for development of MDA capability.

Non-lethal weapons and technology

The committee notes the increasing potential in the emerging role of non-lethal weapons and the continued development of non-lethal weapons technologies and capabilities. The committee believes that the use of these technologies could prove valuable in reducing risks to the warfighter and to non-combatants in areas of ongoing military operations and in potential future missions of humanitarian support, stability, and reconstruction operations, or defense support to civil authorities. In this regard, the committee urges the Department to pursue a greater number of development and employment strategies for the ultimate fielding of such systems and encourages the continued efforts toward developing active denial technologies, including the Active Denial System (ADS), optical incapacitation, and acoustic devices.

The committee strongly encourages the Department of Defense to ensure that the non-lethal weapons science and technology base is adequately funded so that investments in these technologies can lead expeditiously to the development and deployment of advanced non-lethal weapons systems and capabilities that enhance the safety of U.S. armed forces and improve opportunities for mission success. The committee also encourages the Department to ensure that policy, doctrine, and tactics are developed in parallel through increased experimentation, as those elements are necessary to promote technology maturation and to ensure the rapid fielding of non-lethal systems.

Recapitalization of anti-submarine warfare aircraft

The budget request contained $1.2 billion for development and procurement of three P–8 developmental test aircraft. The budget request contained $301.5 million for development and procurement of P–3C modernization and sustainment programs. The Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded requirements list contained $100.0 million for P–8 Multi-Mission Aircraft (MMA) to accelerate replacement of the P–3C aircraft by nine months, and $448.3 million for P–3C unplanned aircraft grounding-item repairs.

The committee understands the Navy recently determined that the P–3C fleet is experiencing structural fatigue in wing struts at a rate greater than originally estimated. As a result, thirty nine of 123 mission capable P–3C aircraft evaluated were grounded in November 2007.

The committee understands that with implementation of a structural fatigue recovery plan, there is sufficient service life remaining in the P–3C fleet to provide needed operational capability until the replacement P–8 MMA reaches initial operational capability status in fiscal year 2013, and full operational capability status in fiscal year 2019, when the last aircraft of the P–3C fleet will be retired.

The committee notes the Secretary of the Navy is contemplating accelerating initial operational capability status of the P–8 MMA by approximately nine months. Due to the two most recent Navy assessments of the contractor's performance as suboptimal, the committee is concerned with program acceleration. The committee notes that program officials conducted a $900.0 million baseline restructuring of the program in January 2007, and reduced the planned procurement of seven test aircraft to five aircraft. Even with the reduction in planned test aircraft, the testing schedule has not been modified, adding additional risk to the program.

Due to these concerns, the committee expects the Secretary of the Navy and the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to review program execution prior to making a decision to accelerate P–8 MMA initial operational capability.

The committee recommends $448.3 million in title XV of this Act for P–3C unplanned aircraft grounding-item repairs.

Reliable Replacement Warhead

The budget request contained $80.1 million in PE 11221N, Strategic Submarine and Weapons Systems Support, including $23.3 million for the proposed Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW).

According to the President's budget justification materials, these funds were requested to enable the Navy to support the RRW Phase 2a design and cost study, and to support RRW Phase 3 Engineering Development, in concert with the National Nuclear Security Administration. The committee finds that the activities described in the budget request are premature and not executable in fiscal year 2009. Subsequent to the release of the fiscal year 2009 budget request, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Navy described the requested funds as designed not to support the RRW program, but instead to support research on integrated Arming, Fuzing, and Firing (AF&F) systems that could be suitable with either an RRW or an existing weapon refurbished through a Life Extension Program. The committee understands that integrated

AF&F designs with applicability across multiple platforms could yield important benefits.

The committee recommends $74.5 million, a decrease of $5.6 million, in PE 11221N for Strategic Submarine and Weapons Systems Support. Within this total for PE 11221N, the committee authorizes no funds for the RRW program. The committee authorizes $13.3 million within PE 11221N, Strategic Submarine and Weapons Systems Support, for research into integrated AF&F systems.

Report on energetic materials research development and manufacturing technology

The committee notes the recent reports on the advances in energetic materials research, development, and manufacturing technologies by foreign countries, and urges the Department of Defense (DOD) to conduct a risk assessment that would address national security threats arising from new and unanticipated energetic materials that may be developed by foreign governments. Additionally the committee is concerned that the investment required to adequately sustain a robust energetics research, development, and manufacturing technology program has not been maintained. The committee urges the Department to adequately invest in this area to ensure that the United States retains sufficient explosive production capacity, continues to develop future innovative munitions, and continues to develop the next-generation of energetics scientists and engineers. The committee believes a loss of this military-unique capability and crucial workforce would have significant ramifications for future weapons systems, military operations, and homeland security.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, to assess the current state of, and future advances in research, development, and manufacturing technology of energetic materials in both foreign countries and in the United States. At a minimum, the report shall include those DOD programmatic and budgetary recommendations that will ensure advanced energetic materials and equally critical energetic science and technology expertise are available to meet future national security requirements and should include the risk to national security if the funding level continues to decline.

The committee recognizes the initial work done by the Department of the Navy in launching an energetics science and technology workforce revitalization initiative and encourages the Secretary of Defense to utilize that initiative as the basis for developing the report. The report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009.

Ruggedized helicopter avionics displays

The budget request contained $112.5 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology, but contained no funds to continue the development of ruggedized avionics displays for Navy and Marine Corps helicopter systems.

The committee understands that helicopter vibrations and adverse environmental flying conditions reduce the useful service-life of helicopter displays, which increases display failure rate, increases maintenance personnel workload, and has the potential to

decrease safety margins of aircrews during critical phases of flight. The committee notes that funding was appropriated in fiscal year 2008 to develop ruggedized helicopter displays and instrumentation for avionics. Ruggedized display systems should have the capability to operate in harsh conditions without the use of air vents for cooling, and should offer better performance, longer service-life, and reduced total life-cycle cost.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.8 million in PE 63236N for continued development of ruggedized avionics displays for Navy and Marine Corps helicopter systems.

Sea-based strategic deterrent/undersea launched missile study

The budget request contained $141.7 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine system development but contained no funds for design and development of a sea-based strategic undersea launched missile.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has no coherent plan for undersea launched strategic deterrent weapons systems to eventually replace the current undersea strategic force. The committee believes that research and development is necessary now to ensure undersea launched weapons capability is available in the future.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63561N to begin initial studies and concept designs of future undersea launched weapons systems.

Seafighter

The budget request contained $55.1 million for force protection advanced technology but contained no funds for continuing the upgrades to make the research and development vessel Seafighter as deployable fleet asset.

The committee is committed to the continued use of Seafighter as both a research and development craft and a deployable Navy asset. The design and development of Seafighter benefited the Navy and Coast Guard in the design and construction the Littoral Combat Ships and the National Security Cutter. Seafighter is a vital asset for continued research and development testing of emerging technologies useful in the littoral warfare environment.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63123N to include the addition of offensive and defensive armament, the improvement of ship survivability systems, and the completion of command and control hull, mechanical, and electrical upgrades.

SSGN/Virginia payload tube development

The budget request contained $141.7 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine system design but contained no funds for continued design and development efforts of a large diameter weapons launch tube for *Virginia* class submarines.

The committee understands that development of a large diameter launch tube for *Virginia* class submarines will increase combat capability and reduce overall construction costs. The large diameter tube also has the potential to field new technologies, such as undersea autonomous vehicles, as those technologies mature.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63561N for design and development of a large diameter weapons launch tube for Virginia class submarines.

Threat-D missile target development

The committee is pleased to note the anticipated source selection for the development of a Threat D missile target development program in the summer of 2008. The committee remains concerned that the estimated initial operating capability of such a target in 2014 creates substantial risk during the interim period. The committee encourages the Secretary to accelerate the target development program to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to notify the congressional defense committees in writing if the estimated initial operating capability of the Threat D target is delayed more than 90 days or if the costs associated with such program exceeds 10 percent of programmed funding. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide such notification within 30 days, along with the reasons for such delay or cost overrun and a mitigation plan consisting of actions that could restore the program to its original timeline.

Trigger and alert sonobuoy

The budget request contained $5.9 million in PE 63216N for aviation survivability, but contained no funds for an in-buoy processor for a trigger and alert sonobuoy system.

The committee understands that the Navy currently has a series of sonobuoys that require human intervention in order to be effective during mission operations. The committee notes there are efforts underway to test a sonobuoy system capable of autonomous operation that can classify, trigger, and send an alert message without human intervention. The committee notes that successful completion of this effort could provide a significant capability for anti-submarine warfare, diver detection, counter narco-terrorism, and harbor protection by using autonomous fields of sonobuoys that alert military personnel on specific cues.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63216N for development of an in-buoy processor that implements an autonomous trigger and alert sonobuoy system.

Ultraviolet-cure structural repair adhesives

The budget request contained $122.9 million in PE 25633N for aviation improvements, but contained no funds for development of ultraviolet-cure structural repair adhesives.

The committee notes standard structural repair adhesives have extremely long cure times ranging 14 days for full cure at room temperature, to a forced cure at 180 degrees Fahrenheit for 2 hours. The committee understands ultraviolet-cure structural repair adhesives have been successfully demonstrated through the small business innovation research program and have cure times as low as five minutes, and could be developed for military aircraft and ground vehicles applications.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 25633N for development of ultraviolet-cure structural repair adhesives for military use applications.

Urban operations laboratory

The budget request contained $59.0 million in PE 63635M for Marine Corps ground combat support systems, but contained no funds for the urban operations laboratory (UOL) program.

The UOL program focuses on the development and enhancement of non-lethal capabilities for use in the urban environment to include vehicle stopping systems, bomb detection capabilities, and improvised explosive device detection capabilities. The committee is aware the Marine Corps has indicated this program is a critical, unfunded requirement for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63635M to accelerate the urban operations laboratory program and address the Marine Corps unfunded requirement.

VH–71 presidential helicopter program

The committee understands the need to replace the aging fleet of VH–3 and VH–60 helicopters currently in use by the executive office of the President of the United States. The committee also notes that the total acquisition costs for the VH–71 Presidential Helicopter replacement program are projected to increase from $6.5 billion to $11.2 billion.

The committee notes that this cost increase is above a 25 percent unit cost increase over the program baseline, commonly referred to as a "Nunn-McCurdy breach," and will necessitate the certification requirements of section 2433 (e)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code.

The committee expects that the Secretary of Defense will submit an analysis of the potential advantages and disadvantages of conducting a re-competition for the program when the report, required by section 2433 (e)(2)(A), is forwarded to the Congress.

Warfighter rapid awareness processing technology

The budget request contained $36.4 million in PE 62131M for Marine Corps landing force technology development, but contained no funds for the development of warfighter rapid awareness processing technology.

The committee recognizes warfighter rapid awareness processing technology could help to address the expeditionary warfighter's need for rapidly configured and deployable training environments that use virtual simulation technologies. The committee recognizes an integral part of these environments are physiologic monitoring technologies for assessing realism of the simulation and readiness of the warfighter. The committee is aware that warfighter rapid awareness processing technology could address a Marine Corps universal need statement for a full immersive live/virtual training environment.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62131M for the development of warfighter rapid awareness processing technology.

AIR FORCE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $28.1 billion for Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $28.2 billion, an increase of $171.7 million to the budget request.

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		RDT&E, AIR FORCE			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	309,926		309,926
0601103F	2	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	125,949	2,000	127,949
		Aerodynamic Wind Tunnel Upgrade Initiative		[2,000]	
0601108F	3	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,425		13,425
0301555F	4	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	0		0
		Remote Suspect Identification		[4,000]	4,000
0301556F	5	SPECIAL PROGRAM	0		0
0305172F	6	COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, AIR FORCE	**449,300**	**6,000**	**455,300**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602015F	7	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	0	5,100	5,100
		Mobile Diabetes Management		[2,000]	
		Basic Science Research		[3,100]	
0602102F	8	MATERIALS	117,143	15,400	132,543
		Advanced Carbon Fiber Research and Test Initiative		[3,000]	
		Advanced Casting and Coating Technologies		[3,500]	
		FEL Capabilities for Aerospace Microfabrication		[1,400]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Next Generation Manufacturing Processes		[1,500]	
		Ceramic Matrix Composite Turbine Blade Demonstration		[5,000]	
		ONAMI Safer Nanomaterials and Nanomanufacturing		[1,000]	
0602201F	9	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	122,870	1,500	124,370
		Single-Mode Optical Connectors for Advanced Air Vehicles		[1,500]	
0602202F	10	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	82,091	4,500	86,591
		Bay Area Language Tech Innovation Center (BALTIC)		[4,500]	
0602203F	11	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	218,049	14,400	232,449
		Advanced Vehicle Propulsion Center		[3,000]	
		National Test Facility for Aerospace Fuels and Propulsion		[1,700]	
		Wavelength Agile Spectral Harmonic Oxygen Sensor		[2,400]	
		Cell-Level Battery Controller		[2,800]	
		High Temperature, High Energy-Density Capacitors		[1,000]	
		Integrated Electrical Starter/Generator		[3,500]	
		Hydrocarbon Boost Technology Demonstrator		[3,000]	3,000
0602204F	12	AEROSPACE SENSORS	109,048	2,000	111,048
		Information Quality Tools - Persistent Surveillance Data Sets		[2,000]	
		Net-Centric Sensor Grids		[3,000]	3,000
0602601F	13	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	117,519	3,000	120,519
		Radiation Hardened Non-Volatile Memory Technology		[3,000]	
0602602F	14	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	55,963		55,963
0602605F	15	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	62,871		62,871

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0602702F	16	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	109,492	1,000	110,492
		Cyber Boot Camp		[1,000]	
0602890F	17	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	49,449		49,449
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, AIR FORCE	**1,044,495**	**52,900**	**1,097,395**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603112F	18	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	41,926	16,000	57,926
		Metals Affordability Initiative		[14,000]	
		Improved Inspection Reliability for Optimized Inspection		[2,000]	
0603203F	19	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	56,916	6,000	62,916
		Moving Target Strike		[6,000]	
0603211F	20	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	44,918		44,918
0603216F	21	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	170,856	5,500	176,356
		VAATE for Supersonic Cruise Missiles		[5,500]	
0603231F	22	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECH	26,630		26,630
0603270F	23	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	21,056	3,000	24,056
		COTS Analysis Tools for Navigational Warfare		[3,000]	
0603311F	24	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	0		0
0603401F	25	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	80,958	9,000	89,958
		Hybrid Sounding Rocket Propulsion		[2,000]	
		Technology Testing Platform		[2,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Small Low Cost Reconnaissance Spacecraft Components		[5,000]	
0603444F	26	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	4,838	8,000	12,838
		High Accuracy Network Determination System (HANDS)		[8,000]	
0603601F	27	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	11,813		11,813
0603605F	28	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	44,507		44,507
0603680F	29	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	39,729	4,000	43,729
		Prepreg Thickness Variability Reduction Program		[2,000]	
		Wire Integrity Technology Program		[2,000]	
0603789F	30	C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	30,103		30,103
0603801F	31	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	0		0
0603924F	32	HIGH ENERGY LASER PROGRAM	4,013		4,013
		SUBTOTAL, ATD, AIR FORCE	**578,263**	**51,500**	**629,763**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
0603260F	33	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,988		4,988
0603287F	34	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	477		477
0603421F	35	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III	0		0
0603423F	36	GPS III - OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	2,975		2,975
0603427F	37	GPS OCS - BACKWARDS COMPATIBILITY	304,360		304,360
0603430F	38	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	388,041		388,041
0603432F	39	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	237,749		237,749

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603438F	40	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	76,845		76,845
0603742F	41	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	29,400		29,400
0603790F	42	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,334		4,334
0603791F	43	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	627		627
0603845F	44	TRANSFORMATIONAL SATCOM (TSAT)	842,974		842,974
0603850F	45	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	21,105		21,105
0603851F	46	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	65,629	5,000	70,629
		ICBM Cryptography Upgrade		[5,000]	
0603854F	47	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM RDT&E (SPACE)	12,422		12,422
0603858F	48	SPACE RADAR	0		0
0603859F	49	POLLUTION PREVENTION	2,877		2,877
0603860F	50	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	7,479		7,479
0604015F	51	NEXT GENERATION BOMBER	0		0
0604796F	52	ALTERNATIVE FUELS	28,464	2,200	30,664
		Advanced Propulsion Non-Tactical Vehicle		[2,200]	
0604830F	53	AUTOMATED AIR-TO-AIR REFUELING	9,889		9,889
0604856F	54	COMMON AERO VEHICLE (CAV)	0		0
0604857F	55	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	110,032	10,000	120,032
		Day/Night ISR Payload for ORS		[10,000]	
0305178F	56	NPOESS	289,469		289,469
		SUBTOTAL, ACD & PROTOTYPES, AIR FORCE	2,440,136	17,200	2,457,336

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
0603840F	57	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	18,790		18,790
0604222F	58	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	20,166		20,166
0604226F	59	B-1B	128,871		128,871
0604233F	60	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	7,462		7,462
0604240F	61	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	351,417	-8,200	343,217
		Transfer to APAF-24		[-18,500]	
		SDB Moving Target Kill Integration		[10,300]	
0604261F	62	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SYSTEMS	0		0
0604270F	63	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	54,995		54,995
0604287F	64	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	52		52
0604329F	65	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	125,067		125,067
0604421F	66	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	74,918	10,000	84,918
		Space Control Test Capabilities		[10,000]	
0604425F	67	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	210,501		210,501
0604429F	68	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	34,279		34,279
0604441F	69	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	529,771		529,771
0604443F	70	THIRD GENERATION INFRARED SURVEILLANCE (3GIRS)	149,064	-74,100	74,964
		Program Decrease		[-74,100]	
0604602F	71	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	2,095		2,095
0604604F	72	SUBMUNITIONS	1,730		1,730

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0604617F	73	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	5,790		5,790
0604618F	74	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	0		0
0604706F	75	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	10,998	6,000	16,998
		ACES 5 Ejection Seat		[6,000]	
0604735F	76	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	28,047		28,047
0604740F	77	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	177	7,000	7,177
		Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit		[7,000]	
0604750F	78	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,488		1,488
0604762F	79	COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM	0		0
0604800F	80	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	1,524,016	262,500	1,786,516
		Joint Strike Fighter Competitive Engine		[247,500]	
		F135 Technology Insertion		[15,000]	
0604853F	81	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM	33,719		33,719
0605011F	82	RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	13,828		13,828
0605221F	83	NEXT GENERATION AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT	831,759		831,759
0605277F	84	CSAR-X RDT&E	305,062	-40,000	265,062
		Program Delay		[-40,000]	
0605278F	85	HC/MC-130 RECAP	11,692		11,692
0207434F	86	LINK-16 SUPPORT AND SUSTAINMENT	186,213	4,000	190,213
		Flexible Access Secure Transfer		[4,000]	
0207450F	87	E-10 SQUADRONS	42,215		42,215
0207451F	88	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP)	66,909		66,909

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0207701F	89	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	135,152		135,152
0401138F	90	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA)	26,777		26,777
0401318F	91	CV-22	18,562		18,562
0401845F	92	AIRBORNE SENIOR LEADER C3 (SLC3S)	1,992		1,992
		SUBTOTAL, SDD, AIR FORCE	**4,953,574**	**167,200**	**5,120,774**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0604256F	93	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	34,568		34,568
0604759F	94	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	61,818	10,200	72,018
		FPS-16 Radar Modernization Upgrade		[6,000]	
		Eglin AFB Range Operations Control Center Upgrade		[4,200]	
0605101F	95	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	28,676	3,000	31,676
		Program Increase		[3,000]	
0605502F	96	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH	0		0
0605712F	97	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	29,537		29,537
0605807F	98	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	787,737		787,737
0605860F	99	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	14,895		14,895
0605864F	100	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	48,072		48,072
0605976F	101	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	46,234		46,234
0605978F	102	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT - T&E SUPPORT	28,898	1,000	29,898
		Low Profile Arresting Gear		[1,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0804731F	103	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	0		0
1001004F	104	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,910		3,910
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, AIR FORCE	**1,084,345**	**14,200**	**1,098,545**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0604263F	105	COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT PLATFORM	3,868	-3,868	0
		Unjustified Program		[-3,868]	
0605024F	106	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	20,987		20,987
0605798F	107	ANALYSIS SUPPORT GROUP	0		0
0101113F	108	B-52 SQUADRONS	38,651		38,651
0101120F	109	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	0		0
0101122F	110	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	396		396
0101313F	111	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM - USSTRATCOM	17,553		17,553
0101314F	112	NIGHT FIST - USSTRATCOM	5,299		5,299
0101815F	113	ADVANCED STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	0		0
0102326F	114	REGION/SECTOR OCC MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	23,858		23,858
0102823F	115	STRATEGIC AEROSPACE INTELLIGENCE SYS ACTIVITIES	15		15
0203761F	116	RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS RAPID TRANSITION FUND	20,807		20,807
0205219F	117	MQ-9 UAV	43,557		43,557
0207131F	118	A-10 SQUADRONS	0		0
0207133F	119	F-16 SQUADRONS	123,979		123,979

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0207134F	120	F-15E SQUADRONS	184,213		184,213
0207136F	121	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	5,585		5,585
0207138F	122	F-22A SQUADRONS	700,305		700,305
0207141F	123	F-117A SQUADRONS	0		0
0207161F	124	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	5,748		5,748
0207163F	125	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	54,239		54,239
0207170F	126	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	3,192		3,192
0207247F	127	AF TENCAP	11,578		11,578
0207248F	128	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	0		0
0207253F	129	COMPASS CALL	4,670		4,670
0207268F	130	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	150,956		150,956
0207277F	131	CSAF INNOVATION PROGRAM	0	4,000	4,000
		Enhanced Guardian Angel Kit		[4,000]	
0207325F	132	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	13,035		13,035
0207410F	133	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	118,834		118,834
0207412F	134	MODULAR CONTROL SYSTEM	60,590		60,590
0207417F	135	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	126,300		126,300
0207418F	136	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	1,530		1,530
0207423F	137	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	29,782		29,782
0207424F	138	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	794,036		794,036
0207433F	139	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	0		0
0207438F	140	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	19,437		19,437

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0207445F	141	FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK	62,788		62,788
0207446F	142	BOMBER TACTICAL DATA LINK	11,702		11,702
0207448F	143	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,727		1,727
0207449F	144	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	32,151		32,151
0207581F	145	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	97,641		97,641
0207590F	146	SEEK EAGLE	21,645		21,645
0207591F	147	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	0		0
0207601F	148	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	28,981		28,981
0207605F	149	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	3,870		3,870
0207697F	150	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	7,137		7,137
0208006F	151	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	97,560		97,560
0208021F	152	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	12,220		12,220
0208161F	153	SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	1,077,970		1,077,970
0301310F	154	NATIONAL AIR INTELLIGENCE CENTER	0		0
		Open Source Research Centers		[3,000]	3,000
0301314F	155	COBRA BALL	0		0
0301315F	156	MISSILE AND SPACE TECHNICAL COLLECTION	0		0
0301324F	157	FOREST GREEN	0		0
0301386F	158	GDIP COLLECTION MANAGEMENT	0		0
0302015F	159	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	4,069		4,069
0303112F	160	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS (AIRCOM)	0		0
0303131F	161	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS	70,995		70,995

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0303140F	162	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	187,933	5,000	192,933
		Cybercraft		[3,000]	
		Dark Screen		[2,000]	
0303141F	163	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	4,320		4,320
0303150F	164	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,218	-1,000	2,218
		Global Command and Control System Air Force		[-1,000]	
0303158F	165	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	3,234		3,234
0303601F	166	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	337,098		337,098
0304111F	167	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	0		0
0304260F	168	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	173,631		173,631
0304311F	169	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	0		0
0304348F	170	ADVANCED GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE (AGI)	0		0
0305099F	171	COMMUNICATION, NAVIGATION, SURVEILLANCE	6,275		6,275
0305103F	172	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,083		2,083
0305110F	173	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	16,758		16,758
0305111F	174	WEATHER SERVICE	47,347		47,347
0305114F	175	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYS	6,867		6,867
0305116F	176	AERIAL TARGETS	34,777		34,777
0305124F	177	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	0		0
0305127F	178	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	0		0
0305128F	179	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	786		786
0305142F	180	APPLIED TECHNOLOGY AND INTEGRATION			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0305146F	181	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	39		39
0305159F	182	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			0
0305160F	183	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM	0		0
0305164F	184	NAVSTAR GPS (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	127,513		127,513
0305165F	185	NAVSTAR GPS (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS)	91,277		91,277
0305172F	186	COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS	0		0
0305173F	187	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	1,985		1,985
0305174F	188	SPACE WARFARE CENTER	3,003		3,003
0305182F	189	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	12,376		12,376
0305193F	190	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS	1,237		1,237
0305206F	191	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	149,752	10,000	159,752
		UAS Universal Distributed Management System		[10,000]	
0305207F	192	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	12,819	3,500	16,319
		RIVET JOINT ISR Network Integration		[3,500]	
0305208F	193	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	107,834		107,834
0305219F	194	MQ-1 PREDATOR UAV	24,773		24,773
0305220F	195	GLOBAL HAWK UAV	284,292		284,292
0305221F	196	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	8,807		8,807

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0305265F	197	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	420,342		420,342
0305887F	198	ELECTRONIC COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	5,438		5,438
0305906F	199	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	0		0
0305913F	200	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	41,292		41,292
0305924F	201	NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE OFFICE	10,797		10,797
0305940F	202	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	16,166		16,166
0307141F	203	IO TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEVELOPMENT	15,726		15,726
0308699F	204	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	3,152		3,152
0401115F	205	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	172,560	6,700	179,260
		Link 16 Program for AFSOC MC-130Hs		[5,200]	
		Electromagnetic In-Flight Propeller Balancing		[1,500]	
0401119F	206	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	125,063		125,063
0401130F	207	C-17 AIRCRAFT	236,047	-48,000	188,047
		Excess Product Investment Requirements		[-48,000]	
0401132F	208	C-130J PROGRAM	52,354	-25,000	27,354
		International Block Upgrade		[-25,000]	
0401134F	209	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	32,100		32,100
0401218F	210	KC-135 AIRCRAFT	7,133		7,133
0401219F	211	KC-10 AIRCRAFT	0		0
0401221F	212	KC-135 TANKER REPLACEMENT	0		0

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0401314F	213	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	0		0
0401839F	214	AIR MOBILITY TACTICAL DATA LINK	0		0
0408011F	215	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	5,728	6,500	12,228
		Joint Precision AirDrop Systems - Mission Planner RFI		[4,500]	
		Tactical Environmental Clothing		[2,000]	
0702207F	216	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,531		1,531
0702806F	217	ACQUISITION AND COMMAND SUPPORT	34,428		34,428
0708011F	218	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	0	3,000	3,000
		Integrated Structures for Affordable Transport Aircraft		[3,000]	
0708012F	219	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	0		0
0708610F	220	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	189,679	-10,000	179,679
		Expeditionary Combat Support System Unjustified Growth		[-10,000]	
0708611F	221	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,145		8,145
		Clean Cities National Outreach Prgm for Power Tech Office		[1,900]	1,900
		Eielson Air Force Base Alternative Energy Source Program		[4,000]	4,000
		Expeditionary 200 kW + Alternative Power Generator		[3,000]	3,000
0804757F	222	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER	3,214		3,214
0808716F	223	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	116		116
0901202F	224	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	5,768		5,768

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0901212F	225	SERVICE-WIDE SUPPORT	3,016		3,016
0901218F	226	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	8,123		8,123
0901220F	227	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	18,625		18,625
0901538F	228	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEV	31,782		31,782
0909999F	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	10,304,689	-200,000	10,104,689
		Program Reduction		[-200,000]	
		Classified Requirement		[100,000]	100,000
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYS DEVELOPMENT, AF	**17,516,504**	**-137,268**	**17,379,236**
		Total, RDT&E Air Force	**28,066,617**	**171,732**	**28,238,349**

Items of Special Interest

B–2 Small Diameter Bomb Moving-Target-Kill integration

The budget request contained $351.4 million in PE 64240F for development of technologies and upgrades for the B–2 bomber, but contained no funds for continued development of Small Diameter Bomb Moving-Target-Kill (SDB/MTK) capability integration for the B–2.

The committee notes that Congress appropriated $12.8 million in fiscal year 2007 and $5.8 million in fiscal year 2008 for integration and upgrades to unreliable and unsupportable cockpit displays for radar image display and targeting functions necessary to implement SDB/MTK capability on the B–2. The committee understands that a B–2 SDB/MTK capability that includes sensor improvements and integration of a low-observable data link capable weapon will provide the combat commander a new capability to covertly approach and strike moving targets.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.3 million in PE 64240F for continued development and integration of SDB/MTK for the B–2 bomber.

C–130J development

The budget request contained $52.4 million in PE 41132F for development of C–130J block upgrade activities, of which $25.0 million was included for the international block upgrade.

The committee understands that the international block upgrade is in excess to program requirements since it is not executable in fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends $27.4 million in PE 41132F, a decrease of $25.0 million.

Combat search and recovery vehicle-x

The budget request contained $305.1 million in PE 64261F for the development of the combat search and recovery vehicle-X (CSAR-X). The budget request also contained $15.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for advance procurement of CSAR-X long-lead components.

The CSAR-X program is developing the next-generation personnel recovery vehicle which will replace the current HH–60G Pave Hawk helicopter, and provide increased capabilities of speed, range, survivability, cabin size, and high-altitude hover operations. The Department of the Air Force anticipated beginning CSAR-X integration and demonstration activities early in fiscal year 2007, but these activities have been delayed by two bid protests, which were subsequently sustained, and have required the Department of the Air Force to re-solicit bids for the CSAR-X program. The committee understands that the contract award will not occur until late in the first quarter of fiscal year 2009. As a result of this delay, the committee notes that the Department of the Air Force has identified $40.0 million for development of the CSAR–X which exceeds fiscal year 2009 requirements. Additionally, the committee notes that the Government Accountability Office identified $15.0 million for advance procurement of CSAR–X long-lead components which, according to Department of the Air Force CSAR–X program officials, is not required for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends $265.1 million, a decrease of $40.0 million in PE 64261F. The committee also recommends no funds in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for the advance procurement of CSAR–X long-lead components, a decrease of $15.0 million.

Common vertical lift support platform

The budget request contained $3.9 million in PE 64263F for system program office and management support of the common vertical lift support platform (CVLSP) program. The CVLSP program is a "new start" for fiscal year 2009 and would provide vertical lift for the Air Force Space Command's nuclear weapon security, and for mass passenger transport in the National Capital Region. The CVLSP would replace 62 UH–1N helicopters which are now used to perform these missions.

The committee notes that the CVLSP requirements process is not complete, the acquisition strategy has not yet been developed, and the Department of the Air Force has not programmed any funds for this purpose beyond 2009. The committee believes that these actions should be taken before funds are authorized for this purpose. Therefore the committee recommends no funds for the CVLSP in PE 64263F, a decrease of $3.9 million.

Cyber boot camp

The budget request contained $109.5 million in PE 62702F for work to develop better command, control, and communications systems within the Air Force, including $1.1 million to support the Advanced Course in Engineering (ACE) Cyber Boot Camp summer program for the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC).

The committee applauds the efforts at the Air Force Research Laboratory Rome Research Site (AFRL/RRS) to develop educational curriculum to develop the future workforce of cyber operations experts. The mission of the ACE is to develop ROTC cadets into cyber officers and represents the only cyber education offered by the Department of Defense for ROTC cadets. ACE is a 10-week summer program consisting of classes, on-the-job mentoring, and officer development that targets the top students in computer-related disciplines, and teaches them to become original thinkers, problem solvers, and technical leaders. The committee recognizes that this program is vital to ensuring a robust information technology workforce that is capable of handling current and future cyber threats to our systems. The committee believes the ACE cyber boot camp should be expanded beyond the Air Force to include ROTC cadets from the other military services.

The committee recommends $110.5 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 62702F for AFRL/RRS to support the expansion of the ACE Cyber Boot curriculum to other service ROTC participants, and to provide for additional 10-week courses to accommodate this expansion.

Global Command and Control System—Air Force

The budget request contained $3.2 million in PE 33150F for the Global Command and Control System—Air Force.

The committee is concerned over a lack of commitment by the services to transition from service stove-piped command and control systems to a joint architecture, such as the Network Enabled

Command and Control system. The services can no longer sustain a multitude of disparate systems, from a technical management or financial perspective. Yet there appears to be no clear strategy articulated to senior decision makers showing how the services will move from multiple independent systems, to a joint, federated approach. This approach does not necessarily entail adopting a single system, but until the services commit to a unified approach to commonality, the military services will continue to waste funds and inhibit the benefits accrued by jointness.

The committee recommends $2.2 million, a decrease of $1.0 million in PE 33150F.

High Accuracy Network Determination System

The budget request contained $4.8 million in PE 63444F for the Maui Space Surveillance System, but no funds for High Accuracy Network Determination System (HANDS).

HANDS addresses critical space situational awareness needs and reduces the potential for collisions of space assets by reducing errors in the current space-object maintenance catalog, as well as supplementing the catalog with system characterization information.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63444F for the HANDS program.

Improved reliability for optimized inspection

The budget request contained $41.9 million in PE 63112F for the development of various advanced materials technologies for transition into Department of the Air Force systems, but contained no funds for development of improved reliability for optimized inspection for C–130 maintenance.

The committee notes that regularly scheduled non-destructive inspection (NDI) and maintenance of Department of the Air Force aircraft require that the aircraft be removed from service for extended time periods. The committee understands that efforts undertaken to improve confidence in the reliability of NDI to assess damage without costly and time-consuming maintenance will increase aircraft availability and reduce maintenance costs over current practices.

To improve the NDI inspection process, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63112F for development of improved reliability for optimized inspection for C–130 maintenance. The committee expects that these funds will be used to obtain samples of cracked C–130 parts, manufacture samples simulating cracked C–130 parts, perform controlled inspections of parts to validate models of inspections, and to validate a process for assessing and improving inspections.

Intercontinental ballistic missile cryptography upgrade

The budget request contained $65.6 million in PE 63851F for Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM), but contained no funds for the ICBM cryptography upgrade, increment II.

The committee is aware that the ICBM cryptography upgrade, increment II, is an unfunded Air Force requirement.

The committee recommends $70.6 million, an increase of $5.0 million, for Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles for the ICBM cryptography upgrade.

Joint cargo aircraft program

The budget request contained $26.8 million in PE 41138F for development of the Joint Cargo Aircraft (JCA). The Chief of Staff of the Air Force also included $74.8 million on the unfunded requirements list for procurement of two special operations JCA. The committee notes that a Joint Requirements Oversight Council validated requirement for a special operations JCA does not currently exist within the Department of Defense.

The committee notes that during the fiscal year 2008 budget cycle, the congressional defense committees raised concerns over the requirements for JCA, whether or not it is needed to fulfill Department of Defense intra-theater airlift requirements, and which service, either Army or Air Force, should operate the platform. As a result, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) restricted the program from obligating or expending appropriated funds until submission of six Department of Defense initiated studies to the congressional defense committees. The committee notes that none of these important studies were directed by Congress and could have informed JCA program decisions more effectively had they been timed prior to program Milestone C certification by the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)).

The committee understands that during the acquisition strategy review process, USD(AT&L) added a caveat to the June 20, 2006 Memorandum of Agreement between the Services that directed further analysis be conducted to determine the appropriate JCA aircraft inventory. USD(AT&L) directed the Services to jointly perform an update to the Army Analysis of Alternatives, with an Air Force requirement to support both Departments by providing an Intra-theater Airlift Fleet Mix Analysis (IAFMA) to determine the Services' JCA inventory requirements. The IAFMA was completed and submitted to Congress in February 2008.

The committee emphasizes that contrary to USD(AT&L) tasking and intent, the IAFMA did not assess the Army's time-sensitive cargo mission or requirements, and notes that the IAFMA makes an unsubstantiated statement in its findings that the Air Force should procure no more than 24 aircraft to meet the Army's time-sensitive cargo mission requirements. The committee also emphasizes that the IAFMA states that it is more cost-effective for the Air Force to procure the C–130J aircraft and found that the JCA was not effective in any of the 2005 Mobility Capabilities Study (MCS) scenarios. The committee also notes that in written testimony provided to the subcommittee on Air & Land Forces on April 1, 2008, the Commander, Air Mobility Command stated that the JCA is 60 to 70 percent less cost-effective than the C–130J in performing MCS missions.

The committee is very concerned by the lack of analytical basis used to justify procurement of JCA and is discouraged by the decision-making process used by USD(AT&L) during the Milestone C process. The committee notes that the decision of USD(AT&L) on May 30, 2007, concerning the division of 78 aircraft between the

Army and Air Force was based on what each service had programmed at the time in the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP), and not on analytical findings. Additionally, the committee notes that the Air Force's fiscal year 2007 Capabilities Review and Risk Assessment study recommends that funding for JCA be reallocated for higher priority Air Force mobility programs.

Finally, the committee is concerned by the cost difference of JCA, compared to the cost and capability of C–130J. The committee notes that the Air Force unit cost for JCA is $60.7 million and the unit cost for a C–130J is $56.7 million. The committee further notes that the C–130J has twice the airlift capability of the JCA and has flight performance characteristics very similar to the JCA. The committee understands the Air Force plans to allocate 24 JCA among 6 Air National Guard basing locations in the states of Maryland, Ohio, Connecticut, North Dakota, Mississippi, and Michigan. The committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force to thoroughly review FYDP funding for JCA and determine if it is more cost-effective and prudent to utilize that funding for 24 additional C–130J aircraft to support future missions of the Air National Guard units programmed to receive JCA.

Joint strike fighter

The budget request contained $1.5 billion in PE 64800F, and $1.5 billion in PE 64800N, for development of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF), but contained no funds for development of a competitive JSF propulsion system. The budget request also contained $136.9 million for F–35 advance procurement in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for the long-lead components necessary to procure 12 F–35A aircraft in fiscal year 2010, but contained no funds for advance procurement of competitive JSF propulsion system long-lead components.

The competitive JSF propulsion system program is developing the F136 engine, which would provide a competitive alternative to the currently-planned F135 engine. In the committee report (H. Rept. 109–452) accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, and once again in the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee recommended increases for the JSF competitive propulsion system, and notes that in both cases, the other three congressional defense committees concurred. Despite section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which requires the Secretary of Defense to obligate and expend sufficient annual amounts for the continued development and procurement of a competitive propulsion system for the JSF, the committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense (DOD) chose not to comply with both the spirit and intent of this provision by opting not to include funds for this purpose in the budget request.

On March 11, 2008, the Subcommittees on Air and Land Forces and Seapower and Expeditionary Forces held a hearing at which the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD (AT&L)) and the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) Director of Acquisition Sourcing and Management testified. Witnesses were asked to provide an update to the independent lifecycle cost analysis of the JSF propulsion system required by sec-

tion 211 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) based on the obligation of an additional $480.0 million authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 2008, performance of the competitive engine program to date, and the additional year of development. The GAO Director of Acquisition and Sourcing Management complied with the subcommittees' request and testified that the Department of Defense would recoup its initial investment costs with program savings of between 9 and 11 percent, or about 1.3 percent less than the GAO reported in 2007. He also testified that at least that amount of savings could be achieved in the long run based on analysis of actual data from the F–16 engine competition. Opting not to comply with the committee request, the USD (AT&L) testified that the Department did not direct the Office of the Secretary of Defense's Cost Analysis and Improvement Group to update its analysis from the previous year, and that there had been no significant changes to the program that would have resulted in any changes to their findings. Based on this testimony, the committee believes that a competitive propulsion system for the JSF offers the promise of long-term savings.

The committee also notes that in August 2007, the currently-planned F135 engine experienced a hardware failure during test stand operations with the short take-off and vertical land (STOVL) lift fan engaged, and that a similar failure occurred again in February 2008, and that these engine failure will result in a currently-projected delay to the first flight of the F–35 STOVL variant by 30 to 60 days. While the committee understands that the F135 engine is still in development and test failures may occur, the committee believes that, over the long-term, a competitive JSF propulsion program will result in improved engine performance for all JSF variants. These test failure events and the subcommittees' hearing testimony cause the committee to remain steadfast in its belief that the non-financial factors of a two-engine competitive program such as better engine performance, improved contractor responsiveness, a more robust industrial base, increased engine reliability and improved operational readiness strongly favor continuing the competitive propulsion system program.

For continued development of the competitive JSF propulsion system program, the committee recommends $1.8 billion, an increase of $247.5 million in PE 64800F, and $1.8 billion, an increase of $247.5 million in PE 64800N. The committee also recommends $167.9 million, an increase of $31.0 million for advance procurement of competitive JSF propulsion system long-lead components, for F–35 advance procurement in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. Additionally, the committee strongly urges the Department of Defense to comply with the spirit and intent of section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) by including the funds necessary for continued development and procurement of a competitive JSF propulsion system in its fiscal year 2010 budget request.

Low profile arresting gear

The budget request contained $28.9 million in PE 65978F to sustain the inventory of the Air Force Material Command's test and

evaluation facilities, but contained no funds to test the low profile arresting gear (LPAG).

The committee notes that numerous airports across the United States host both military and commercial flight operations concurrently. Many military tactical aircraft have arresting hooks for use in emergency situations; however installation of arresting equipment for military use may cause interference to large commercial aircraft due to the size of the arresting equipment engines and their close proximity to the runway. To address this problem, the Department of the Air Force has introduced the Airfield Obstruction Reduction Initiative (AORI) program. The committee understands that the LPAG would be consistent with the AORI requirements since it would minimize physical interference and obstructions to commercial aircraft, while providing the necessary arresting equipment for military tactical aircraft use.

The committee recommends $29.9 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 65978F to test the LPAG.

Metals affordability initiative

The budget request contained $41.9 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapon systems.

The committee supports the continued government-industry collaboration provided through the Metals Affordability Initiative. It provides significant improvements in the manufacturing of specialty metals for aerospace applications for the government and aerospace industry, and provides improved affordability of aerospace materials.

The committee recommends an additional $14.0 million in PE 63112F for the Metals Affordability Initiative.

Multiple unmanned aerial vehicle employment against a common objective

The budget request contained $149.8 million in PE 35206F for airborne reconnaissance systems, but contained no funds for the employment of multiple unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) against a common objective.

The committee notes the operational utility of operating large numbers of UAVs, yet notes the increased difficulty of operating multiple UAVs in close proximity because of limited bandwidth availability. United States Central Command issued an operational need statement to meet an objective requirement for the Predator UAV to operate up to eight air vehicles simultaneously from a single ground station.

The committee recommends an additional $10.0 million in PE 35206F for demonstration and deployment of multiple UAV employment against a common objective.

Next-generation tactical environmental clothing

The budget request contained $5.7 million in PE 48011F for special tactics-combat control, but contained no funds for next-generation tactical environmental clothing for Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC) special tactics teams and combat controllers.

The committee recognizes AFSOC special tactics teams and forward combat air controllers operate in harsh environments and

conditions that require extreme physical exertion for extended periods of time. The committee is aware that recent developments in clothing technology could reduce the effects of moisture on the body and could provide superior antimicrobial characteristics. The committee believes these materials could benefit military personnel who operate in prolonged harsh combat conditions.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 48011F for the continued development and demonstration of next generation tactical environmental clothing for AFSOC special tactics teams and forward combat air controllers.

Non-attribution of open source intelligence research

The budget request contained funds in PE 31310F for the National Air Intelligence Center, but contained no funds to support expanded open source research to complement traditional intelligence analytical products.

The committee recognizes that open source intelligence provides a critical complementary capability to traditional intelligence gathering and analysis. The committee is encouraged by the growing recognition within the military and intelligence communities of the value of open source intelligence which is punctuated by the establishment of the Open Source Center and the development of an Army field manual on open source intelligence.

Efforts in this area will require collectors to operate in benign cyberspace domains, such as media websites and academic databases, as well as more hostile areas, such as foreign language blogging websites and even websites maintained by terrorist or state-actors groups. The committee is concerned about the ability of our adversaries to be able to track and attribute collection activities to U.S. and allied forces. Technology exists to provide non-attribution services to protect identities, especially source country of origin.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to ensure, through the use of all reasonable means, protection of government investigators involved in gathering open source intelligence. These means should include proven non-attribution services, as well as development of appropriate tactics, techniques and procedures that are incorporated into manuals and training programs.

The committee also recommends an increase of $3.0 million, in PE 31310F to support the development of training packages for new analysts that address how to integrate open source into analytic products, as well as techniques for maintaining anonymity online when conducting research. This funding may also be used to support development of new tools to promote open source research, and associated experimentation and evaluation that may be needed to validate both the tools and training.

Operationally responsive space

The budget request contained $110.0 million in PE 64857F for operationally responsive space (ORS) programs.

The committee remains supportive of ORS, but is concerned about the implementation of the ORS program office mandated by the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The committee observes that nearly two years after its establishment, the program office re-

mains considerably understaffed with only 3 billets filled out of 20 authorized. In the near-term, the committee encourages efforts to leverage available technology for on-orbit demonstrations and investments in common components and interface standards to facilitate building a robust pipeline of ORS systems for on-demand space support and reconstitution. Responsive processes, coordination mechanisms, and acquisitions are equally important to the success of ORS. The committee also recognizes that a balance must be struck between near-term and future capabilities, particularly in the area of space launch vehicle (SLV) development. The committee is aware of several low-cost, responsive SLV concepts and encourages the Department to develop a longer-term strategy that includes opportunities for competition.

The budget request for ORS contained no funds for the Operational Airborne Sensor In Space (OASIS) program. The committee notes that the United States Strategic Command has a stated mission need for operationally responsive day-night visual sensors on tactical space platforms. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the development an electro-optical/infrared sensor for an ORS spacecraft.

The committee recommends $120.0 million in PE 64857F for operationally responsive space, including $10.0 million for OASIS.

RAND Project Air Force

The budget request contained $28.7 million in PE 65101F for RAND Project Air Force.

The committee notes with concern that funding requested for RAND Project Air Force declined significantly from fiscal year 2007 levels. The committee is concerned with the lack of stable funding for this program, and encourages the Air Force to provide stable funding for RAND Project Air Force.

The committee recommends $31.7 million, an increase of $3.0 million, in PE 65101F for RAND Project Air Force.

Single-mode optical connectors for advanced air vehicles

The budget request contained $122.9 million in PE 62201F for aerospace vehicle technologies, but contained no funds for the development of single-mode optical connectors for advanced air vehicles.

The United States aerospace vehicles (manned and unmanned) require processing of increasing amounts of data for communications, mission computers, and sensor and flight control systems in order to fly, fight, and win in increasingly dangerous aerospace environments. The committee notes that as the demand for bandwidth increases, so too does the need to protect this information from external threat such as electromagnetic interference (EMI). The development of single-mode multi-channel optical connectors in support of fly-by-light technology could lead to improvements in data transmission, reduced equipment costs, safer aircraft operations, and improved resistance to EMI.

The committee recommends $124.4 million, an increase of $1.5 million, in PE 62201F for the development of single-mode optical connectors.

Space control test capabilities

The budget request contained $74.9 million in PE 64421F for counterspace systems, but contained no funds for the space control test capabilities program.

The space control test capabilities program supports the development of an architecture analysis tool to address integration and optimization of space control systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64421F for the space control test capabilities program.

Third Generation Infrared Surveillance

The budget request contained $149.1 million in PE 64443F for development of the Third Generation Infrared Surveillance (3GIRS).

The 3GIRS program is designed to provide advanced capability in warning of ballistic missile attacks on the United States, its deployed forces, and its allies, while also supporting missile defense, battlespace awareness, and technical intelligence missions. The program, originally referred to as the Alternative Infrared Satellite System (AIRSS), was initiated in 2006, as a result of a Nunn-McCurdy review of the Space Based Infrared Systems (SBIRS)-High program to generate competition for the third SBIRS geosynchronous orbit (GEO) satellite and explore alternative technologies.

With the Defense Acquisition Executive's decision to procure SBIRS GEO–3 in July 2007, and following congressional guidance, the Air Force has redirected AIRSS resources to pursue risk reduction, system definition, and ground tests to enable a third generation space based infrared program after the SBIRS GEO–3 satellite is delivered.

Originally conceived as a low technical risk system, the 3GIRS program now includes significant technology development and a potential flight test demonstration. Both activities add additional risk to the program and have limited benefits in the near-term. With the success achieved by the Space Based Infrared System highly elliptical orbit payload in 2007, the committee finds the 3GIRS development program is premature.

The committee recommends $75.0 million, a decrease of $74.1 million to the 3GIRS program, in PE 64443F to support continued development of wide field-of-view focal plane technology.

Winglets for in-service aerial refueling aircraft

The committee commends the Air Force for its efforts to increase aircraft fuel efficiency and decrease fuel consumption. The committee notes that initiatives such as re-engining aircraft, modifying in-flight profiles, and revising aircraft ground operations contribute to decreased fuel consumption and increased life-cycle savings.

The committee is aware that winglet technology exists for aircraft to increase fuel efficiency, improve take-off performance, increase cruise altitudes, and increase payload and range capability. The committee notes that winglets are currently used on commercial aircraft and result in a five to seven percent increase in fuel efficiency. The committee believes that incorporating winglets on military aircraft could increase fuel efficiency on certain platforms

and that the Air Force should examine incorporating this technology onto its platforms.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 109–452) accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, the committee directed the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees examining the feasibility of modifying Air Force aircraft with winglets. The Air Force report preliminarily concluded that between $36.0 million and $400.0 million in fuel savings could be achieved for the KC–135R tanker aircraft and between $12.0 million and $221.0 million could be achieved for the KC–10 tanker aircraft if modified with winglets. However, the committee notes that the report stated that it is not possible to know the actual modification costs and fuel savings without performing a detailed engineering analysis for each aircraft type.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to task a federally funded research and development center to conduct an engineering analysis on modifying KC–135R and KC–10 tanker aircraft with winglets and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by May 1, 2009. For the engineering analysis and report, the Secretary of the Air Force shall: use current performance data for each aircraft; include a cost comparison analysis for the cost of winglet modifications compared to the return on investment realized over time for each aircraft during its programmed service-life; determine the market price of JP–8 aviation jet fuel at which incorporating winglets would be beneficial for each aircraft mission design series; assess all positive and negative impacts to aircraft maintenance and flight operations; and analyze investment strategies the Air Force could implement with commercial partners to minimize Air Force capital investment and maximize investment return.

Wire integrity technology program

The budget request contained $39.7 million in PE 63680F for the development of manufacturing technology programs, but contained no funds for development of a wire integrity technology program.

The committee understands that the Department of the Air Force currently relies on out-dated testing equipment and repair technologies to sustain aging aircraft wiring systems. To address this deficiency, the committee believes that a wire integrity technology program would develop and test new wire materials, develop advanced testing equipment to ensure accurate fault detection, develop processes and procedures for wire manufacturing technology, and improve workforce training in repair and analysis of aircraft wiring systems.

The committee recommends $41.7 million, an increase of $2.0 million, in PE 63680F for development of a wire integrity technology program, and believes that this program has the potential to reduce the approximately $300.0 million expended annually on wiring inspections, and improve weapon system reliability and safety.

DEFENSE WIDE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $21.5 billion for Defense Wide research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $20.8 billion, a decrease of $654.4 million to the budget request.

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		RDT&E, DEFENSE-WIDE			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601000BR	1	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	18,000		18,000
0601101E	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	195,657	6,000	201,657
		Combined Injury Consortium		[5,000]	
		DARPA Computer Future		[1,000]	
0601111D8Z	3	GOVT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIV RESEARCH	0	2,000	2,000
		Integrated Cryo-cooled High Power Density Systems		[2,000]	
0601114D8Z	4	PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH	2,833	10,000	12,833
		Program Increase		[10,000]	
0601120D8Z	5	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	68,972		68,972
0601384BP	6	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	53,191	5,000	58,191
		Chemical/Biological Defense Basic Research Initiative		[5,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, DEFENSE-WIDE	**338,653**	**23,000**	**361,653**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602000D8Z	7	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	15,254		15,254
0602227D8Z	8	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	0		0
0602228D8Z	9	HBCU SCIENCE	15,156	7,000	22,156
		John H. Hopps Defense Research Scholars Program		[2,000]	
		HBCU and Minority Serving Institutions		[5,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0602234D8Z	10	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	31,340		31,340
0602303E	11	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	254,009		254,009
0602304E	12	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	145,262		145,262
0602383E	13	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	66,291	-15,000	51,291
		DARPA Poor Execution		[-15,000]	
0602384BP	14	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	203,731	15,000	218,731
		Chemical/Biological Defense Applied Research Initiative		[15,000]	
0602670D8Z	15	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING	7,685	2,000	9,685
		Center for Automated Language and Cultural Analysis		[2,000]	
0602702E	16	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	371,481	-30,000	341,481
		DARPA Poor Execution		[-30,000]	
0602715E	17	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	285,264	-10,000	275,264
		DARPA Poor Execution		[-10,000]	
0602716BR	18	WMD DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY	0		0
0602716E	19	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	211,457	-15,000	196,457
		DARPA Poor Execution		[-15,000]	
0602717BR	20	WMD DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES	0		0
0602718BR	21	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECH	211,078	10,000	221,078
		Post-Detonation Nuclear Forensics		[10,000]	
0303153K	22	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	0		0
1160401BB	23	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	23,104	8,350	31,454
		Craft Tech Demos to Quantify and Mitigate Operator Injury		[4,850]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Expendable Airdrop Delivery system		[3,500]	
1160407BB	24	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,459		2,459
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, DEFENSE-WIDE	**1,843,571**	**-27,650**	**1,815,921**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603000D8Z	25	INSENSITIVE MUNITIONS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	15,970		15,970
0603121D8Z	26	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	32,832		32,832
0603122D8Z	27	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	79,970	27,000	106,970
		Affordable Robust Mid-Sized Unmanned Ground Vehicle		[1,500]	
		Foliage Penetration Capability		[5,000]	
		Advanced Sighting Systems for Machine Guns		[4,000]	
		Airborne CT/CN Threat Protections System		[4,000]	
		Bio Ops Policy and Public Emergency Response		[4,000]	
		EDIT Tech for Counter-Tunnel Ops and Cache Detections		[1,500]	
		Full Scale Impact and Blast Loading Laboratory Testing		[4,000]	
		Vehicle Design for Survivability Under Blast Loading		[3,000]	
0603160BR	28	CPI - PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	211,325		211,325
		Portable Radionuclide Detection and Identification Systems		[2,000]	2,000
0603175C	29	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	118,718	-5,000	113,718
		Program Decrease		[-5,000]	
0603225D8Z	30	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	23,727		23,727

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603286E	31	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	107,857		107,857
0603287E	32	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	287,009	-10,000	277,009
		DARPA Poor Execution		[-10,000]	
0603384BP	33	CHEM/BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADV DEVELOPMENT	337,927	-30,000	307,927
		Chemical/Biological Defense (TMTI)		[-50,000]	
		Chem/Bio Defense Advanced Tech Development Initiative		[20,000]	
0603618D8Z	34	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,320		9,320
		Advanced Energy Storage Technology Initiative		[10,000]	10,000
0603648D8Z	35	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	206,337	2,900	209,237
		Distributed Network Switching		[2,900]	
0603662D8Z	36	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	39,923		39,923
0603665D8Z	37	BIOMETRICS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	10,579		10,579
0603670D8Z	38	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING	9,381	4,000	13,381
		Modeling Advanced Development		[4,000]	
0603680D8Z	39	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECH	11,981		11,981
0603711D8Z	40	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM/AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS	8,449		8,449
		Connectory Expansion for Rapid ID of Tech Sources		[1,300]	1,300
0603712S	41	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECH DEMONSTRATIONS	19,375	2,000	21,375
		Emerging/Critical Interconnection Technology Program		[2,000]	
0603713S	42	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHN	30,000		30,000
0603716D8Z	43	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	69,038		69,038
0603720S	44	MICROELECTRONICS TECH DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	0	16,000	16,000

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Superlattice Nanotechnology		[3,000]	
		3-D Electronics and Power		[3,000]	
		Feature Size Yield Enhancement at DMEA ARMS Foundry		[5,000]	
		End to End Semi Fab Alpha Tool		[5,000]	
0603727D8Z	45	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	11,098		11,098
0603739E	46	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	201,146	-10,000	191,146
		DARPA Poor Execution		[-10,000]	
0603745D8Z	47	SAR COHERENT CHANGE DETECTION (CDD)	7,984		7,984
0603750D8Z	48	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	0		0
0603755D8Z	49	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION	208,079		208,079
0603760E	50	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	338,964	-10,000	328,964
		DARPA Poor Execution		[-10,000]	
0603764E	51	LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	0		0
0603765E	52	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	196,697		196,697
0603766E	53	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	156,733		156,733
0603767E	54	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	226,470		226,470
0603768E	55	GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	110,572		110,572
0603769SE	56	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECH DEVELOPMENT	13,538		13,538
0603781D8Z	57	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	31,244		31,244
0603805S	58	DUAL USE TECHNOLOGY	0		0
0603826D8Z	59	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	113,924	2,000	115,924
		REDTIE		[2,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603828D8Z	60	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	114,947		114,947
0603832D8Z	61	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	38,147	800	38,947
		Modeling and Simulation Standards Development		[800]	
0603941D8Z	62	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	94,672		94,672
0603942D8Z	63	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,170		2,170
1160402BB	64	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECH DEVELOPMENT	28,930	23,000	51,930
		Partnership for Defense Innovation Wi-Fi Laboratory Testing		[3,000]	
		SOCOM Rapid Exploitation of Innovative Technologies		[20,000]	
1160472BB	65	SOF INFORMATION AND BROADCAST SYS ADV TECH	10,990		10,990
		SUBTOTAL, ATD, DEFENSE-WIDE	**3,536,023**	**26,000**	**3,562,023**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
0603161D8Z	66	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY	38,758		38,758
0603228D8Z	67	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	0		0
0603527D8Z	68	RETRACT LARCH	22,945		22,945
0603709D8Z	69	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	11,847		11,847
0603714D8Z	70	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	0		0
0603851D8Z	71	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION	31,600		31,600
0603881C	72	BMD TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,019,073	-55,000	964,073
		Transfer of Funds to Line 96 of Procurement, Defense-Wide		[-65,000]	
		Short Range Missile Defense		[10,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603882C	73	BMD MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	2,076,662	-182,000	1,894,662
		European Site reduction		[-182,000]	
0603883C	74	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT	421,229	-42,600	378,629
		Program Decrease		[-42,600]	
0603884BP	75	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	51,291		51,291
0603884C	76	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	1,076,983	-98,900	978,083
		Site Activation and Security		[-50,000]	
		European Midcourse Radar		[-48,900]	
0603886C	77	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM INTERCEPTOR	386,817	-100,000	286,817
		Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI)		[-100,000]	
0603888C	78	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS	665,445	25,000	690,445
		Target Development		[25,000]	
0603890C	79	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS CORE	432,262	-20,000	412,262
		Program Decrease		[-20,000]	
0603891C	80	SPECIAL PROGRAMS - MDA	288,315	-150,000	138,315
		Program Decrease		[-150,000]	
0603892C	81	AEGIS BMD	1,157,783	-36,000	1,121,783
		Transfer of Funds to Line 95 of Procurement, Defense-Wide		[-56,000]	
		Ballistic Missile Defense Signal Processors		[20,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0603893C	82	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	242,441	-25,000	217,441
		Program Decrease		[-25,000]	
0603894C	83	MULTIPLE KILL VEHICLE	354,455	-100,000	254,455
		Program Decrease		[-100,000]	
0603895C	84	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	29,771	-10,000	19,771
		Space Test Bed		[-10,000]	
0603896C	85	BMD C2, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS	289,277		289,277
0603897C	86	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE HERCULES	55,955		55,955
0603898C	87	BMD JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	69,982		69,982
0603904C	88	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER	96,404		96,404
0603905C	89	BMD DISTRIBUTED MULTI ECHELON TRAINING SYSTEM	0		0
0603906C	90	REGARDING TRENCH	2,978		2,978
0603907C	91	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	0		0
0603920D8Z	92	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	14,373		14,373
0603923D8Z	93	COALITION WARFARE	14,030		14,030
0604016D8Z	94	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	5,102		5,102
		Managing and Extending DOD Asset Lifecycles		[4,000]	4,000
0604648D8Z	95	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	14,962		14,962
0604670D8Z	96	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING	5,991	2,000	7,991
		Program Increase		[2,000]	
0604787D8Z	97	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION COMMAND (JSIC)	19,643		19,643
0604828D8Z	98	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	16,906		16,906

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0605017D8Z	99	REDUCTION OF TOTAL OWNERSHIP COST	24,765		24,765
0303191D8Z	100	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	3,524		3,524
		SUBTOTAL, ACD & PROTOTYPES, DEFENSE-WIDE	8,941,569	-788,500	8,153,069
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
0604051D8Z	101	DEFENSE ACQUISITION CHALLENGE PROGRAM	30,363		30,363
0604161D8Z	102	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,355		4,355
0604165D8Z	103	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	117,572	7,000	124,572
		Army Advanced Hypersonic Weapon		[7,000]	
0604384BP	104	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	299,373		299,373
0604709D8Z	105	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	5,725		5,725
0604764K	106	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE	13,770		13,770
0604771D8Z	107	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	20,600		20,600
0605000BR	108	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	15,946		15,946
0605013BL	109	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,611		11,611
0605018BTA	110	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYS	37,400		37,400
0605020BTA	111	BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY R&D ACTIVITIES	148,958		148,958
0605021SE	112	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	400		400
0605140D8Z	113	TRUSTED FOUNDRY	42,360		42,360
0605648D8Z	114	DEFENSE ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE PILOT PROGRAM	5,883		5,883
0303129K	115	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	0		0

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0303141K	116	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	18,604		18,604
0303158K	117	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	147,339		147,339
		SUBTOTAL, SDD, DEFENSE-WIDE	920,259	7,000	927,259
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0603757D8Z	118	TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (T2)	38,729	2,000	40,729
		Indiana Complex Operations Partnership		[2,000]	
0604774D8Z	119	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	11,385		11,385
0604875D8Z	120	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	14,310		14,310
0604940D8Z	121	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEV	133,852	18,000	151,852
		Advanced SAM Hardware Simulator Development		[6,000]	
		Joint Gulf Range Complex Upgrade		[8,000]	
		Gulf Range Mobile Instrumentation Capability (GR-MIC)		[4,000]	
0604943D8Z	122	THERMAL VICAR	9,658		9,658
0605100D8Z	123	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	8,834		8,834
0605104D8Z	124	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	34,520	1,500	36,020
		Center for Technology and National Security Policy		[1,500]	
0605110D8Z	125	USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	4,007		4,007
0605117D8Z	126	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	62,816	5,000	67,816
		Foreign Material Acquisition Training Devices		[5,000]	
0605126J	127	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	55,282		55,282

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0605128D8Z	128	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	0		0
0605130D8Z	129	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	34,910		34,910
0605161D8Z	130	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,475		4,475
0605170D8Z	131	NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	14,723		14,723
0605200D8Z	132	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	4,379		4,379
0605384BP	133	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	100,082		100,082
0605502BR	134	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH	0		0
0605502C	135	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - MDA	0		0
0605502D8Z	136	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
0605502E	137	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
0605502S	138	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
0605790D8Z	139	SBIR/CHALLENGE ADMINISTRATION	2,165		2,165
0605798D8Z	140	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	11,040		11,040
0605798S	141	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	0		0
0605799D8Z	142	FORCE TRANSFORMATION DIRECTORATE	20,701		20,701
		Science and Technology for Strategic Communications		[8,000]	8,000
		Defense Command Integration Center		[3,400]	3,400
0605801KA	143	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	52,696		52,696
0605803SE	144	ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	25,435		25,435
0605804D8Z	145	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	20,396	4,000	24,396
		Renewable Fuel Systems for Defense Applications		[4,000]	
0605897E	146	DARPA AGENCY RELOCATION	28,000		28,000

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0605898E	147	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	52,700		52,700
0606100D8Z	148	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	5,878		5,878
0301555G	149	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM			
0301556G	150	SPECIAL PROGRAM			
0303166D8Z	151	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS CAPABILITIES	30,039		30,039
0303169D8Z	152	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RAPID ACQUISITION	5,254	7,000	12,254
		Information Technology Clearinghouse		[7,000]	
0305103E	153	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	50,000		50,000
0305193D8Z	154	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS	17,625		17,625
0305193G	155	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS			
0305400D8Z	156	WARFIGHTING AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUPPORT	831		831
0901585C	157	PENTAGON RESERVATION	19,734		19,734
0901598C	158	MANAGEMENT HQ - MDA	86,453	-5,000	81,453
		Management Support		[-5,000]	
0901598D8W	159	IT SOFTWARE DEV INITIATIVES	599		599
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, DW	**961,508**	**43,900**	**1,005,408**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0604130V	160	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR SECURITY (DISS)	11,533		11,533
0605127T	161	PFP INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	2,496		2,496
0607384BP	162	CHEM/BIO DEFENSE	10,274		10,274

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0607828D8Z	163	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	49,371		49,371
0204571J	164	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	8,030		8,030
0208043J	165	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,728		1,728
0208045K	166	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	76,226		76,226
0301011G	167	CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES		7,000	7,000
		IED Industrial Exploitation (IDEX) Program		[7,000]	
0301144K	168	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	19,073		19,073
0301301L	169	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM			
		Portable Device for Latent Fingerprint Identification		[1,800]	1,800
03011318BB	170	HUMINT (CONTROLLED)			
0301371G	171	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE - CCP			
0301372L	172	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE - GDIP			
0301555BB	173	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			
0301555BZ	174	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			
0301556BB	175	SPECIAL PROGRAM			
0301556BZ	176	SPECIAL PROGRAM			
0302016K	177	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	615		615
0302019K	178	INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	16,054		16,054
0303126K	179	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS - DCS	8,508		8,508
0303131K	180	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NET	9,685		9,685
0303135G	181	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	15,577		15,577
0303136G	182	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	49,578		49,578

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0303140D8Z	183	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	13,459		13,459
0303140G	184	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	394,074		394,074
0303140K	185	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	0		0
0303148K	186	DISA MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	2,181		2,181
0303149J	187	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	3,662		3,662
0303149K	188	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	0		0
0303150K	189	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	36,374		36,374
0303153K	190	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	19,319		19,319
0303170K	191	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	429		429
0303610K	192	TELEPORT PROGRAM	2,060		2,060
0304210BB	193	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	16,225		16,225
		Unmanned Aerial Systems Test Facility Upgrade		[8,000]	8,000
		Expeditionary Persistent Power		[3,000]	3,000
0304345BQ	194	NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (NGP)			
0305102BQ	195	DEFENSE GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM			
0305103D8Z	196	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	1,000		1,000
0305103G	197	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE			
0305103K	198	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	12,800		12,800
0305125D8Z	199	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	12,700		12,700
0305127BZ	200	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES			
0305146BZ	201	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	2,947		2,947
0305183L	202	DEFENSE HUMAN INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) ACTIVITIES			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0305186D8Z	203	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	8,237		8,237
0305193G	204	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS			
0305193L	205	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS			
0305199D8Z	206	NET CENTRICITY	12,716		12,716
0305202G	207	DRAGON U-2			
0305206G	208	AIRBORNE RECONNAISANCE SYSTEMS			
0305207G	209	MANNED RECONNAISANCE SYSTEMS			
0305208BB	210	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,165		3,165
0305208BQ	211	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS			
0305208G	212	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS			
0305208K	213	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,227		3,227
0305208L	214	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS			
0305219BB	215	MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV	13,679		13,679
0305229G	216	REAL-TIME ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT (RT10)			
0305866L	217	DIA SUPPORT TO SOUTHCOM INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES			
0305880L	218	COMBATANT COMMAND INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS			
0305883L	219	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET INTEL SUPPORT			
0305884L	220	INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES			
0305885G	221	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES			
0305889G	222	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT			
0307141G	223	IO TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEV			
0307207G	224	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
0708011S	225	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	20,480		20,480
0708012S	226	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	2,846		2,846
0902298J	227	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS)	3,401		3,401
1001018D8Z	228	NATO JOINT STARS	27,756		27,756
1130435BB	229	STORM	0		0
1160279BB	230	SBIR/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PROG	0		0
1160403BB	231	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS	43,977	30,000	73,977
		Gunship Lite Prototype Test Bed		[30,000]	
1160404BB	232	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEV	13,263	4,000	17,263
		Covert Communications for Special Operations Forces		[4,000]	
1160405BB	233	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEV	39,125	4,200	43,325
		Advanced Long Endurance Unattended Ground Sensors		[4,200]	
1160408BB	234	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	48,137	3,900	52,037
		Meteorological and Oceanographic Collection Sensors		[3,900]	
1160421BB	235	SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV-22 DEVELOPMENT	38,229		38,229
1160425BB	236	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AIRCRAFT DEFENSIVE SYSTEMS	0		0
1160426BB	237	OPERATIONS ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM DEV	7,090		7,090
1160427BB	238	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS)	4,052		4,052
1160428BB	239	UNMANNED VEHICLES (UV)	1,527		1,527
1160429BB	240	MC130J SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION	4,659		4,659
1160477BB	241	SOF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	2,759		2,759
1160478BB	242	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	3,190		3,190

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
1160479BB	243	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SYS	3,495		3,495
1160482BB	244	SOF ROTARY WING AVIATION	3,822		3,822
1160483BB	245	SOF UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	3,142		3,142
1160484BB	246	SOF SURFACE CRAFT	5,206		5,206
1160488BB	247	SOF PSYOP	15,554		15,554
1160489BB	248	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	14,686		14,686
1160490BB	249	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	8,729		8,729
9999999999	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,805,519		3,805,519
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYS DEV, DEFENSE-WIDE	**4,957,646**	**61,900**	**5,019,546**
		Total, RDT&E Defense-Wide	**21,499,229**	**-654,350**	**20,844,879**

OPERATIONAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $188.8 million for Operational research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $188.8 million, the requested amount for fiscal year 2009.

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Element	Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE			
0605118OTE	1	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	53,196		53,196
0605131OTE	2	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	11,572		11,572
0605814OTE	3	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	124,004		124,004
		Total, Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	**188,772**	**0**	**188,772**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**79,615,941**	**109,492**	**79,725,433**

Items of Special Interest

Acquisition of foreign material for training purposes

The budget request contained $62.8 million in PE 65117D8Z for foreign material acquisition and exploitation, but contained no funds to acquire quality, cost effective, and realistic training aids to be distributed evenly to the joint service explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) community.

The committee understands the importance of realistic training aids in providing effective training for EOD technicians, especially considering the challenges faced in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The insurgencies in those two nations have proven to be resourceful in the use of readily available materials, and highly adaptive in responding to our countermeasures. Lessons learning in those areas of responsibility are also rapidly proliferating to other areas due to the ubiquity of the internet to provide anonymous communications capacity. Without the ability to quickly acquire realistic systems and develop training packages for the EOD community, American forces will be unable to keep within the decision cycle of our adversaries, jeopardizing the lives of coalition forces and civilians.

The committee recommends $67.8 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 65117D8Z.

Advanced energy storage technology initiative

The budget request contained $9.3 million in PE 63618D8Z for joint electronic advanced technology.

The committee is aware of continuing requirements for innovative battery and non-battery power sources for a number of military applications. These military applications include power generation for soldiers, weapons, vehicles, and installations, which require energy storage technologies that meet unique performance and system integration specifications. The committee notes a number of developmental technologies that have the potential for meeting the requirements of the military services. These include the following: thin lithium-ion disulfide batteries; rechargeable lithium batteries; carbonate fuel cells; polymer electrolyte membrane fuel cell auxiliary power units; mobile micro-grid energy storage devices; fuel cells and electrochemical energy storage; domestically-produced lithium-ion battery materials and safer lithium ion battery designs; lithium ion superpolymer battery systems for future vehicle power; novel zinc air power sources for soldier power; fuel cell demonstrations for backup power; fuel cell hybrid electrical generation systems; acid alkaline direct methanol fuel cell technology; and carbon nanotube enhanced power sources for space. The committee recommends that such technologies be considered for potential research, development, testing and/or demonstration funding. The committee recommends that the Director of Defense Research and Engineering select a technology or technologies on the basis of technical merit, cost-effectiveness, and the potential of a particular technology to meet service needs.

The committee recommends $19.3 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63618D8Z for the advanced energy storage technology initiative.

Analysis of the industrial base for space acquisitions

The Cost Analysis Improvement Group (CAIG) within the Office of the Secretary of Defense recently conducted an analysis of the industrial base for the hardware elements of space programs that identified significant challenges. The committee believes this analysis should be maintained and updated on a regular basis. The committee also notes that current and planned space systems are software dependent, and recommends the industrial base study be broadened to analyze the industrial capabilities and capacity to respond to future software requirements.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to task the CAIG to analyze the industrial base that supports the development and production of space systems on a regular basis. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2008, on the health of the industrial base supporting space acquisitions and plans for monitoring the industrial base in the future.

Army advanced hypersonic weapon

The budget request contained $117.6 million in PE 64165D8Z for Prompt Global Strike Capability development, including no funds for the Army advanced hypersonic weapon.

The committee is aware that the Army has been developing the advanced hypersonic weapon under the auspices of a separate Army program. The committee believes that the Army should continue its work in coordination with the Defense-wide Prompt Global Strike program.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 64165D8Z for Army advanced hypersonic weapon technology development.

Ballistic missile defense

The committee is concerned that the Missile Defense Agency remains too focused on the threat from long-range missiles and is not devoting sufficient resources and attention on threats from short- and medium-range ballistic missiles. Such short- and medium-range missiles represent the overwhelming ballistic missile threat to U.S. interests, deployed forces, and allies around the world. The Joint Capabilities Mix II study, sponsored by the U.S. Strategic Command in 2007, is just one example of combatant commanders reporting to Congress that the United States does not currently possess sufficient numbers of regional missile defense capabilities to counter the current and growing threat from short- and medium-range ballistic missiles.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee has re-prioritized resources away from systems designed to address longer-term threats and focused them instead on closing existing capability gaps against short- and medium-range threats. As the Department of Defense begins to develop its fiscal year 2010 budget, the committee urges it to focus greater attention on the threat from short- and medium-range ballistic missiles.

Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense

The budget request contained $1.2 billion in PE 63892C, for the sea-based Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD), which is designed

to defend against short-, medium-, and intermediate-range ballistic missiles.

The committee notes its continuing concern that the Missile Defense Agency is not providing sufficient funds for Aegis BMD. Given the threat posed by short- and medium-range ballistic missiles, the committee is concerned that the 133 Standard Missile-3 (SM–3) interceptors that are currently planned will be insufficient. The committee's views are consistent with the results of the recently completed Joint Capabilities Mix Study II, which concluded that combatant commanders require nearly twice as many SM–3 interceptors than the 133 now planned. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee has increased funding for SM–3 production.

The committee also notes its strong support for the United States-Japan Cooperative Development Program, which is co-developing the SM–3 Block IIA missile designed to counter longer-range ballistic missile threats. The committee expects the Missile Defense Agency to continue to support the development of the current unitary kill vehicle for that interceptor.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 63892C for the purchase of additional ballistic missile signal processors. Furthermore, in accordance with section 223 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), the committee recommends the transfer of $56.0 million for procurement of SM–3 interceptors to title 1.

The committee, therefore, recommends a total of $1.1 billion, a decrease of $36.0 million, in PE 63892C for Aegis BMD.

Airborne Laser

The budget request contained $421.2 million in PE 63883C for the Airborne Laser (ABL) Capability Development program.

The committee continues to have serious concerns about the ABL program. The ABL program has suffered numerous delays and cost increases since its inception in 1996, and is currently estimated to cost $5.1 billion, five times greater than the original cost estimate, from inception to completion of its first lethal shoot-down test, currently scheduled for 2009. Additionally, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that it could cost as much as $36.0 billion to develop, procure, and operate a fleet of 7 ABL aircraft for 20 years.

The committee notes several challenges remain for the ABL program that will not be addressed as part of the lethal shoot-down test in 2009, including ABL's inherent operational constraints. Additional testing is required to demonstrate operational capability and military utility. The committee is also concerned about the number of ABL aircraft required to maintain an operational ABL patrol.

The committee notes that even if the 2009 shoot down demonstration is successful, it will not demonstrate whether ABL will be operationally effective, survivable, or affordable. Before a decision is made to begin procuring additional ABL aircraft, the committee believes that a full review of this program, and other potential boost phase defense systems, is required. Elsewhere in this title, the committee directs a review of options for boost phase missile defense systems. The committee therefore believes it is premature to begin planning for the procurement of a second ABL aircraft as requested in the budget request. Furthermore, the com-

mittee has also reduced funding for activities not directly required to achieve the 2009 shoot down demonstration.

The committee recommends $378.6 million, a decrease of $42.6 million, in PE 63883C for the ABL program, and authorizes no funding for a second ABL aircraft.

Arrow Weapons System

The State of Israel has indicated a requirement for a follow-on system to the existing Arrow Weapons System to improve its capability to engage ballistic missiles at longer ranges. It has also noted an interest in developing a new weapons system, the Arrow-3, to meet this requirement.

The committee strongly supports ongoing cooperation with Israel in the area of missile defense. The committee, however, questions the necessity of developing a new program when current missile defense systems may be able to meet Israel's requirements. Recent analysis by the Missile Defense Agency indicates that existing missile defense systems such as the Standard Missile-3 (SM–3) would provide equal or better capability than the proposed Arrow-3. The SM–3 is a more mature, demonstrated technology that could provide capability for Israel on a faster timeline and at less cost.

Before proceeding with the development of the Arrow-3, the committee urges Israel and the Department of Defense to conduct a full review of existing missile defense systems to determine the most cost-effective solution to meet the missile defense requirements of Israel and the United States.

Ballistic missile defense discrimination radar in Israel

The committee notes that the State of Israel faces a real and growing threat from short- and medium-range ballistic missiles from states such as the Syrian Arab Republic and the Islamic Republic of Iran. The committee believes that the deployment of a U.S. Army-Navy/Transportable–2 (AN/TPY–2) missile defense discrimination radar to Israel would greatly increase the capabilities of both Israel and U.S. forces deployed in support of Israel to defend against ballistic missile threats. Therefore, the committee urges the Department of Defense to begin discussions with Israel about the possibility of deploying an AN/TPY–2 radar on its territory at the earliest feasible date.

Ballistic missile defense reductions

The budget request contained $432.2 million in PE 63890C for Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) Core, $86.4 million in PE 91598C for Management Headquarters-Missile Defense Agency (MDA), $118.7 million in PE 63175C for ballistic missile defense technology, and $288.3 million in PE 63891C for Missile Defense Agency special programs.

The committee recommends $412.2 million, a decrease of $20.0 million, in PE 63890C for BMD Core; $81.4 million, a decrease of $5.0 million, in PE 91598C for Management Headquarters-MDA; $113.7 million, a decrease of $5.0 million, for BMD technology; and $138.3 million, a decrease of $150.0 million, in PE 63891C for MDA special programs to partially offset the additional funding for other higher priority defense programs.

Ballistic missile defense sensors

The budget request contained $1.1 billion in PE 63884C for ballistic missile defense sensors.

The request for sensors included $97.8 million in title II for the proposed European Midcourse Radar (EMR). Elsewhere in this Act, the committee has reduced funding for the military construction of the proposed radar site out of concern over the ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2009. The committee expects these changes will have an impact on the ability to execute research and development-funded activities according to the proposed schedule.

The request also included funding for deployment and site preparation efforts to deploy Army-Navy/Transportable Radar (AN/TPY–2) #3, at a potential foreign location. According to Department of Defense budget documents, these funds will be used to assist with planning and coordination with the host nation and combatant commanders, radar site design, site construction, transport of the radar to an overseas site, radar set-up, calibration, site security, and activation. The committee finds this request to be premature, as the Department of Defense has not yet made an internal decision on where to place AN/TPY–2 #3, nor have negotiations begun with a potential host nation.

The committee recommends $978.0 million, a decrease of $98.9 million, in PE 63884C including a reduction of $48.9 million for the EMR and a reduction of $50.0 million for AN/TPY–2 #3.

Ballistic missile defense system space program

The budget request contained $29.8 million in PE 63895C for the ballistic missile defense (BMD) system space program, including funding for a proposed space test bed.

According to the Missile Defense Agency, the purpose of the space test bed is to examine options for deploying space-based missile defense interceptors in the future. The committee does not support the deployment of space-based interceptors.

The committee recommends $19.8 million for the BMD system space program, a decrease of $10.0 million, in PE 63895C and authorizes no funds for the proposed space test bed.

European Ground-based Midcourse Defense component

The budget request contained $2.1 billion in PE 63882C for the Ground-based, Midcourse Defense (GMD) program, of which $317.0 million is for the proposed GMD interceptor site in the Republic of Poland and associated equipment.

In January 2007, the Administration announced negotiations with Poland and the Czech Republic about the possibility of deploying long-range missile defense interceptors and radars in their respective territories to defend against a potential long-range missile threat from the Islamic Republic of Iran. While the Administration reached a tentative agreement in April 2008 with the Czech Republic, it has not concluded negotiations with Poland.

The committee remains concerned about the potential effectiveness of the two-stage GMD interceptor to perform its mission in the European theater. The committee notes that the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) has observed that the employment of the proposed two-stage interceptor in European defensive operations is not well understood, and has recommended addi-

tional testing of the two-stage interceptor, including against multiple, threat representative targets.

The committee welcomes the Missile Defense Agency's recent decision to add an additional test of the two-stage interceptor, but notes that it is unclear at this point whether that third test will include all of the key recommendations made by DOT&E, including, for example, a recommended salvo test. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to prepare a jointly agreed plan to ensure the European-based GMD assets can successfully accomplish their mission. The plan shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2008.

Section 222 of this title would limit the availability of funds for the acquisition of operational, two-stage GMD interceptors until the Secretary of Defense certifies that the interceptor has demonstrated, through operationally realistic testing, a high probability of operational effectiveness. The committee views such a certification as unattainable in fiscal year 2009, because the first of three tests of the system is not planned until the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2009. In light of the time necessary for the three planned tests and subsequent certification, the committee views funding in fiscal year 2009 for operational interceptors premature.

The committee notes that the proposed long-range interceptors in Poland would not be able to protect the southern portions of Europe against existing Iranian short- and medium-range ballistic missiles. The committee is concerned that it may be premature to move forward at the pace recommended by the Administration given the fact that the long-range missile threat from Iran has yet to emerge and neither the United States nor our North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies have sufficient regional missile defense capabilities to meet current short-and medium-range Iranian ballistic missile threats.

The committee has long advocated the need to win NATO support for the proposed deployment, and welcomes the Alliance's April 3, 2008, Bucharest Summit Declaration which recognized the "substantial contribution to the protection of Allies from long-range ballistic missiles to be provided the planned deployment of European-based United States missile defence assets." The committee encourages further actions to ensure that United States and NATO missile defense systems are fully integrated in the future.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee has reduced funding for the military construction of the proposed European GMD interceptor site out of concern over the ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2009. The committee expects these changes will have an impact on the ability to execute research and development-funded activities according to the proposed schedule.

In view of these concerns, the committee recommends $1.9 billion, a decrease of $182.0 million, in PE 63882C for the proposed GMD interceptor site in Poland and associated equipment.

Kinetic Energy Interceptor

The budget request contained $386.8 million in PE 63886C for the Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI).

The KEI program has been described by the Missile Defense Agency as both a potential boost phase defense system and a fol-

low-on to the current generation of Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system. The Missile Defense Agency's current emphasis for the KEI program is as a follow-on to the current GMD program.

The committee questions the urgency of a GMD follow-on program at this time. The Missile Defense Agency has only just begun deploying the existing GMD interceptors in Alaska and California. The committee understands those interceptors have an expected service-life of at least 20 years. Given the limited number of long-range missile threats that the United States will likely face in the near-to mid-term from rogue states, the planned inventory of 54 GMD interceptors should be sufficient to address that threat.

The committee believes some investment in a follow-on system is warranted, but not at the level requested. Therefore, the committee recommends $286.8 million, a decrease of $100.0 million, in PE 63886C for KEI.

Missile defense force structure

The committee is concerned about how the Department of Defense sets its force structure and establishes inventory requirements for missile defense. The committee does not believe that the Missile Defense Agency has the appropriate expertise to set missile defense force structure requirements. The committee notes a general lack of transparency and methodology in the development of current missile defense force requirements. The committee is concerned that the Department has not yet determined the production quantities and operational force level requirements to address the full-range of ballistic missile threats that confront the United States.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive plan for setting future missile defense force structure and inventory requirements. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by April 15, 2009, to the congressional defense committees which identifies:

(1) The methodology for determining current and future missile defense force structure and inventory requirements;

(2) The Department's specific process for making decisions related to force structure and inventory requirements;

(3) The expected roles and responsibilities of all relevant organizations for analyzing force structure and inventory requirements, including the Joint Staff, the military services, Missile Defense Agency, combatant commands, intelligence organizations, and the Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation; and

(4) Which elements (e.g., Missile Defense Agency, the military services) within the Department will be responsible for procuring additional missile defense inventory.

Missile defense program element structure

The committee continues to believe that the Missile Defense Agency program element (PE) structure is too broad, and that this structure needs to be further refined to provide Congress greater transparency into missile defense programs.

Therefore, starting with the fiscal year 2010 budget submission, the committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency

to provide separate PE numbers for each specific element in the Terminal Defense Segment and within Ballistic Missile Defense Sensors. These new PE numbers should include: Terminal High Altitude Area Defense; Israeli Cooperative Programs; Upgraded Early Warning Radars; Sea-based, X-Band radar; Army-Navy/Transportable Radars; and European Midcourse Radar.

Missile defense program oversight

In 2002, the Secretary of Defense granted the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) unusual flexibility to deploy an initial missile defense system for the United States, including an exemption from the normal Department of Defense requirements process. Now that the initial system has been developed and deployed, the committee believes there is less rationale for maintaining this flexibility. The committee believes the Missile Defense Agency must begin to transition into more normal defense planning and budget processes.

In August 2007, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) Chairman recommended that the Deputy Secretary of Defense transition the Missile Defense Agency back into standard departmental processes and direct the JROC to provide oversight of MDA. Rather than implement this proposal, the Department of Defense established a new senior-level group, the Missile Defense Executive Board (MDEB), in March 2007, to improve oversight and integration of MDA activities.

The committee is concerned that these processes may not enable the JROC and the services to effectively validate missile defense requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in his capacity as chairman of the JROC, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act that assesses whether the newly established MDEB process:

(1) Allows the JROC to provide effective military advice to validate missile defense capabilities;

(2) Facilitates the synchronization of MDA-fielded assets with other air and missile defense capabilities being developed; and

(3) Enables the military departments to appropriately plan and program resources for the fielding and sustainment of MDA-fielded assets.

Missile defense testing and targets

The budget request contained $665.4 million in PE 63888C for ballistic missile defense test and targets.

The committee is concerned about the testing program for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) program. The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) conducted a successful intercept test of GMD in September 2007, its second successful intercept since 2002. However, the committee believes that more frequent and rigorous testing of the system is needed to demonstrate the system's operational effectiveness.

The Director of the Department of Defense Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) office has raised similar concerns, noting in

the DOT&E fiscal year 2007 annual report, "GMD flight testing to date is not sufficient to provide a high degree of statistical confidence in its limited capabilities . . . additional flight test data under realistic conditions is necessary to validate models and simulations and to increase confidence in the ability of these models and simulations to accurately assess system capability."

The committee is also concerned with the MDA targets program, and notes the failure to produce sufficient reliable targets has become the pacing item of the Missile Defense Agency's entire test program. The committee notes that the Flexible Target Family (FTF) has become more complex and expensive than originally estimated.

The committee, therefore, recommends $690.4 million, an increase of $25.0 million, in PE 63888C for target development. Additionally, the committee directs the Missile Defense Agency to re-assess both its testing program for the GMD program and target acquisition strategy including the FTF initiative. The committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to deliver a report within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act to the congressional defense committees describing the results of this assessment and a plan to:

(1) Increase the frequency and rigor of GMD testing; and

(2) Increase the quantity and reliability of missile defense targets.

Multiple Kill Vehicle

The budget request contained $354.5 million in PE 63894C for the Multiple Kill Vehicle (MKV) program.

The committee supports research into options for ultimately replacing the unitary exo-atmospheric kill vehicles (EKV) on the existing and future fleet of long-range, mid-course interceptors. However, the committee believes the Missile Defense Agency is moving forward too quickly with development of the MKV program, and notes that Missile Defense Agency has not yet fully demonstrated the capabilities of the existing EKV.

The committee also notes that the Missile Defense Agency intends to support two vendors to examine alternative MKV technology concepts. The committee believes there is significant technical risk that must be addressed in the MKV program and understands the approach of maintaining two vendors to reduce technology risk. However, the committee is concerned about the financial implications of maintaining two vendors indefinitely.

The committee recommends $254.5 million, a decrease of $100.0 million, in PE 63894C for MKV. In addition, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to provide a report to the congressional defense committees that provides criteria and a clear path for down-selecting between vendors as the MKV program matures and meets its established knowledge points.

Short-range ballistic missile defense

The budget request contained $44.8 million in PE 63881C for short-range ballistic missile defense or "David's Sling" program.

The short-range ballistic missile defense program is being jointly designed by the United States and the State of Israel to provide an

affordable and effective defense against the threat from long-range artillery rockets and short-range ballistic missiles.

The committee recommends $54.8 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63881C to support the continued development of the short-range ballistic missile defense program.

Space Tracking and Surveillance System

The budget request contained $242.4 million in PE 63893C for the Space Tracking and Surveillance System (STSS).

The committee notes that the Missile Defense Agency plans to launch two STSS demonstration satellites in November 2008, to demonstrate the ability to track ballistic missiles from space. The committee is supportive of this effort. The committee notes it is premature, however, to begin development of a follow-on constellation of satellites before these two demonstration satellites have demonstrated any capability to track ballistic missile targets.

The committee recommends $217.4 million, a decrease of $25.0 million, in PE 63893C for STSS, and authorizes no funds to begin work on an STSS follow-on constellation.

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense

The budget request contained $864.8 million in PE 63881C for the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system, which is designed to protect against short-, medium-, and intermediate-range ballistic missiles.

For several years, combatant commanders have expressed strong support for THAAD. The 2007 Joint Capabilities Mix Study II concluded that combatant commanders require nearly twice as many THAAD interceptors as the 96 now planned. The committee also notes that the Army's original requirement for THAAD included 8 fire units and 1,250 interceptors. Under a separate title of this Act, the committee has increased funding for THAAD procurement.

In accordance with section 223 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), the committee recommends the transfer of $65.0 million for advanced procurement of THAAD Fire Units #3 and #4 from PE 63881C to title 1.

The committee recommends $799.8 million, a decrease of $65.0 million, in PE 63881C for THAAD.

Blood cell storage

The committee is aware that the military requires blood-containing viable platelets necessary for effective hemorrhage control. The committee notes that unlike other blood components like plasma and red cells, platelets can only be stored at room temperature and only for a few days. Currently, the quality of platelet concentrates is determined by a subjective visual check or by taking random samples directly from the platelet storage bag to measure the degree of acidity (pH) of the sample, as pH is considered to be a good indicator of platelet quality. However, taking a sample breaks the sterility of the bag and the respective unit of platelets can no longer be used.

The committee seeks to ensure that the best medical treatment is available for warfighters wounded in combat and other military operations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of De-

fense to conduct a study and pilot project on technology and methods for improving the shelf-life and viability of blood platelet storage. Such a study shall include examining methods of closed-loop pH monitoring for platelets. The committee directs the Secretary to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a summary of his findings and recommendations, by March 31, 2009.

Center for Technology and National Security Policy at the National Defense University

The budget request contained $34.5 million in PE 65104D8Z for technical studies, support, and analysis, but contained no funds for analyses for the Center for Technology and National Security Policy (CTNSP) at the National Defense University.

The committee recognizes that CTNSP provides valuable support to the Department through the development of a wide range of studies and analyses. The committee has also been the beneficiary of the critical mass of knowledge and expertise at CTNSP, having both received written products such as the 2006 "Report to Congress on the Information Technology Program" and oral testimony on a range of topics from experts at CTNSP. The committee encourages the researchers at CTNSP to continue to explore issues of importance to the Department and the nation. The synergy created between the academic research and operational experience the CTNSP is an asset that provides advice to policy makers in shaping national security direction.

The committee recommends $36.0 million, an increase of $1.5 million, in PE 65104D8Z for the CNSTP.

Chemical and biological defense basic and applied research and advanced technology development initiative

The budget request contained $594.8 million for chemical/biological defense science and technology, including $53.2 million in PE 61384BP for basic research, $203.7 million in applied research, and $337.9 million in advanced technology development.

The committee recommends continuation of the chemical and biological basic research, applied research, and advanced technology development initiatives established in the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). These initiatives would provide opportunities for emerging technologies and concepts to compete for funding on the basis of technical merit and on the contribution that such technologies could make to the chemical and biological defense capabilities of the armed forces and to homeland defense.

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 are not limited to the following:

(1) Chemical and biological protective clothing;
(2) Protective self-decontaminating surface technology;
(3) Nano porous regenerative filters;
(4) Rapid bio-detection and early warning systems;
(5) Antioxidant micronutrient countermeasures;

(6) Anthrax skin patch vaccine; and
(7) Wide area surveillance and warning systems.

The committee recommends $358.9 million in PE 63384BP, an increase of $20.0 million for the chemical/biological defense advanced technology development 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) Self-decontaminating polymers;
(2) Sample preparation;
(3) Standoff multispectral imaging detection;
(4) CBRNE detection sensor network design;
(5) Multi-agent vaccine development;
(6) Bio-terror shield for yellow fever, dengue, and West Nile virus;
(7) Biosurety development and management;
(8) Enhanced chemical and biological protective clothing;
(9) Smallpox biodefense therapeutic; and
(10) Mass decontamination technology.

The committee recommends $218.7 million in PE 62384BP, an increase of $15.0 million for the chemical/biological defense applied research initiative.

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) X-ray beamline determination of molecular structures;
(2) Standoff chemical detection;
(3) Anti-biowarfare medicines; and
(4) High-speed network for infectious diseases.

The committee recommends $58.2 million in PE 61384BP, an increase of $5.0 million, for the chemical/biological defense basic research initiative.

Cyberterror protection expansion for the Department of Defense

The committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 urged the Department of Defense to implement the successful Air Force model for enterprise license agreements throughout the Department. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to report back to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the steps taken by the Department to comply with these recommendations. The report shall include an assessment of future compliance plans intended by the Department.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency

The committee applauds the overall progress in the defense science and technology program, particularly that of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). The committee also recognizes that this year marks the 50th anniversary for DARPA

as a defense agency and notes that DARPA, since 1958, has had notable success with performing its original role to find and develop advanced technology to prevent technological surprise by other nations. The committee is pleased with DARPA's current efforts to find and rapidly field advanced innovative technologies to meet critical operational needs of our forces.

The committee understands that much of DARPA's success is due to several factors including its team of top-notch technical experts, a flat organization with greater management flexibility, and a rigid performance-based business model. Under the performance-based model, the committee understands that funds are withheld until the performer passes a significant, agreed upon milestone. While this model can give the impression of poor obligation rates throughout the year, the committee finds that DARPA continually under executes a significant portion of its budget each year. For example, with two quarters remaining for the obligation of fiscal year 2008 funds only 14.2 percent has been obligated. This trend continues despite a congressional rescission of $144.0 million of funds appropriated for fiscal year 2007 and a reduction of $129.0 million to the fiscal year 2008 budget request.

The committee does not believe that additional program growth is justified at this time and recommends funding DARPA's fiscal year 2009 program at a level consistent with current expenditures in the fiscal year 2008 program.

The committee makes a series of recommendations for general reductions in DARPA programs:

62383E—Biological Warfare Defense	$ − 15,000,000
62702E—Tactical Technology	− 30,000,000
62715E—Materials and Bio Technology	− 10,000,000
62716E—Electronics Technology	− 15,000,000
63287E—Space Program and Technology	− 10,000,000
63739E—Advanced Electronics Technology	− 10,000,000
63760E—Command, Control and Communications Systems	− 10,000,000

These recommendations are made without prejudice to the particular account identified.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency relocation

The committee recognizes the unique requirements for the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency (DARPA) physical location. Among these requirements are an immediate proximity to the Pentagon and other extramural research organizations; the direct availability of a large cadre of highly qualified scientists and engineers; non-governmental technical support staff experts and facilities; nearby housing and quality of life amenities needed to attract and recruit high-quality technical program managers; accessibility that balances force protection with the need to be open to new performers who have never done business with the Department of Defense or the federal government; and access to public transportation and airports to facilitate travel of these employees and DARPA's partners in research. For these reasons, the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Commission voted unanimously to overturn the Secretary of Defense's recommendation to relocate DARPA outside of Northern Virginia.

The committee believes that DARPA's mission could potentially be undermined if the relocation fails to meet these requirements. Therefore, the committee urges the General Services Administra-

tion to continue to work with DARPA to ensure that the source selection process works best to meet DARPA's unique agency requirements. The committee supports the Department and the General Services Administration's existing plans for DARPA's relocation.

Defense Agencies Initiative sustainment

Section 1005 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) pertained to the financial transformation initiative for the defense agencies. This section called for the creation of a Defense Agencies Initiative to do two things:

(1) To eliminate or replace financial management systems that are duplicative, redundant, or fail to comply with financial management standards; and

(2) To transform budget, finance, and accounting operations of the defense agencies to achieve accurate and reliable financial information for accountability and effective decision making.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment on the Defense Agencies Initiative and submit the report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This report shall offer a sustainment plan for the first phase, or wave one, capability being developed under the Initiative. It shall also include both an implementation plan for all additional waves associated with the overall solution deployment and a funding profile and timeline.

Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research

The budget request contained $2.8 million in PE 61114D8Z for the Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (DEPSCoR).

The committee notes that projects under DEPSCoR are intended to expand research capabilities and opportunities in states that traditionally receive the least funding in federal support for university research. The committee further notes that DEPSCoR was originally authorized by section 257 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337) to enhance the capabilities of institutions of higher education to develop, plan, and execute science and engineering research that is competitive under a peer-review system for awarding federal research assistance. The committee applauds the Department for its sound execution of the program. The committee also recognizes the many DEPSCoR contributions in support of our national security and for building national infrastructure for research education.

The committee is concerned that despite the success of the program, the Department's budget requests for the program has significantly declined from the fiscal year 2007 request of $9.5 million to $2.8 million in the fiscal year 2009 request. The Department informed the committee that no funds will be requested for DEPSCoR in fiscal year 2010 and in future year budget requests.

The committee strongly urges the Department to fund DEPSCoR, at an adequate level, to continue expanding the national research infrastructure. The committee recommends $12.8 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 61114D8Z for DEPSCoR.

Defense Information System for Security

The committee applauds the interagency effort between the Department of Defense and the intelligence community to reform and improve the security clearance process. The Joint Security and Suitability Reform Team, utilizing Lean Six Sigma and other business process modernization techniques, has made a number of suggestions that will revolutionize how the Department, other federal agencies, and the intelligence community administer, vet, and issue security clearances.

The committee is aware that this significant revamping of the system has necessitated the Defense Information System for Security (DISS), which was established under the Defense Security Service but transitioned to the Business Transformation Agency, to undergo a strategic pause. The committee recognizes that this is necessary so that the recommendations of this process reform can be better understood and translated into requirements for DISS. In addition to its ability to enable this change within the Department, the committee encourages the strategic alignment of DISS capabilities with the information technology needs of the federal-wide reform effort.

The committee recognizes that taking such actions will have an impact on the ability of these programs to execute funds in a timely fashion. The committee supports any associated pause in these programs that may be necessary in order for a solution that achieves these goals to be realized.

Department of Defense bandwidth requirements for the future

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act outlining Department bandwidth needs in the near-term (next two years) and the longer term (eight years and beyond). The report shall detail the Department's plan for addressing increasing demands, including:

(1) Current data transport capabilities (including terrestrial cable, as well as military and commercial satellite communications, both protected and unprotected) and current demands;

(2) Future planned data transport capabilities (including terrestrial cable, as well as military and commercial satellite communications, both protected and unprotected) and projected demands;

(3) Synchronization of future planned data transport capabilities to bandwidth needs for future systems (such as the Future Combat System, Naval Networking Environment, etc.); and

(4) Proposed mitigation strategies should future planned data transport capabilities not become available when scheduled.

The committee is concerned that the Department lacks an organization to conduct comprehensive assessments and trades of communications bandwidth requirements, and capabilities and acquisition strategies to meet those requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends the Department consider identifying or creating an organization responsible for defense-wide bandwidth management and synchronization with the following activities:

(1) Develop a near-, mid-, and far-term defense-wide communications architecture;

(2) Conduct strategic communications bandwidth analysis with requirements, capability, schedule, and cost trade studies;

(3) Provide bandwidth analysis on whether future acquisitions of systems and platforms are properly scoped into the current and planned communications architecture; and

(4) Provide the milestone decision authority with acquisition recommendations based on whether the proposed capability can be supported and integrated into the communications architecture.

Energy technology investment roadmap

The committee is aware that a recent Defense Science Board (DSB) task force on Department of Defense Energy Strategy recommended that the Department increase investments in energy efficient and alternative energy technologies, and maintain a level of funding commensurate with operational and financial value. A separate study released in April 2007 and commissioned by the Office of Force Transformation and Resources of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, found that numerous federal and commercial energy research and development initiatives exist but lack coordination and metrics for integration with an energy-efficient future operational concept.

The committee believes the Department should embrace a more coordinated and energy-efficient future operational concept. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare an energy technology investment roadmap. The roadmap shall consider, among other things, the DSB recommendations for accelerated development of those technologies for blended wing body aircraft, variable speed tilt rotor vertical lift, lightweight composite 'blast-bucket' tactical vehicles, advanced electro-mechanical actuators, semi-rigid lighter-than-air high-altitude lifting bodies, advanced micro-generators, biomimetic design for platform components and very high efficiency electronics for soldier system and other combat systems applications. The roadmap shall also consider the DSB recommendation to support mobile, in-theater fuel production processes with operational applications. Finally, the roadmap shall make recommendations to ensure that all energy technology investments across the services are prioritized, coordinated, and are not duplicative of other efforts with the Department, other federal agencies, or the commercial sector.

The Secretary shall submit the energy technology investment roadmap to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2009.

Foliage penetration capability

The budget request contained $79.9 million in PE 63122D8Z for combating terrorism technology support, but contained no funds for the development, demonstration, or transition of foliage penetrating technology.

The committee notes that the ability to see through mature jungle canopy to identify and locate structures associated with terrorism and other high-value targets requires advanced foliage penetration (FOPEN) capability. The committee is aware of the De-

partment's recent successes with demonstrating various FOPEN capabilities, but is concerned about the current funding levels to adequately support continued development of FOPEN technology and transition to operational use. The committee notes that our armed forces and U.S. civilians are engaged globally and must have the capability to operate in a wide range of environmental conditions, including in regions with dense foliage. The committee is concerned that the combatant commands lack the full-spectrum intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capability they need to adequately carry out their missions. The committee urges the Department to make rapid transition of FOPEN technology a high priority.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63122D8Z for the continued development, demonstration, and rapid transition of promising foliage penetration technology.

The committee encourages the Director, Rapid Reaction Technology Office, within the office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to brief the congressional defense committees on the Department's current capability and plans to develop, procure, and deploy FOPEN systems. The brief should address the results of any tests of FOPEN systems, to include when, where, and type of system tested; the capability of the sensor technology, processing algorithms, and analytical suite; the transitional or operational funding identified and secured for the FOPEN system; and any future testing and acquisition planning and associated costs.

Green information technology standards

The committee is aware of an effort within the Pentagon to reduce the energy and environmental impact of the Department of Defense information technology (IT) enterprise. IT systems, including all of the desktop computing, servers, routers, and associated equipment consume significant quantities of power.

The committee supports the goals of this "green IT" initiative, sponsored by the office of the Pentagon Chief Information Officer (CIO), to work within existing budgets and authorities to adopt smart business practices that will help reduce the energy consumption of IT resources. In addition, this effort has the opportunity to reclaim physical space that can be used for other purposes.

The committee encourages the Pentagon CIO to maintain robust metrics on power, cost, and space savings made through this effort and to socialize the benefits of this program so that it might be adopted more broadly throughout the Department, as well as the rest of the federal government.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions

The budget request contained $15.2 million in PE 62228D8Z for the Historically Black College and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions (HBCU/MI) infrastructure support program.

The committee is concerned about the limited effort that the Department of Defense has undertaken in developing, funding, and expanding the HBCU/MI program. Specifically, the budget request for this program has not increased since the inception of the pro-

gram under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510). The committee believes that inadequate funding could have direct and indirect effects in ensuring future generations of minority students are trained to meet the challenges in developing future defense capabilities.

As noted elsewhere in this title, the committee supports the Department's commitment to reshape its science and technology approach for developing non-kinetic capabilities to enable mission success in irregular warfare environments. These capabilities include elements of net-centric operations, behavioral and social sciences, information assurance, modeling and simulation, and bio-inspired research. The committee believes that the minority serving institutions have strong research capabilities in these areas and urges the Department to include the HBCU/MI program as part of this important reshaping.

The committee remains committed to ensuring that the Department adequately supports the training and development of minority students who are an increasing part of the foundation that the future of our national security rests upon. The committee recognizes the critical need of the Department to take the necessary steps to enhance the HBCU/MI and other related programs across the Department. Section 232 in this Act requires the Secretary of Defense to carry out an assessment of the capability of minority serving institutions to participate in research, development, test and evaluation activities for the Department. To strengthen the HBCU/MI program, the committee urges the Department to explore other proven methodologies, such as creating centers-of-excellence and expanding the Mentor Protégé program to include minority serving institutions.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62228D8Z for the enhancement of the HBCU/MI infrastructure support program. The committee encourages the Department, in its future defense budget submissions, to include an increase to the HBCU/MI program to, at a minimum, reflect the rate of inflation.

Human, social, and cultural behavioral modeling advanced development

The budget request contained $9.4 million in PE 63670D8Z and $6.0 million in PE 64670D8Z for human, social, cultural, and behavior (HSCB) modeling advanced development.

The committee notes that today's military forces are involved in a growing number of complex missions from counterinsurgency to security and stability operations. These missions are best served by a security force that understands and appreciates the individual, tribal, cultural, ethnic, religious, social, economic, and other aspects of the human terrain. The committee supports the Department's effort to reshape their approach to research, training, and doctrine to adapt to the current irregular warfare environment. The Department's creation and deployment of Human Terrain Teams (HTT) that employ cultural awareness and analysis practices notes one approach toward adapting to complex military operations.

In title XV of this Act, the committee notes the contributions of the prototype HTTs currently supporting operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and believes that sound research and resulting tools are

key technology enablers for success of these teams now and in the future.

The committee recommends $13.4 million, an increase of $4.0 million, in PE 63670D8Z and $8.0 million, an increase of $2.0 million, in PE 64670D8Z for the continued development, demonstration and rapid transition of key technologies supporting human terrain understanding and forecasting to include, Mapping the Human Terrain Joint Capability Technology Demonstration and the Conflict Modeling, Planning and Outcome Experimentation Program.

Human, social, and cultural behavior modeling research

The committee supports efforts to further human, social, and cultural behavioral (HSCB) modeling research activities, but believes greater planning coordination and concept development is necessary to yield a productive program.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to establish a Department of Defense User Community Advisory Group (UCAG) to provide input to the Department on the utility of existing HSCB research efforts, to include determining the research direction for future programs in this area. Advisory group members shall include researchers from the scientific and engineering world and members from operational disciplines, such as special operations, intelligence, and provincial reconstruction team specialists. The advisory group shall not only provide input on future research directions, but shall also be used as a peer review group to provide feedback on existing HSCB programs managed by the services and agencies.

The committee further directs the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to submit to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act a report outlining the charter, functions, and proposed membership of this group.

Human systems integration

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) contains a provision requiring the Department of Defense (DOD) to establish a single office to coordinate the planning, management, and expectation of human systems integration (HSI) activities throughout all DOD acquisition programs. The provision also requires the Department to identify and recommend resource requirements for all HSI activities.

The committee continues to support HSI as an affordability initiative for reducing overall life cycle costs of weapon systems and improving training regimes of military personnel. As noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 106–616) accompanying the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, significant savings in defense systems ownership costs are possible with wisely targeted science and technology investments. The committee views HSI as an integral part of this approach, continues to support these affordability efforts, and urges the Department to commit further to HSI activities.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to develop a comprehensive plan for funding and implementing HSI through all phases of science,

research, and acquisition. This plan shall include the development of policy, requirements, and recommendations on methods for incorporating HSI concerns throughout all phases of systems acquisition. The committee also expects the plan to include a specific method for determining and tracking the implementation of HSI activities to ensure adherence with stated Department goals and policy objectives. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to submit the report by March 15, 2009 to the congressional defense committees.

Increase in basic research

The committee applauds the Department's increased investment in basic research as noted in the fiscal year 2009 budget request. The committee also recognizes that in a difficult budget environment, this request represents a 2 percent increase over the appropriated amount for fiscal year 2008 and a 16 percent increase in real terms over the Department's fiscal year 2008 request for basic research. The committee supports this increase and reminds the Department that the committee noted strong concerns in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) over the continued decline in Department of Defense basic research budgets and its impact to national security and our future science and engineering workforce. The committee strongly urges the Department to sustain this increase.

Independent verification and validation for financial management systems

The committee believes that the financial management goal of the Department of Defense should be to provide quality, high confidence, and real-time financial data consistent with national security objectives. The committee also believes that efforts to improve the consistency, quality, and timeliness of financial data will improve the stewardship of government funds and improve overall decision making. The committee believes such transparency has the potential to result in significant cost savings over time.

The committee understands that a key aspect of achieving this vision will be to clearly mandate the roles and responsibilities for independent verification and validation (IVV) for financial data.

As a result, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to draft and provide the congressional defense committees a Department of Defense directive articulating the roles and responsibilities for IVV for the financial management process. The committee further directs delivery of the directive within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Information technology clearinghouse

The budget request contained $5.3 million in PE 33169D8Z for information technology (IT) rapid acquisition, but contained no funds for the development of the clearinghouse for rapid identification and dissemination of commercial information technologies.

As noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense's budgeting and acquisition processes continue to struggle to keep pace with the IT innovation cycle. As a result of legislative

action by the committee, the Department established a clearinghouse for rapid identification and dissemination of commercial information technologies that leveraged technology being developed in parallel under the emerging technology demonstration. Both of these programs are showing promising results, and the committee supports continued development in order to ensure the Department can provide the best, most modern IT systems to meet its mission requirements.

The committee recommends $12.3 million, an increase of $7.0 million, in PE 33169D8Z for the development of the clearinghouse for rapid identification and dissemination of commercial information technologies.

K–12 computer sciences and mathematics education

The budget request contained $195.6 million in PE 61101E for basic research in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, including $2.0 million for the Computer Futures program. The committee notes that the Computer Futures program supports kindergarten through 12th grade educational programs to develop and foster students of computer science and mathematics at an early age in order to create a pipeline to support the nation's future scientific and engineering needs in these areas.

The committee is concerned about reports such as the National Academy of Science study "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" which indicate that the United States may not be producing sufficient numbers of scientists and engineers (S&E) to meet our future technology needs. The committee believes that if the nation is unable to provide for its demands in S&Es, it will have severe detrimental effects on the defense sector and the broader economic health of the nation. Facing a similar challenge 50 years ago, President Eisenhower increased investments in science and mathematics education that continue to pay dividends today. In that same spirit, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's Computer Futures program is an investment in the nation's intellectual capital that the committee believes will reap significant rewards in the future.

The committee recommends $195.6 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 61101E for Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's Computer Futures program to create and validate additional curriculum covering new topics, and to expand the program into new school systems.

Lean Six Sigma process analysis within the Office of Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics

The committee approves of the Department's designation of a process improvement officer (PIO) tasked with applying Lean Six Sigma process improvement techniques to the business practices of the Department. The committee believes such techniques must be utilized on a continuous basis to ensure that the Department does not become trapped by process, rather than having processes adapt over time to changing realities. The committee recommends that the Department's PIO examine the processes for rapid acquisition activities that have been established since the initiation of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and determine if there are lessons learned

from this analysis that might be integrated into the Department's main acquisition process.

Managing and extending Department of Defense asset lifecycles

The budget request contained $5.1 million in PE 64016D8Z for Department of Defense (DOD) corrosion programs, but contained no funds for the managing and extending DOD asset lifecycles (MEDAL) initiative.

Aging assets within the Department require DOD planners to aggressively pursue technologies and innovative concepts to maintain and improve mission capability rates and reduce life-cycle costs. The MEDAL initiative would provide a comprehensive enterprise review of investment in technologies such as asset health and logistics processes, condition-based maintenance opportunities, material aging research, and sustainment and remanufacturing education. It will identify savings, reduce costs, and increase systems availability to meet mission requirements.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64016D8Z for the MEDAL initiative.

Nanocrystal source display

The budget request contained $177.0 million in PE 61102A for defense research sciences, containing $7.2 million for advanced sensors research supporting the development of flexible displays.

The committee notes that flexible display technology developed at the Army Research Laboratory (ARL) is being applied to significantly improve the compact, ruggedized displays for the Army's future force. The committee notes that much of the research laboratory's success with advancing flexible display technology is attributed to their effort to integrate strategically important technologies from industry, academia, and government in the development of the displays. The committee encourages ARL, using a similar approach, to begin developing a small-scale manufacturing capability for flexible displays.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 61102A to continue the development and small-scale manufacturing of flexible display technology.

Naval Postgraduate School

The committee notes the strong contribution made by the Naval Postgraduate School in conducting research programs relevant to the Navy and the Department of Defense. The committee strongly supports these research initiatives and understands them to be consistent with the principles and policies of other Department of Defense research programs such as the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation scholarship for service program.

Open source software systems

The committee is concerned by the rising costs and decreasing security associated with software development for information technology (IT) systems. These rising costs are linked to the increasing complexity of software, which has also resulted in increasing numbers of system vulnerabilities that might be exploited by malicious hackers and potential adversaries. While the Administration has put forth a plan to increase cybersecurity within the larger enter-

prise of federal IT systems, a focus and assessment of fundamental software engineering practices is not apparent.

Open source software (OSS) is a set of practices on how to write software, based on the open availability and right to use software code. This process provides greater rigor in the software development process by making it available to a diverse community of programmers for review, testing, and improvement. The Linux operation system and Internet Protocol internet addressing system are examples of high quality products developed within the business sector using the OSS standard.

The committee encourages the Department to rely more broadly on OSS and establish it as a standard for intra-Department software development. The committee acknowledges the availability of proprietary software and encourages its development and acquisition as necessary and appropriate. The committee believes, however, the wide-spread implementation of an OSS standard will not only lead to more secure software, but will also foster broader competition by minimizing traditional constraints imposed by an over-reliance on proprietary software systems.

Post-detonation nuclear forensics

The budget request contained $211.1 million in PE 62718BR for weapons of mass destruction defeat technologies.

The committee believes that a rapid global nuclear forensics capability is critical to support attribution and response following a nuclear detonation and will serve as a deterrent to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorist attacks. The committee is aware that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) would play an essential role in the time-critical attribution process and collection of radioactive material samples for forensics analysis. According to a recent study entitled "Nuclear Forensics: Role, State of the Art, and Program Needs" by the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Physical Society, "specialized field-deployable equipment that could save days in making results available to decision makers is either not available or incompletely tested." The study identifies a particular need for automated, field-deployable instrumentation that can conduct rapid and accurate sample analysis. The committee is aware that DTRA has identified several technologies that could help meet this need as unfunded requirements.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62718BR for accelerated research and development of post-detonation nuclear forensics technologies.

Pre-Key Decision Point-B system vulnerability assessment

Recognizing the increased vulnerability of the United States' national security space systems that was highlighted by the Chinese test of a direct ascent anti-satellite weapon on January 11, 2007, the committee directs the Department of Defense to prepare a system vulnerability assessment for each new or revised space system prior to Key Decision Point-B. The vulnerability assessment should be prepared by an organization independent of the system program office.

The committee further directs the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees on the Department's actions to inte-

grate vulnerability assessments into the acquisition process by March 31, 2009.

Printed circuit board technology

The committee remains concerned with sustaining a robust domestic printed circuit board (PrCB) manufacturing capability as well as ensuring access to new PrCB technology. The committee notes the Report on Department of Defense Implementation of the National Research Council Committee on Manufacturing Trends in Printed Circuit Technology Recommendations and supports the suggestion to establish an executive agent to carry out the recommended actions of the Council. The committee supports this recommendation and strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to establish an executive agent for PrCB technology.

The committee believes the executive agent should be responsible for:

(1) Monitoring the manufacturing materials, processes, and component vulnerabilities for PrCBs;

(2) Development of a PrCB Technology Roadmap;

(3) Evaluation or recapitalization and investment requirements of Department of Defense PrCB facilities;

(4) Development of funding strategies;

(5) Advocacy for continuing PrCB domain knowledge, expertise, and organic PrCB capabilities; and

(6) Development of methods to assure the availability of needed technical data.

The committee also notes that the Report, which was submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services on March 3, 2008, suggested establishing the executive agent oversight by the Navy through the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division. The committee strongly supports this recommendation. The committee notes, however, that the Report did not include estimated implementation funding and timelines, as requested by the conference report accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), and understands that preliminary funding estimates were developed by the Department. The committee recommends that the Department provide such funding as is necessary to implement the recommendations of the Report in the fiscal year 2010 budget request and in future years.

Review of cost reimbursements on defense research grants and contracts

The committee strongly supports federally-sponsored research and believes the relationship between the Department of Defense (DOD), universities, and other research institutions depends on each party bearing a fair share of the costs of conducting research. The committee believes that such partnerships should also rely on deliberate policies and procedures to ensure that taxpayer dollars are well used and that research institutions and scientists are adequately reimbursed for the costs of the research performed.

The committee is obligated to ensure that taxpayer dollars are properly executed and that federal policies and procedures governing payments and reimbursements for research costs are sound. The committee therefore directs the Comptroller General to con-

duct a review of the existing Office of Management and Budget (OMB) policies, practices, and procedures, as well as those included in the federal acquisition regulations. At a minimum, this report shall:

(1) Describe the OMB rules and regulations that guide research institution's facilities and administration (F&A) cost reimbursements on DOD research grants and contracts;

(2) Describe and assess the F&A costs that are reimbursable under current rules and explain if similar payments for such costs are made to support industry and federal laboratories that conduct research and development research on behalf of the government;

(3) Assess the extent to which the rules for reimbursement of F&A costs are different for the Department of Defense than for other federal agencies;

(4) Assess trends in negotiated F&A rates and effective (based on actual reimbursement) F&A rates for universities that receive DOD extramural research grants and contracts;

(5) Assess the impact to F&A costs as a result of increased federal regulations such as environmental, security, and visa issues, assess trends in actual payments by the Department of Defense for direct and indirect costs on DOD extramural research grants;

(6) Document current procedures DOD uses to ensure compliance with OMB guidance in reimbursing F&A costs; and

(7) Report on the methodology used by the government entities responsible for determining F&A rates—the Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Cost Allocation, and the Department of Defense, Office of Naval Research—to review, audit, negotiate, and ensure that F&A rates are fair and equitable to the federal government.

The report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees within 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

Science and technology for strategic communication

The budget request contained $20.7 million in PE 65799D8Z for the Force Transformation Directorate, but contained no funds for science and technology (S&T) to support the Department's strategic communication mission.

The committee supports the findings of the recent Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on Strategic Communication, as well as of the National Science and Technology Council report, "Research and Development Challenges for Regional Stability and Capacity Building." The committee believes that the Department should devote more S&T effort to support this mission. The Department already has underway a variety of programs that could be used to support the operational needs of the strategic communication and public diplomacy community. The committee believes the Department should leverage these efforts to designate an S&T thrust area for strategic communication and focus on critical S&T opportunities, such as those identified by the DSB.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This report shall describe current S&T efforts within the Department, services, and agencies that

could be linked together to form the basis of a program supporting these needs, including an analysis of gaps not addressed by current programs.

The committee also recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 65799D8Z for the Force Transformation Directorate.

Social science research within the Department of Defense

As noted elsewhere in this title, the committee is encouraged by the effort within office of the Director for Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E) to place an increasing focus on the human, social, and cultural behavior (HSCB) elements of research. The committee is further encouraged by a corresponding emphasis within the science and technology (S&T) programs of the respective services.

The committee has also been encouraged by the success of integrating social science expertise into Department of Defense operations via the Human Terrain Teams (HTT), which provide culturally relevant advice to military decision makers. As has been pointed out in recent testimony before the committee, these teams provide value added to traditional military operational planning and have been instrumental in saving lives in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee believes that more programs in the future should be informed by social science research.

Despite this recent emphasis on efforts such as HSCB and the deployment of HTTs, the committee is concerned about the dearth of social scientists within the Department's S&T community and especially within program management leadership positions. The committee believes the Department should take steps to leverage social scientist expertise existing within other parts of the federal government, such as the National Science Foundation.

Sustainment of Business Transformation Agency programs

The committee notes that the Business Transformation Agency was established in order to improve the efficiency of Department of Defense business process by accelerating the development and deployment of transformational capabilities. The committee understands that a key element of that process has been to transition programs of record to the Business Transformation Agency for management oversight, but the committee is concerned that there is no apparent transition strategy to move these capabilities to other organizations that might be better positioned to maintain and sustain these efforts once mature.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a report on a transition strategy for programs managed by the Business Transformation Agency for the sustainment of systems that have reached a defined level of maturity. This report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This transition strategy shall include:

(1) An evaluation process for determining the maturity of a program;

(2) Exit criteria defining at what point a program has reached a maturity level to transition out of the Business Transformation Agency for sustainment purposes;

(3) A process defining how the Business Transformation Agency will continue to be involved in these mature programs in order to help guide them as they need to go through update cycles; and

(4) A transition path, including transition partners, for all of the programs currently being managed by the Business Transformation Agency.

Technology to improve future spectrum management usage

The committee is concerned that Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom have exposed a looming challenge related to the availability of usable spectrum for defense applications. The proliferation of electronic devices that utilize radio frequency (RF) spectrum to communicate is a function of the information revolution, and is, in large part, driving the Department's development and employment of network-centric operations. The downside of this proliferation is that it places increasing demands on a finite resource made scarcer by the auctioning of spectrum for commercial applications, and the further competition with commercial systems like cellular phones and wireless computing networks.

The committee believes that technological solutions exist that can alleviate these concerns. In one example, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency has demonstrated the applicability of dynamic spectrum access technologies in its neXt Generation (XG) communications program. The XG program demonstrated the ability to utilize portions of the spectrum that are currently being unused, and to adapt to changing conditions within the RF spectrum. Technology and concepts developed under the XG program are already being adopted into current military radio programs, and are being explored further for adoption to networking applications.

The committee urges the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to conduct an assessment of the state-of-the-art of technologies that can be applied to improve our access to available spectrum in the near-term, as well as future research directions. This assessment should also examine existing regulatory barriers that might impede the development or deployment of such technologies.

Transformational Medical Technology Initiative

The budget request contained $337.9 million in PE 63384BP for chemical and biological defense advanced technology development, including $217.3 million for the Transformation Medical Technology Initiative.

The committee commends the Department of Defense's recent progress toward developing broad-spectrum medical countermeasures and notes that after just two-and-a-half years of development, the Department expects to file for six investigational new drug (IND) applications and one new drug application with the Food and Drug Administration in fiscal year 2009.

The fiscal year 2009 budget request marks an increase of $157.0 million, or 260 percent, over amounts provided in fiscal year 2008. The committee is aware that IND filings represent a move toward Phase I clinical trials and consequently requires a significant funding increase to support this stage of development. The committee, however, is concerned that the 2009 budget request is excessive

given the unlikelihood that all six anticipated INDs will be ultimately filed by the Department and approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

The committee recommends $167.3 million for the Transformational Medical Technology Initiative, a decrease of $50.0 million in the 2009 request or a 177 percent increase over the fiscal year 2008 level.

Wounded Warriors as information technology, scientific, and engineering specialists

The committee recognizes the improvements the Department of Defense has made to the care and management of wounded service members, and understands that the process is ongoing with more improvements yet to be implemented. These improvements have resulted in increased survival rates and improved quality of life for many wounded warriors by lessening the impact of disability through the application of new technologies and treatments.

The committee continues to hear from wounded service members regarding their desire to continue military service by leveraging their knowledge and experience, even if it means entering into new mission specialties. The committee believes that the military cannot afford to lose such devoted personnel with years of vital military operational experience, and more years to give. As such, the committee believes that wounded service members would be excellent candidates to support information technology, scientific, or engineering activities. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility of identifying and providing education and training to selected wounded service members to continue their military service as information technology, scientific, or engineering specialists and submit a report with the findings of the study to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would establish the amounts authorized to be appropriated for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2009.

Section 202—Amount for Defense Science and Technology

This section would establish basic, research, applied research, and advanced technology development funding levels for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2009.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—Additional Determinations to be Made as Part of Future Combat Systems Milestone Review

This section would amend section 214 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109–364) by

adding additional determinations to be made by the Secretary of Defense during the Future Combat Systems program review.

Section 212—Analysis of Future Combat Systems Communications Network and Software

This section would require the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Networks and Information Integration, to conduct an independent study and report to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2009, on possible vulnerabilities of the Future Combat Systems (FCS) communications network. The purpose of this study is to inform the review of the FCS program mandated by section 214 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

Section 213—Future Combat Systems Manned Ground Vehicle Selected Acquisition Reports

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to submit to the congressional defense committees selected acquisition reports as defined in section 2432(c) of title 10, United States Code, on each of the eight Future Combat Systems manned ground vehicle variants. The reports are required by February 15 of each year from 2009 to 2015.

Section 214—Separate Procurement and Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Line Items and Program Elements for Sky Warrior Unmanned Aerial Systems Project

This section would require establishment of a program element for the Army's "Sky Warrior" Unmanned Aerial System program.

Section 215—Restriction on Obligations of Funds for the Warfighter Information Network—Tactical Program

This section would restrict obligation of eighty percent of research and development funds authorized for appropriation for the Warfighter Information Network—Tactical, Increment 3 program until 15 days after receipt by the congressional defense committees of certification from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics that the program has an approved acquisition program baseline, a new independent cost estimate is complete, and the Director, Defense Research and Engineering has completed a technology readiness assessment.

Section 216—Limitation on Source of Funds for Certain Joint Cargo Aircraft Expenditures

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from funding initial spares, support equipment, training simulators, post production modifications, and system engineering and management items through the Operations and Maintenance, Army appropriation account.

SUBTITLE C—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Section 221—Independent Study of Boost Phase Missile Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to enter into an agreement with a Federally Funded Research and Development Center to conduct an independent assessment examining the costs and benefits of missile defense systems designed to intercept ballistic missiles in their boost phase.

This study would examine the operational capabilities of the Airborne Laser and the Kinetic Energy Interceptor programs to counter short-, medium-, and intermediate-range ballistic missile threats to the deployed forces of the United States and its friends and allies from rogue states; and to defend the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack.

Section 222—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Procurement, Construction, and Deployment of Missile Defenses in Europe

This section would limit the availability of funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense in this and subsequent acts from being obligated or expended for site activation or construction of Ground-based Midcourse Defense interceptors and associated radars in Europe until certain conditions are met.

This section would also limit the availability of funds for the acquisition or deployment of operational missiles for the proposed European deployment until the Secretary of Defense certifies that the two-stage interceptor proposed for European deployment has demonstrated, through successful, operationally realistic testing, a high probability of operational effectiveness.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 231—Oversight of Testing of Personnel Protective Equipment by Director, Operational Test and Evaluation

This section would clarify the authorities of the Director, Operational Test & Evaluation with respect to personnel protective equipment by repealing the authority to provide guidance and consultation to the Secretary of Defense for force protection equipment and adding authority for the Secretary, or his designee, to designate an item of personnel protective equipment as a covered system for the purposes of survivability testing under section 2366 of title 10, United States Code. The Director, Operational Test and Evaluation currently has the authority to monitor and review testing conducted under the authority of section 2366. This section would also require, in the event that personnel protective equipment is fielded for operational use prior to the completion of survivability testing or a decision to proceed beyond low rate initial production, the Director to submit the required report on survivability testing to the Secretary of Defense and the congressional defense committees as soon as practicable.

The committee intends to clarify the Secretary's authorities to direct his principal advisor on operational test and evaluation and live-fire testing, Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, to monitor and review survivability test data for selected equipment in

order to promote greater use of consistent, defensible test standards and, through the establishment of such standards, accelerate the testing of personnel protective equipment. Likewise, as threats to our warfighters continue to evolve, the committee urges the Secretary to make use of all appropriate acquisition authorities to ensure urgent operational needs are fulfilled without undue delay, including, if circumstances warrant the prudent use of waivers to field personnel protective equipment prior to the completion of survivability testing if substantial evidence exists that such equipment would provide greater levels of protection. If the current acquisition authorities are not sufficient to ensure urgent operational needs are met, the Secretary shall notify the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 45 days as to why.

Section 232—Assessment of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out an assessment of the capability of minority serving institutions to participate in research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) programs for the Department of Defense (DOD). The report, to be submitted to the congressional defense committees within 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, shall describe and assess the current activities within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, military departments, and defense agencies intended to increase opportunities for these institutions to participate in and benefit from DOD RDT&E programs. Matters such as metrics, lessons learned, capability gaps, and other areas deemed appropriate by the Secretary should be addressed. The report should also include, as directed by Executive Order 13256, the Department's effort to establish an annual plan with clear goals for how it intends to increase the capacity of historically black colleges and universities to compete effectively for DOD grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements.

Section 233—Technology-Neutral Information Technology Guidelines and Standards to Support Fully Interoperable Electronic Personal Health Information for the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs

This section would require the Director of the Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Interagency Program Office to report within 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act on the development of information technology infrastructure guidelines and standards for use by the Departments of Defense (DOD) and Veterans Affairs (VA) to enable fully interoperable electronic personal health information.

For more than 15 years, the committee has been urging the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs to develop this capability. The committee believes that a standards-based approach is a vital prerequisite to having a capability to generate, maintain, and seamlessly update electronic health records, regardless of which department is treating the service person. With the growing number of wounded warriors entering the DOD and VA

medical systems, the need for this capability is imperative in order to prevent the health system from becoming overwhelmed.

Section 234—Repeal of Requirement for Technology Transition Initiative

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to assess the feasibility of consolidating technology transition accounts into a unified effort managed by a senior official of the Department of Defense. This section would repeal certain subsections of section 2359a title 10, United States Code, which required the Secretary of Defense to carry out the Technology Transition Initiative.

The committee believes that effective technology transition remains vital for making the right technology available to the warfighter as quickly as possible and at the lowest cost. The Government Accountability Office notes that a number of commercial best practices, such as strategic planning at the corporate level, are good enablers for technology transition. The Government Accountability Office has observed that despite a number of Department of Defense initiatives aimed at technology transition, the reach of these initiatives is limited and there is no unified, corporate approach to using them. The Government Accountability Office also states that the Department's approach to funding transition is flawed and that multiple, small funding sources for specific transition activities offer a piecemeal solution to a more systemic problem.

Section 235—Trusted Defense Systems

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to assess the vulnerabilities in the supply chain for certain acquisition programs' information processing systems. This section would further require the assessment to identify the appropriate lead for the development of a strategy to ensure trust in the supply chain for certain acquisition programs. Finally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to implement an interim policy requiring certain Department of Defense (DOD) major systems to utilize a trusted source to design, prototype, and fabricate integrated circuits.

The committee notes that the Deputy Secretary of Defense approved a Defense Trusted Integrated Circuits Strategy on October 10, 2003. Further, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration jointly issued interim guidance on trusted suppliers for application-specific integrated circuits on January 27, 2004. The Under Secretary's interim guidance referenced policy that was in development to require certain trusted systems to employ on trusted foundry services. The interim guidance provided specific examples of "Top DOD Candidate Programs for Trusted Foundry." Nevertheless, the committee understands that after more than four years in coordination within the Department, the policy referenced in the Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary's memo remains in draft form. Moreover, only 1 program out of the 14 identified as top candidates for trusted foundry services, has utilized the foundry funded by the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency. While the use

of trusted microcircuits is only a single step in ensuring the warfighter has trusted systems, the committee strongly encourages the Department to take greater advantage of trusted foundries for integrated circuits as an iterative step and to potentially foster greater industrial interest and competition.

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit, within 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, a report to the congressional defense committees on the vulnerability assessment and strategy.

Section 236—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Enhanced AN/TPQ–36 Radar System Pending Submission of Report

This section would limit the amount of funds provided to the program until the Secretary of the Army provides the congressional defense committees with a plan to rapidly transition the Counter-Rockets, Artillery, and Mortars (C–RAM) program to a program of record.

The committee notes the remarkable and unprecedented success of C–RAM systems in protecting a limited number of forward operating bases in the Republic of Iraq. According to commanders in the field, C–RAM is a force multiplier that is saving lives. The committee believes that lessons learned from Iraq demonstrate that the indirect fire threat to fixed sites is enduring and will likely proliferate, requiring: deployment of additional C–RAM systems; continuous improvements to its capabilities; and integration of the system into the Army's future force. The C–RAM system was rapidly developed and fielded in response to an urgent wartime need. It is not a program of record and therefore lacks the complete and necessary doctrine and support for training, operations, and manning. The committee does not direct a material solution, but does believe there is a requirement void that must be met as soon as possible.

The committee understands that the Army has proposed to transition the C–RAM program into the Indirect Fire Protection Capability (IFPC) program of record. Given the success of the C–RAM system and the urgent need for additional systems and for system enhancements, the committee encourages the Army to complete this transition immediately. This transition will allow the new IFPC program to rapidly deploy capability to the field and to minimize development costs by evolving the C–RAM command and control and by capitalizing on the substantial investment of the Army in future force indirect fire sensors and intercept technologies. Immediate transition to the IFPC program of record will also enable funding for the IFPC program to begin in fiscal year 2010, thereby accelerating the fielding of IFPC to both the current and future force.

Section 237—Capabilities Based Assessment to Outline a Joint Approach for Future Development of Vertical Lift Aircraft and Rotocraft

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff conduct a capabilities-based assessment that outlines a joint approach to the future development of vertical lift aircraft and rotorcraft for all of the military services.

Section 238—Availability of Funds for Prompt Global Strike Capability Development

This section would limit the use of funds for prompt global strike in fiscal year 2009 to only those activities expressly delineated in the expenditure plan for fiscal years 2008 and 2009, that was required by section 243 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) and transmitted to the congressional defense committees on March 24, 2008, or those activities otherwise expressly authorized by Congress. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on prompt global strike concepts to the congressional defense committees concurrently with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2010.

The committee expects the execution of the expenditure plan to be consistent with prompt global strike plans presented informally by the Department of Defense to the committee in April 2008. The committee anticipates near-term receipt of the research, development, and testing plan required by section 243 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) and intends to review it for consistency with the basic approaches presented to the committee in April 2008.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained approximately $179.8 billion in operation and maintenance funds to ensure the Department of Defense can train, deploy, and sustain U.S. military forces. The budget request increased the operation and maintenance account by $15.6 billion over the fiscal year 2008 enacted level, resulting in a 7.1 percent increase after accounting for inflation. The committee recommends additional funding for readiness needs and operations and maintenance expenses in this title and also title XV of this Act.

The fiscal year 2009 budget request seeks to improve full-spectrum ground combat training, but due to inflation and cost increases, it results in reductions in other areas. The fiscal year 2009 budget request reduces some air, ground, and sea training to below the level required to maintain military standards. Vital to training for full-spectrum missions are Combat Training Center rotations, sustained air crew training, and increased ship-deployed steaming days. The fiscal year 2009 budget request significantly increases tank training miles over fiscal year 2008, but not above the fiscal year 2007 level. Flying hours slightly increase for the Navy and decline for the Air Force, but all are well below the levels for fiscal year 2007. Ship steaming days remain at the level adopted in fiscal year 2008, which is below the deployed steaming days goal of 51.

The committee is gravely concerned with the continuing decline in the readiness of the armed forces. More than six years of continuous combat operations have placed a significant strain on the services, and this strain has begun to manifest itself in declining readiness trends across many aspects of U.S. military forces. Equipment shortfalls hamper the ability to train and deploy ground forces. Personnel shortfalls drive lengthy deployment periods, less than desirable dwell periods and a reliance on sailors and airmen to perform missions typically carried out by soldiers. Resource

shortfalls and aging equipment reduce the mission capability of U.S. air forces. Shortfalls in maintenance have created significant equipment readiness deficiencies in the Navy's surface fleet. These problems indicate a military under significant strain as it supports ongoing operations.

Readiness problems appear to be most severe in the ground forces, particularly the Army. Department of Defense readiness reports indicate that every non-deployed Army and Army National Guard combat brigade would face significant challenges completing their assigned full-spectrum combat missions if they were called upon to fight. Readiness shortfalls in equipment availability and training assessments can be attributed to the challenges of increased operational tempo on both equipment and personnel.

Marine Corps readiness has declined since 2001, as continuous combat operations have consumed readiness. The nature of current combat operations has forced the Marine Corps to draw from equipment in non-deployed units and afloat stocks to meet operational needs, resulting in less equipment available for training. Added to this is the fact that the Marines, like the Army, are focusing heavily on counter-insurgency operations in their training, resulting in an overall reduction of full mission capability.

Readiness strains are also appearing in the Navy, where two surface warfare ships recently were found to be unfit for sustained combat. While Navy officials expect to find problems during inspections, the scale and scope of these material deficiencies raise questions about the sufficiency of the Navy's inspection process, especially during a time of increased deployment tempo and as Department of Defense officials underscore the reliance upon the Navy and Air Force as the nation's strategic reserve force and global deterrent.

The Air Force continues to struggle with maintaining the full mission capability of its aircraft. Operational tempo for the Air Force has remained high since the first Gulf War, placing continued strain on the Air Force's aging aircraft fleet. Maintenance challenges have reduced overall mission capability rates below levels seen in prior years and are particularly troubling given that procurement programs for new aircraft will not fill capability gaps until the years beyond the Future Years Defense Plan.

The committee continues to be concerned about the status of prepositioned stocks of combat equipment. The Army and Marine Corps have been forced to draw down these stocks to support ongoing operations and to fill shortfalls across the force. This drawdown has increased the time it will take to deploy equipment to a contingency. The committee notes that the intended restoration timeline of 2015 increases strategic risk for a significant period of time. For this reason, the committee strongly urges the Army and the Department of Defense to move rapidly to restore prepositioned stocks earlier than the current 2015 timeline.

It is critical for the United States to provide the resources necessary to properly train and equip its men and women in uniform, to care for servicemembers and their families, and to prepare the military to fight today's battles while deterring and defending against future threats. The committee believes that the current funding levels for operation and maintenance are not sufficient to fully address the Department of Defense's needs while the military

is engaged in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee has made significant adjustments to the budget request in order to address some of the most urgent shortfalls.

The committee has added additional funds for: depot maintenance of ground equipment, ships, and aircraft; increased training of critical skills, exporting training from the combat training centers, and increased battle command training; increased ground force operational training; redistribution of equipment to fill shortages; and maintenance of missiles and ammunition stocks. The committee has directed funding to fill shortages in the prepositioned stocks and to repair and maintain barracks and troop housing in all of the services.

The committee is very concerned about these readiness shortfalls expanding beyond fiscal year 2009 as stress on the operation and maintenance budget continues. Also disturbing is that the strategic risk presented by the degraded readiness posture shows no sign of improving in the near future. Readiness will improve only in the out years with intensive management and resourcing as the services require funding to reset and retrain their forces. For this reason, the committee strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to use every available authority to accelerate restoration of a strong readiness posture to reduce risk as soon as possible.

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	Operation and Maintenance, Army			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,259,183		1,259,183
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	107,517		107,517
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	606,827	2,000	608,827
	Army Force Generation Synchronization Tool		[2,000]	
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	963,864		963,864
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,244,612	2,000	1,246,612
	Cognitive Air Defense Trainer System (CAD-TS)		[1,000]	
	M-Gator		[1,000]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,013,851		1,013,851
	LAND FORCES READINESS			
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,821,481	14,300	1,835,781
	Army NETCOM Unjustified Growth		[-10,000]	
	Army Asymmetric Warfare Office-IED Defeat Division-EOD		[24,300]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	624,053	3,500	627,553
	CASEVAC Medical Equipment Set (MES) Conversion Kits (Ground & Air)		[3,500]	

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	737,303	263,143	1,000,446
	M24 Sniper Weapons System Upgrade		[5,400]	
	Depot Maintenance Increase		[257,743]	
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,309,710		7,309,710
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	2,093,829		2,093,829
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	301,149	19,000	320,149
	Integrated Training Area Management		[9,000]	
	Training Support Centers-Fabricate Training Aids and Devices		[10,000]	
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	262,556		262,556
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	274,654		274,654
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM			
160	RESET			
170	COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS	282,990		282,990
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**18,903,579**	**303,943**	**19,207,522**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
	MOBILITY OPERATIONS			
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	204,559		204,559

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	122,273		122,273
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		2,500	2,500
	Army Manufacturing Technical Assistance Production Program (MTAPP)		[2,500]	
	TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**326,832**		**329,332**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
	ACCESSION TRAINING			
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	121,985		121,985
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	90,999		90,999
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	66,512		66,512
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	441,264		441,264
	BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING			
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	825,237	67,000	892,237
	Critical Skill Training TRADOC-TFNC		[48,000]	
	Military Training Support Allotment MTSA-Additional School Travel		[19,000]	
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	781,761		781,761
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	130,208	2,000	132,208
	Leadership for Leaders at Fort Leavenworth		[2,000]	

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	852,545	4,610	857,155
	United States Army Sergeants Major Academy Lecture Center Audio Visual Equipment Replacement		[610]	
	Operational/Technical Training Validation Test Bed		[4,000]	
	RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING			
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	645,968		645,968
300	EXAMINING	148,274		148,274
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	244,844	350	245,194
	Arabic Strategic Language Program North Georgia College and SU		[350]	
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	223,957		223,957
330	JUNIOR ROTC	149,329		149,329
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**4,722,883**	**73,960**	**4,796,843**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SECURITY PROGRAMS			
340	SECURITY PROGRAMS	876,020		876,020
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	552,629	50,000	602,629
	Army Directed Redistribution of Equipment to Fill Unit Shortfalls		[50,000]	
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	630,145	57,000	687,145
	Support Missile Stockpile Reliability Inspections and Parts Obsolescence Issues		[57,000]	
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	510,326	5,000	515,326
	Condition Based Maintenance Information Management		[5,000]	
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	450,394	60,000	510,394
	Ammunition Readiness and Management		[60,000]	
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
390	ADMINISTRATION	768,681	-10,000	758,681
	Information Technology Agency Unjustified Growth		[-10,000]	
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,154,085	2,900	1,156,985
	Army Knowledge Online Helpdesk		[2,900]	
	Army NETCOM Unjustified Growth		[-5,000]	
	Fort Bliss Data Center COOP		[5,000]	
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	276,925		276,925
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	195,129		195,129
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,152,968		1,152,968
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	233,680		233,680
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	58,345		58,345

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS			
460	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	408,788		408,788
470	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	21,683		21,683
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**7,289,798**	**164,900**	**7,454,698**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Army	**31,243,092**	**545,303**	**31,788,395**
	Operation and Maintenance, Navy			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	3,873,884		3,873,884
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	969,661		969,661
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	53,272		53,272
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	120,305		120,305
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	494,832		494,832
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,127,774	63,000	1,190,774

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	Airframe Depot Maintenance		[63,000]	
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	142,618		142,618
	SHIP OPERATIONS			
080	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,536,837		3,536,837
090	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	689,893		689,893
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	4,139,996		4,139,996
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,167,411	120,000	1,287,411
	Ship Depot Maintenance		[120,000]	
	COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT			
120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	633,376		633,376
130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	85,349		85,349
140	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	160,175		160,175
150	WARFARE TACTICS	397,763		397,763
160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	315,803		315,803
170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	783,689		783,689
180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	186,860		186,860
190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,256		3,256
200	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	152,167		152,167
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	261,105		261,105

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	WEAPONS SUPPORT			
220	CRUISE MISSILE	131,692		131,692
230	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,046,422		1,046,422
240	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	64,298		64,298
250	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	478,103	5,000	483,103
	Mark 75 Maintenance Facility Support and Upgrade		[3,000]	
	NULKA Support		[2,000]	
260	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	321,921		321,921
	BASE SUPPORT			
270	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	893,448	-10,000	883,448
	Base-level Information Infrastructure (OCONUS) Unjustified Growth		[-10,000]	
280	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,734,146		1,734,146
290	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,158,483		4,158,483
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**28,124,539**	**188,000**	**28,302,539**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
	READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES			
300	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	394,729		394,729

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS			
310	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	7,276		7,276
320	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	110,268		110,268
	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS			
330	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	27,650		27,650
340	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,419		2,419
350	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	25,473		25,473
	TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**567,815**		**567,815**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
	ACCESSION TRAINING			
360	OFFICER ACQUISITION	142,175		142,175
370	RECRUIT TRAINING	11,136		11,136
380	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	116,985		116,985
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
390	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	540,855		540,855
400	FLIGHT TRAINING	518,077		518,077

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
410	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	170,486		170,486
420	TRAINING SUPPORT	155,533		155,533
	RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION			
430	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	272,498		272,498
440	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	163,077	300	163,377
	Naval Sea Cadet Training		[300]	
450	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	95,959		95,959
460	JUNIOR ROTC	50,494		50,494
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**2,237,275**	**300**	**2,237,575**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
470	ADMINISTRATION	735,822	-5,600	730,222
	Secretary of the Navy Organizational Restructuring		[-3,200]	
	Navy Enterprise Office		[-2,400]	
480	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	4,213		4,213
490	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	109,968		109,968
500	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	163,568		163,568

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
510	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	278,085		278,085
520	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	381,511		381,511
530	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES			
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT			
540	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	257,008		257,008
550	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS			
560	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	240,991		240,991
570	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	595,050		595,050
580	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	60,723		60,723
590	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	17,378		17,378
600	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	79,615		79,615
	INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS			
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	504,649		504,649
	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS			
680	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	6,570		6,570
	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS			
690	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
700	JUDGMENT FUND			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OTHER PROGRAMS			
999	OTHER PROGRAMS	557,618		557,618
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**3,992,769**	**-5,600**	**3,987,169**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		-225,000	-225,000
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		[-115,000]	
	Overstatement of Civilian Pay		[-110,000]	
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy	**34,922,398**	**-52,300**	**34,870,098**
	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	759,814	48,900	808,714
	Clothing and Flame Resistant Organizational Gear (FROG)		[44,900]	
	Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS)		[4,000]	

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	611,660	21,700	633,360
	Mobile Corrosion Prevention and Abatement Program		[7,600]	
	Consolidated Storage Program		[14,100]	
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	86,422	2,000	88,422
	BV206 Maintenance		[2,000]	
	USMC PREPOSITIONING			
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	73,725		73,725
050	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	5,217		5,217
	BASE SUPPORT			
060	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	803,530		803,530
070	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,940,671		1,940,671
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**4,281,039**	**72,600**	**4,353,639**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
	ACCESSION TRAINING			
080	RECRUIT TRAINING	15,361		15,361
090	OFFICER ACQUISITION	411		411

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
100	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	56,106		56,106
110	FLIGHT TRAINING	361		361
120	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	22,882		22,882
130	TRAINING SUPPORT	312,339		312,339
	RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION			
140	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	238,900		238,900
150	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	64,080		64,080
160	JUNIOR ROTC	17,740		17,740
	BASE SUPPORT			
170	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	55,737		55,737
180	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	155,530		155,530
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**939,447**		**939,447**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
190	SPECIAL SUPPORT	282,043		282,043

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
200	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	30,662		30,662
210	ADMINISTRATION	45,545	3,900	49,445
	Heroes and Healthy Families		[1,000]	
	Total Force Structure Management System (TFSMS)		[2,900]	
	BASE SUPPORT			
220	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION	3,169	6,300	9,469
	Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)		[6,300]	
230	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	15,349		15,349
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**376,768**	**10,200**	**386,968**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	**5,597,254**	**82,800**	**5,680,054**
	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	4,158,181	2,000	4,160,181

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	MBU-20A/P Oxygen Masks with Lights		[2,000]	
020	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	290,744		290,744
030	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	680,109	-30,000	650,109
	Contract Logistics Support		[-20,000]	
	Network Defense		[-10,000]	
040	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,545,613		1,545,613
050	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,711,951	-2,000	1,709,951
	Other Costs		[-2,000]	
060	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,751,194	-449,000	2,302,194
	B-2 Depot Maintenance		[-2,000]	
	F-15 Maintenance Support		[-447,000]	
070	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,142,947		1,142,947
080	BASE SUPPORT	2,434,047	-5,000	2,429,047
	Base Communications		[-5,000]	
	COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS			
090	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	1,167,875	-7,000	1,160,875
	Contract Logistics Support		[-7,000]	
100	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	277,681		277,681
110	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	674,169	31,000	705,169
	Weapon System Evaluation Program (WSEP)		[-3,000]	
	Air Sovereignty Alert System		[34,000]	

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
120	JCS EXERCISES			
130	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HQ	215,775		215,775
140	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	546,822	-20,000	526,822
	Other Contracts		[-20,000]	
	SPACE OPERATIONS			
150	LAUNCH FACILITIES	340,385	-2,000	338,385
	Other Contracts		[-2,000]	
160	LAUNCH VEHICLES	33,390		33,390
170	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	228,617		228,617
180	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	91,067		91,067
190	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	326,784	-2,000	324,784
	Management Professional Services		[-2,000]	
200	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	191,764		191,764
210	BASE SUPPORT	675,821		675,821
	COCOM			
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	626,787		626,787
230	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	195,714		195,714
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**20,307,437**	**-484,000**	**19,823,437**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
	MOBILITY OPERATIONS			
240	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	3,228,790	-20,000	3,208,790
	Other Contracts		[-20,000]	
250	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	91,392	-2,000	89,392
	Management Professional Services		[-2,000]	
260	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	181,713		181,713
270	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	308,895		308,895
280	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	378,429		378,429
290	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	242,505		242,505
300	BASE SUPPORT	622,960		622,960
	TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**5,054,684**	**-22,000**	**5,032,684**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
	ACCESSION TRAINING			
310	OFFICER ACQUISITION	88,547		88,547
320	RECRUIT TRAINING	16,557		16,557
330	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	108,730		108,730
340	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	79,052		79,052

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
350	BASE SUPPORT	95,807		95,807
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
360	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	420,590	3,000	423,590
	Engineering Training and Knowledge Preservation System		[3,000]	
370	FLIGHT TRAINING	948,787		948,787
380	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	178,749		178,749
390	TRAINING SUPPORT	114,435		114,435
400	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	14,711		14,711
410	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	223,960		223,960
420	BASE SUPPORT	648,618		648,618
	RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION			
430	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	196,140		196,140
440	EXAMINING	5,242		5,242
450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	206,608		206,608
460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	161,089		161,089
470	JUNIOR ROTC	74,558		74,558
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,582,180**	**3,000**	**3,585,180**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS			
480	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	917,794		917,794
490	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	666,546		666,546
500	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	295,355		295,355
510	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	68,869		68,869
520	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	313,182		313,182
530	BASE SUPPORT	1,192,616		1,192,616
	SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
540	ADMINISTRATION	226,665		226,665
550	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	576,493		576,493
560	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	231,919	240	232,159
	Wage Modification for Employees in Azores		[240]	
570	ARMS CONTROL	38,669		38,669
580	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	851,904		851,904
590	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	23,851		23,851
600	CIVIL AIR PATROL	24,445	700	25,145
	Secure Site at Ely NV Radar Site (Edwards AFB)		[700]	
610	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	51,377		51,377

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
620	BASE SUPPORT	358,164		358,164
	SECURITY PROGRAMS			
630	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,085,224		1,085,224
	SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS			
640	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	35,113		35,113
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**6,958,186**	**940**	**6,959,126**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		-340,000	-340,000
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		[-120,000]	
	Overstatement of Civilian Pay		[-220,000]	
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	**35,902,487**	**-842,060**	**35,060,427**
	Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	406,141		406,141
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	3,652,060		3,652,060
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**4,058,201**		**4,058,201**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
	DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	120,726		120,726
	RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION			
040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	79,960		79,960
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	**200,686**		**200,686**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
050	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE			
060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	107,987	6,000	113,987
	National Guard Youth Challenge		[5,000]	
	Starbase		[1,000]	

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
090	DEFENSE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY	156,652		156,652
100	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	418,006		418,006
110	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE			
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,227,626	-22,000	1,205,626
	SORTS Reduction		[-22,000]	
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES	31,905		31,905
150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	345,838	5,000	350,838
	Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities		[5,000]	
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	213,808		213,808
170	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	16,731		16,731
180	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY AGENCY	33,468		33,468
190	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	355,331		355,331
200	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY	2,007,089		2,007,089
210	DOD HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	557,029		557,029
220	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,066,462	10,543	1,077,005
	Restoration of Staffing		[10,543]	
230	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	880,024	-300,000	580,024
	Global Training and Equipment		[-200,000]	
	Security and Stabilization Assistance		[-100,000]	
240	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	452,531	20,000	472,531
	Industrial Security Program		[20,000]	
260	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	50,654	60,000	110,654

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	DOD Impact Aid		[50,000]	
	World War II Museum		[10,000]	
270	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,709,174	41,000	1,750,174
	Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight		[20,000]	
	Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)		[21,000]	
280	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	519,508		519,508
	OTHER PROGRAMS			
999	OTHER PROGRAMS	11,683,154		11,683,154
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**21,832,977**	**-179,457**	**9,970,366**
	UNDISTRIBUTED		-105,750	-105,750
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		[-124,000]	
	Interdisciplinary Critical Language and Area Studies		[3,500]	
	Family Support Programs		[15,000]	
	Emergency and Extraordinary Expenses		[-250]	
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	**26,091,864**	**-285,207**	**25,806,657**
	Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,567		1,567
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	16,419		16,419
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	484,460		484,460
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	173,583		173,583
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	508,322	4,800	513,122
	Mobile Corrosion Prevention and Abatement Program		[4,800]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS	61,030		61,030
	LAND FORCES READINESS			
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	254,901	12,000	266,901
	Increase in Full Time Reservists		[12,000]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	87,541		87,541
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	108,191		108,191
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	548,086		548,086
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	255,912		255,912
120	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	13,531		13,531

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**2,513,543**	**16,800**	**2,530,343**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
130	ADMINISTRATION	70,806		70,806
140	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	6,189		6,189
150	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,491		8,491
160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	43,312		43,312
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**128,798**		**128,798**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	**2,642,341**	**16,800**	**2,659,141**
	Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	AIR OPERATIONS			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	604,501		604,501
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	16,083		16,083
030	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	3,156		3,156
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	144,515		144,515
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	427		427
	SHIP OPERATIONS			
060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	55,920		55,920
070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	595		595
080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	62,629		62,629
	COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT			
090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	14,834		14,834
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	122,567		122,567
	WEAPONS SUPPORT			
110	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,385		5,385
	BASE SUPPORT			
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	92,327		92,327
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	61,680		61,680

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	111,296		111,296
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,295,915**		**1,295,915**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
150	ADMINISTRATION	3,341		3,341
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	9,002		9,002
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,396		2,396
180	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS			
190	OTHER SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	431		431
	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS			
200	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**15,170**		**15,170**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	**1,311,085**		**1,311,085**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	54,848		54,848
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	11,640		11,640
030	TRAINING SUPPORT	29,296		29,296
	BASE SUPPORT			
040	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	16,174		16,174
050	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	68,065		68,065
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**180,023**		**180,023**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	SPECIAL SUPPORT	7,616		7,616
070	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	815		815

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
080	ADMINISTRATION	11,316		11,316
090	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,712		8,712
	BASE SUPPORT			
100	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,649		4,649
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**33,108**		**33,108**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	**213,131**		**213,131**
	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,150,860		2,150,860
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	115,971		115,971
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	379,452	60,000	439,452
	Air Force Reserve DPEM		[60,000]	
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	92,969		92,969

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
050	BASE SUPPORT	277,350		277,350
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**3,016,602**	**60,000**	**3,076,602**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	71,059		71,059
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	25,392		25,392
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	22,513		22,513
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,625		6,625
100	AUDIOVISUAL	701		701
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**126,290**		**126,290**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	**3,142,892**	**60,000**	**3,202,892**
	Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	905,866		905,866
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	159,765		159,765
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	553,548		553,548
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	267,183		267,183
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	41,141		41,141
060	AVIATION ASSETS	852,986		852,986
	LAND FORCES READINESS			
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	316,359	19,000	335,359
	Increase in Full Time National Guard		[19,000]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	120,210	4,800	125,010
	Mobile Corrosion Prevention and Abatement Program		[4,800]	
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	367,551		367,551
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	756,579		756,579
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	500,933		500,933
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	504,977		504,977
130	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	87,089		87,089

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**5,434,187**	**23,800**	**5,457,987**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
140	ADMINISTRATION	124,769		124,769
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	50,668		50,668
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	7,679		7,679
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	258,243	1,000	259,243
	Delaware Valley Continuing Education Initiative		[1,000]	
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**441,359**		**442,359**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	**5,875,546**	**24,800**	**5,900,346**
	Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	AIR OPERATIONS			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,580,927		3,580,927
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	670,554		670,554
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	691,199	50,000	741,199
	Depot Provided Equipment Maintenance		[50,000]	
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	300,101		300,101
050	BASE SUPPORT	594,733		594,733
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**5,837,514**	**50,000**	**5,887,514**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	31,234		31,234
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	10,828		10,828
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**42,062**		**42,062**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	**5,879,576**	**50,000**	**5,929,576**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	13,254		13,254
010	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	83,273		83,273
010	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION (FORMERLY FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION)	414,135	31,000	445,135
020	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	447,776		447,776
030	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	290,819		290,819
040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	496,277		496,277
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	13,175		13,175
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	257,796		257,796
070	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	9,101		9,101
080	IRAQ FREEDOM FUND			
090	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS, DEFENSE			
100	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND			
110	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE			
	TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**2,025,606**	**31,000**	**2,056,606**
	TOTAL TITLE III -- OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	**154,847,272**	**-368,864**	**154,478,408**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS

The committee recommends the following adjustments to the fiscal year 2009 amended budget request:

Operation and Maintenance, Army Adjustments:	
BA 1 Army Force Generation Synchronization Tool	+2.0
BA 1 Cognitive Air Defense Trainer System (CAD–TS)	+1.0
BA 1 M—Gator	+1.0
BA 1 Army NETCOM Unjustified Growth	(10.0)
BA 1 Army Asymmetric Warfare Office—IED Defeat Division—EOD	+24.3
BA 1 CASEVAC Medical Equipment Set (MES) Conversion Kits (Ground & Air)	+3.5
BA 1 M24 Sniper Weapons System Upgrade	+5.4
BA 1 Depot Maintenance Increase	+257.7
BA 1 Integrated Training Area Management	+9.0
BA 1 Training Support Centers—Fabricate Training Aids and Devices	+10.0
BA 2 Army Manufacturing Technical Assistance Production Program (MTAPP)	+2.5
BA 3 Critical Skill Training TRADOC–TFNC	+48.0
BA 3 Military Training Support Allotment MTSA—Additional School Travel	+19.0
BA 3 Leadership for Leaders at Fort Leavenworth	+2.0
BA 3 United States Army Sergeants Major Academy Lecture Center Audio Visual Equipment Replacement	+0.6
BA 3 Operational/Technical Training Validation Test Bed	+4.0
BA 3 Arabic Strategic Language Program North Georgia College and SU	+0.4
BA 4 Army Directed Redistribution of Equipment to Fill Unit Shortfalls	+50.0
BA 4 Support Missile Stockpile Reliability Inspections	
and Parts Obsolescence Issues	+57.0
BA 4 Condition Based Maintenance Information Management	+5.0
BA 4 Ammunition Readiness and Management	+60.0
BA 4 Information Technology Agency Unjustified Growth	(10.0)
BA 4 Army Knowledge Online Helpdesk	+2.9
BA 4 Army NETCOM Unjustified Growth	(5.0)
1BA 4 Fort Bliss Data Center COOP	+5.0
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Adjustments:	
BA 1 Airframe Depot Maintenance	+63.0
BA 1 Ship Depot Maintenance	+120.0
BA 1 Mark 75 Maintenance Facility Support and Upgrade	+3.0
BA 1 NULKA Support	+2.0
BA 1 Base-level Information Infrastructure (OCONUS) Unjustified Growth	(10.0)
BA 3 Naval Sea Cadet Training	+0.3
BA 4 Secretary of the Navy Organizational Restructuring	(3.2)
BA 4 Navy Enterprise Office	(2.4)
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate	(115.0)
Undistributed—Overstatement of Civilian Pay	(110.0)
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Adjustments:	
BA 1 Clothing and Flame Resistant Organizational Gear	+44.9
BA 1 Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS)	+4.0
BA 1 Mobile Corrosion Prevention and Abatement Program	+7.6
BA 1 Consolidated Storage Program	+14.1
BA 1 BV206 Maintenance	+2.0
BA 4 Heroes and Healthy Families	+1.0
BA 4 Total Force Structure Management System (TFSMS)	+2.9
BA 4 Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)	+6.3
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Adjustments:	
BA 1 MBU–20A/P Oxygen Masks with Lights	+2.0
BA 1 Contract Logistics Support	(20.0)
BA 1 Network Defense	(10.0)
BA 1 Other Costs	(2.0)
BA 1 B–2 Depot Maintenance	(2.0)
BA 1 F–15 Maintenance Support	(447.0)

BA 1 Base Communications	(5.0)
BA 1 Contract Logistics Support	(7.0)
BA 1 Weapon System Evaluation Program (WSEP)	(3.0)
BA 1 Air Sovereignty Alert System	+34.0
BA 1 Tactical Intel and Other Special Activities—Other Contracts	(20.0)
BA 1 Launch Facilities—Other Contracts	(2.0)
BA 1 Management Professional Services	(2.0)
BA 2 Airlift Operations—Other Contracts	(20.0)
BA 2 Management Professional Services	(2.0)
BA 3 Engineering Training and Knowledge Preservation System	+3.0
BA 4 Wage Modification for Employees in Azores	+0.2
BA 4 Secure Site at Ely NV Radar Site (Edwards AFB)	+0.7
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate	(120.0)
Undistributed—Overstatement of Civilian Pay	(220.0)
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide Adjustments:	
BA 4 National Guard Youth Challenge	+5.0
BA 4 Starbase	+1.0
BA 4 SORTS Reduction	(22.0)
BA 4 Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities	+5.0
BA 4 Restoration of Staffing	+10.5
BA 4 Global Training and Equipment	(200.0)
BA 4 Security and Stabilization Assistance	(100.0)
BA 4 Industrial Security Program	+20.0
BA 4 DOD Impact Aid	+50.0
BA 4 World War II Museum	+10.0
BA 4 Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight	+20.0
BA 4 Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)	+21.0
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate (124.0)	
Undistributed—Interdisciplinary Critical Language and Area Studies	+3.5
Undistributed—Family Support Programs	+15.0
Undistributed—Emergency and Extraordinary Expenses	(0.3)
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve Adjustments:	
BA 1 Mobile Corrosion Prevention and Abatement Program	+4.8
BA 1 Increase in Full Time Reservists	+12.0
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve Adjustments:	
BA 1 Air Force Reserve DPEM	+60.0
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard Adjustments:	
BA 1 Increase in Full Time National Guard	+19.0
BA 1 Mobile Corrosion Prevention and Abatement Program	+4.8
BA 4 Delaware Valley Continuing Education Initiative	+1.0
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard Adjustments:	
BA 1 Depot Provided Equipment Maintenance	+50.0
Miscellaneous Appropriations Adjustments:	
Cooperative Threat Reduction (formerly former Soviet Union threat reduction)	+31.0

Air Sovereignty Alert

The budget request contained no funds for the Air Sovereignty Alert (ASA) mission undertaken by the Air National Guard.

The committee strongly supports the ASA mission and is concerned that by providing no funding in the budget request, the Air Force is not fully committed to this mission, which puts the ability of the Air National Guard to support it at risk.

The committee recommends $34.0 million to fund this critical mission. In section 354 of this Act, the committee requires that future budget justifications include a specific break-out for ASA funds.

Cheyenne Mountain

The budget request contained $1.2 million for contract logistics support for Global C3I and early warning, $7.9 million of which included contractor logistics support for an increase in Cheyenne

Mountain reconfiguration management and project engineering. The committee remains concerned that the U.S. Northern Command is proceeding with relocation of the North American Aerospace Defense Command center without full analysis of the cost and benefits of such relocation.

The committee recommends a decrease of $7.0 million from the requested increase for Cheyenne Mountain support to ensure sufficient time to provide additional information on cost and benefits of the relocation. In section 1062 of this Act, the committee requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report and certify that the relocation does not increase risk to the mission or functions.

Defense Contract Management Agency Restoration of Staffing

The budget request contained $1.1 billion for the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA).

The committee is concerned that from fiscal year 2000 to fiscal year 2007, the DCMA sustained a 79 percent increase in workload simultaneous with a 22 percent reduction in staff. In addition, the committee is aware that, if funded at the level of the budget request, the DCMA will lose funding for an additional 102 full time employees.

The committee recommends $1.1 billion, an increase of $10.5 million, for the Defense Contract Management Agency to restore staffing to fiscal year 2008 levels.

F–15 Maintenance

The budget request contained $497.0 million for repairs of the F–15 A/D fighters as a result of cracks in the longerons resulting from stress. The committee recognizes that the repairs are essential; however, the committee believes that the costs of repairs have been overestimated. The committee recommends a decrease of $447.0 million as unjustified growth.

Navy Headquarters Organizational Changes

The budget request contained $5.6 million for the creation of new positions and standup of a new organization within the Navy headquarters. The proposed Deputy Under Secretary would advise the Secretary of the Navy on Maritime Domain Awareness support issues and coordinate policy with the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The proposed special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy would serve as senior advisor for policy relating to Navy undersea strategy. The proposed Navy Enterprise Office would "assure standardization and coordination among all Navy enterprises." The committee believes the responsibility for requirements generation lies correctly within the purview of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. Additionally, the Navy did not provide the committee sufficient justification information regarding the authorities and responsibilities of the requested positions. The committee believes these functions are sufficiently covered by current Navy headquarters organizational structure and leadership.

The committee recommends a decrease of $5.6 million to Navy servicewide support, administration.

Other Contracts

The budget request contained additional funds for several line items entitled "other contracts," "other costs," and "management professional services." In many instances, the funding increases are substantial. The committee is concerned that there is no transparency to allow for effective oversight when funds are consolidated in these categories. The committee notes that section 806 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which requires service contracts to be broken out separately in the budget justification materials, was intended to obtain greater fidelity on these categories as related to service contracts.

Where there was a substantial but unexplained growth, the committee recommends the following decreases: $2.0 million from Other Costs, Combat Communications (line 050); $20.0 million from Other Contracts, Tactical Intel and Other Special Activities (line 140); $2.0 million from Other Contracts, Launch Facilities (line 150); $2.0 million from Management Professional Services, Other Space Operations (line 190); $20.0 million from Other Contracts, Airlift Operations (line 240); $2.0 million from Management Professional Services, Airlift Operations C3I (line 250).

Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative

The budget request contained $39.8 million for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI).

The committee expects the secretaries of the military departments to use the authority and funding available through the REPI program to partner with public and private entities to establish protective buffer zones around military installations that have impending encroachment pressures. The committee recognizes the benefits of REPI, including its ability to enhance military readiness, increase protection of key military spaces and natural habitats, foster public safety standards, and encourage economic growth.

The committee recommends $60.8 million, an increase of $21.0 million, for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative.

Readiness Shortfalls

Budget justification materials provided to the committee demonstrated readiness shortfalls across the military services, in both the active-duty and reserve components. For depot-level maintenance, the committee recommends the following increases to improve readiness by reducing maintenance shortfalls and deferrals across various platforms:

(1) Army Land Forces Depot Maintenance, $257.7 million to repair and recapitalize equipment including communications electronics; missile end items; other—construction ships, rails, bulldozers; combat vehicles; M88A1; and armored combat earth mover; and to increase the capacity and efficiency of the depots;

(2) Navy Airframe Depot Maintenance, $63.0 million;

(3) Navy Ship Depot Maintenance, $120.0 million;

(4) Air Force Reserve Depot Provided Equipment Maintenance, $60.0 million; and

(5) Air National Guard Depot Provided Equipment Maintenance, $50.0 million.

To address other concerns related to the declining readiness posture of the Army, the committee has recommended increases of $117.0 million for Army missile and ammunition maintenance, $50.0 million to redistribute Army equipment and fill unit shortages; and $110.3 million for training. Additionally, the committee has recommended an additional $70.2 million for unfunded Marine Corps operation and maintenance needs.

Secure Site

The budget request contained no funds for security enhancements at isolated range tracking sites located near Edwards Air Force Base (EAFB). The committee is concerned about potential unauthorized entry at these sites.

The committee recommends $0.7 million to fund security enhancements at these radar sites and to demolish buildings at an EAFB radar site near Ely, Nevada.

ENERGY ISSUES

Energy Conversation

The committee commends the considerable efforts of the Secretary of Defense to improve the energy security of the United States. The Department of Defense has been at the forefront of federal government efforts to promote, develop, and implement energy conservation, energy efficiency, and advanced energy technologies, including renewable energy. In particular, the committee acknowledges the efforts of the Department to support the Energy Conversation, begun in 2006, to facilitate and accelerate the adoption of energy-related policy changes to maintain U.S. military superiority and enhance U.S. national security. These policy objectives include reducing energy intensity, reducing reliance upon imported oil, and developing domestic, renewable energy sources for energy needs. Recent programs sponsored by the Energy Conversation include: the development of a public and government-wide portal for collaborative exchange of energy developments; the creation of a government directory of individuals with energy portfolios; and the drafting of an energy manual for educating current and rising leaders about the costs and consequences of energy-related decisions in their jobs.

The committee finds that the Energy Conversation initiatives reduce transaction costs and unnecessary duplication of energy-related decisions by connecting stove-piped federal government policymakers and informing the public about the costs and consequences of energy-related decisions. The committee recognizes that the Energy Conversation facilitates solutions to the energy security challenges faced by the nation because a single agency cannot overcome them.

Energy Security on Military Installations

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense appears to lack a coherent strategy for energy security on military installations. Despite the absence of a coherent strategy, the com-

mittee recognizes numerous individual efforts by the military services to address energy security on installations. The committee believes that these efforts reflect the services' willingness to take the initiative and creatively apply their authorities. While the committee is pleased with the leadership shown by the services, the committee would prefer to see the Department of Defense centralize leadership, ensure collaboration of efforts, and implement a coherent and comprehensive installation energy security strategy. In addition, the committee believes that the Department of Energy should take a greater role in initiating clean alternative energy programs across the federal government.

Improving Energy Efficiency in Reset and Recapitalization Programs

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense spends billions of dollars each year to reset and recapitalize its operational systems. The reset program includes actions to not only repair equipment, but also to enhance or replace equipment used in support operations for current conflicts. Additionally, the committee is aware that a recent Defense Science Board report "More Fight—Less Fuel" is consistent with a number of preceding reports that conclude there are operational benefits to deploying technologies that enable systems to use fuel more efficiently, and technical options available for doing so.

The committee recognizes value in the inclusion of analyses of new energy technologies in the Department's decisions to upgrade and modify systems during reset. Such technologies should be valued in terms of operational capability and an economic business case using the fully burdened cost of fuel to determine the benefits.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a report by March 1, 2009, on technologies that are suitably mature to be integrated into reset and recapitalization programs that, if deployed, could reduce energy consumption. Such a report shall include the list of reset and recapitalization programs planned by the military services through the Future Years Defense Program, and a description of technologies capable of improving systems' energy efficiency considered to have reached an appropriate technology readiness level to enable integration in the reset program without causing undue delay in the fielding of critical systems to the warfighter.

Environmental Issues

Marine Mammal Protection Act National Defense Exemption

The committee notes that the Deputy Secretary of Defense invoked a two-year national defense exemption from the Marine Mammal Protection Act (Public Law 92–522), under the authority provided by section 1361–1421h of title 16, United States Code, on January 23, 2007. In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee directed the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report on those activities undertaken under the authority of the exemption. This report was received February 5, 2008.

The committee is aware that the Department of the Navy intends to achieve full compliance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and other environmental laws by issuing environmental impact statements (EIS) addressing sonar use on all training ranges and operating areas before the expiration of the exemption.

For the second year of the two-year exemption, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report on specific activities undertaken under the authority of the exemption to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2009. The report shall include the estimated number and species of marine mammals injured and killed as a result of those activities undertaken under the authority of the exemption and an estimate of the population level effect on these species. The committee also directs the Secretary to report on the status of each of the range and operating area EISs, including a strategy and schedule for achieving long-term compliance with MMPA and other relevant environmental laws if it has not already been achieved.

The committee is concerned that naval force readiness may be affected by a growing number of environmental statutes beyond the Marine Mammal Protection Act. For example, the committee is aware of litigation resulting in an injunction under the National Environmental Policy Act (Public Law 91–190) limiting fleet training exercises to the extent that the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) concluded "unacceptably risks the training of naval forces for deployment to high-threat areas overseas." The committee welcomes the CNO's view of the readiness implications of future federal court rulings limiting naval force training and will carefully review the outcome of all pending cases.

Measurement of Encroachment Impacts on Military Readiness

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee directed the Comptroller General to report on whether exemptions granted under environmental laws resulted in a measured increase in military readiness. In March 2008, the Comptroller General issued a report recommending that the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness jointly develop a sound business case that includes detailed qualitative and quantitative analyses assessing the associated benefits, costs, and risks of proposed exemptions from environmental laws. The committee believes that the ability to measure the effects of encroachment on military readiness is a key element of such a business case.

The committee is aware that the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the military services are developing systems to measure the effects of encroachment on training ranges. For example, OSD is working to develop the capability of the Defense Readiness Reporting System to identify the extent to which encroachment factors affect a range's ability to support various operational capabilities. The Department of Defense plans to pilot test this new functionality during calendar year 2008. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the findings of the pilot

effort and how encroachment affects the training and readiness levels of tactical units of the military services. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary to summarize the status of the individual services' reporting systems, and assess whether requirements for these individual systems are sufficiently consistent so that information produced will serve both the Department's and services' needs. The Secretary shall submit these reports to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2009.

Environmental Management Information Systems

The committee is aware that Executive Order 13423, "Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management," requires federal officials to implement sustainable practices for greenhouse gas emissions and environmental management on installations. The executive order also recognizes the successful use of environmental management systems within organizations and requires more widespread use of that management framework to implement, measure, and improve upon sustainable practices. The committee is aware of the time and costs associated with paper-based environmental management systems and encourages the Department of Defense to develop and deploy a web-based environmental management information system to achieve uniform policies and practices for sustainable environmental compliance and reporting.

Workplace and Depot Issues

Army Rail Shop Relocation Study

The committee notes that the Department of Defense's sole capability for depot-level repair and maintenance of rail stock and rail equipment, as well as certain types of large-scale power-generation equipment, is managed by the U.S. Army Tank and Automotive Command at facilities located at Hill Air Force Base (AFB), Utah, which has been operating under a tenant support agreement with the Air Force. The Air Force has notified the Army of its intent, under terms of the support agreement, to terminate the Army's occupancy of the current rail shop facilities within an approximate five-year time frame in order to facilitate the Air Force's master plan for the Westside Development project at Hill AFB. This termination will necessitate the relocation of this core maintenance capability. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of the Army to report to the congressional defense committees by March 30, 2009, on the primary considerations involved in relocating the rail shop core capabilities. The report shall include a discussion of the core capabilities, the cost and manpower implications of such a move, and a list of the most practical relocation alternatives. The alternatives shall include consideration of Tooele Army Depot's central rail location, its inherent rail operations capabilities, and its history as the rail shop prior to consolidation to Hill AFB in the early 1990s.

Post-Reset Depot Maintenance

Section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Department of Defense (DOD) to retain the core logistics capabilities needed to ensure a ready and controlled source of technical competencies and resources necessary to ensure effective, timely response to mobilization, national defense contingency situations, and other emergency requirements. In light of the increased reliability and maintainability of military weapons systems and equipment, the committee must understand what enduring depot capabilities will be needed to support long-term national security needs through peacetime, persistent conflict, and future surge contingencies. These depot capabilities include facilities, skills, and equipment.

The Government Accountability Office noted that previous DOD efforts have not provided Congress with the information necessary to assess what the Department requires in terms of enduring depot capability and the legislative framework in which this capability should exist to establish a long-term, cost-effective approach. In June 2007, the Government Accountability Office reported: "DOD has not set forth all the information needed to effectively guide the military depots into the future. Without a comprehensive baseline that identifies the current state of the depots and outlines the actions that will be needed to ensure the military depots are postured, resourced and equipped with the necessary facilities, equipment, technical capabilities and skilled workforce, the depots may not be prepared to support long-term national security needs."

The committee believes that when wartime operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan cease, and supplemental appropriations for depot-related maintenance are reduced, DOD depots must not return to the post-Cold War environment where public- and private-sector facilities fought for limited available workload to the detriment of both. Therefore, the committee has included in this Act a provision requiring that the Department enter into a contract for an independent study of the organic capability needed to provide depot-level maintenance in the post-reset environment.

Inherently Governmental Functions

The committee is concerned about a range of issues involving the proper role of contractors in supporting the mission of the Department of Defense (DOD), including the extent to which contractors may be performing inherently governmental functions. In general, the committee believes that agencies must be properly staffed with government employees, both civilian and military, to perform not only functions identified as those which must be performed by government employees (including oversight of the work being performed by private sector contractors), but those commercial-type functions that should be performed by government employees in order to retain certain core capabilities as a matter of national policy. Recognizing this need, Congress created, in section 804 of the Ronald Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) another category of functions applicable only to the Department of Defense, "functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions." Furthermore, section 324

of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required defense agencies, to the maximum extent practicable, to bring in-house positions performing inherently governmental functions, or those closely associated with inherently governmental functions.

The Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing on this issue on March 11, 2008, during which the subcommittee heard from various witnesses about the Department's increased reliance on services provided by contractors. The committee recognizes that there are both advantages and disadvantages associated with this development, and that determining which functions should only be performed by government employees may be difficult. That task is made even more difficult by the lack of a single definition and accompanying guidance on what constitutes an "inherently governmental function." Currently, the Federal Acquisition Regulation defines that term in multiple places, the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 also defines the term, and there is yet another definition in the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act (Public Law 105–270). There also is the additional DOD-specific definition of "closely associated with inherently governmental functions."

While these various definitions are similar, they are not consistent in all respects. The committee believes that an essential first step in reaching consensus on what functions are inherently governmental is to have a single, consistent definition of that term. To that end, the committee proposes legislation in section 322 of this Act that would require the Office of Management and Budget to develop a single definition of "inherently governmental" and ensure that it is used consistently in all implementing guidance and regulations. This will assist the Department and all federal agencies in achieving the goal of minimizing potential conflicts of interest in the government's decisionmaking process. Finally, the committee encourages the Department to ensure that DOD internal implementing guidance is sufficiently specific in order to facilitate appropriate staffing decisions within the Department.

Report on Actions Taken Related to Public-Private Competitions

Section 325 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) prohibited the Department of Defense from undertaking, preparing for, continuing, or completing public-private competitions in fulfillment of any requirements for such competitions at the direction of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The provision also prohibited the Office of Management and Budget from issuing such directions to the Department. In addition to the restrictions on OMB influence, section 323 of Public Law 110–181 overturned mandatory requirements, outlined in OMB Circular A–76, for recompetitions of employees in a Most Efficient Organization after a period of five years.

The committee regrets that the Department has not issued guidance to implement either section in compliance with congressional intent. The committee is aware that the Department has denied military commands' requests to cancel competitions, or to defer or reduce the scope of competitions where sections 323 or 325 have been cited among the commands' rationale.

Of further concern to the committee is a March 20, 2008, memorandum by the Under Secretary of Defense which reaffirms the Department's commitment to public-private competitions as part of the President's Management Agenda, as enforced by the Office of Management and Budget. This memorandum also stresses that recompetitions should be continued. As a result, the committee believes that both section 323 and 325 are being disregarded by the Department.

Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to immediately issue implementation guidelines and honor such requests for cancellations, deferrals, or reductions in scope of competition in accordance with the provisions included in Public Law 110–181. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report by October 1, 2008, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on all competitions initiated since May 30, 2007, as well as all requests for cancellations, deferrals, or requests for reductions in scope by military commands, and any actions taken in regard to the requests, including justifications for any refusals.

OTHER MATTERS

Army Logistics Modernization Program

The Logistics Modernization Program (LMP) is the Army's enterprise resource planning system for achieving an integrated supply chain. To date, the Army spent $637.3 million developing and transitioning to LMP, and the program cost through fiscal year 2015 is projected to be $2.1 billion. The committee understands that relying on legacy information systems is not a long-term solution to logistics support, but is concerned that future implementation of LMP at Army depots could disrupt depot operations and crucial warfighter support during a time of conflict. Such disruption was experienced in 2003 at Tobyhanna Army Depot due to implementation of LMP. Additionally, the committee is concerned that the intended system capability end-state is not understood by all relevant parties, from depot production-line employees to Headquarters, U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC).

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report on LMP implementation at Army depots and expected end-state capabilities of LMP to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, and the Comptroller General, by January 31, 2009. This report shall include:

(1) Expected LMP capabilities at the levels of depot production, business operations and financial management, and Headquarters, AMC;

(2) Specific LMP capabilities implemented at each depot;

(3) Date of expected implementation at each depot;

(4) Description of how LMP will forecast future maintenance capacity and drive budgetary decisions;

(5) Percentage of workforce at each depot expected to be proficient on the system;

(6) Strategy to educate and train depot employees on system capabilities and the new business approach to resource plan-

ning and supply chain management as a result of LMP implementation;

(7) Detailed plan for ensuring 100 percent of each depot's operating files are loaded by the planned date of implementation at each depot;

(8) Leveraging of lessons learned from previous implementations; and

(9) Detailed risk-mitigation strategy to support current production in the event that LMP implementation is not as successful as planned.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the report submitted by the Secretary of the Army for completeness and provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2009. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to certify to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services that each Army depot is prepared for the transition to LMP. This certification must be applied 30 days prior to any transition to LMP.

Clarification of Department of Defense Transportation Regulations

The committee is aware that a policy directive related to the transport of Department of Defense (DOD) cargo within the United States issued by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition Technology and Logistics in 1998 to all DOD components was intended to move the Department and the military services to the same mode-neutral, time-definite delivery model successfully being used by the commercial transportation industry. However, a subsequent Air Mobility Command regulation conflicts with DOD policy by requiring the use of aircraft for shipment even when it makes little economic sense. The committee proposes a legislative requirement, in section 356 of this Act, to address this inconsistency.

The committee also notes the confusion between the terms "air carrier" and the term "air freight forwarder," as well as a lack of understanding of the contractual conditions required by the Surface Distribution and Deployment Command under which "air freight forwarders" operate. The committee understands this confusion to be generated by lack of clear guidance, uncertain definitions of terms, and poor training, which results in transportation inefficiencies and unnecessary cost to the taxpayers. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to clarify the Department's transportation regulations to provide specific definitions for the various transportation carriers, and provide additional guidance and training to ensure that all DOD entities use commercial best practices when shipping any DOD cargo. A copy of the additional guidance shall be provided to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2008.

Corrosion Control and Prevention

The committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense (DOD) failed to submit, with its fiscal year 2009 budget materials, the report on the corrosion control and prevention strategy and funding requirements as stipulated in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

The Government Accountability Office's (GAO) review of the fiscal year 2009 budget submission, as required by Public Law 110–181, shows total funding of $14.1 million for the DOD Corrosion Policy and Oversight Office against a fiscal year 2009 requirement of $33.8 million, including $28.5 million for projects. The Government Accountability Office reported to the committee on April 3, 2008, that the Department calculated an overall 40-to-1 return on investment (ROI) for corrosion control projects. Using DOD requirements data and overall ROI averages, the Government Accountability Office calculated that if all fiscal year 2009 validated requirements were funded, the total ROI would be $1.2 billion.

The committee is disappointed that requirements for systems and services, rather than ROI and readiness, drive corrosion prevention and control program funding levels in the Department's annual budget process. For example, current depot-maintenance requirements for corrosion abatement on F–22 Raptor aircraft are extensive, and result from decisions made during program development. The committee finds such an approach to corrosion prevention to be fiscally short-sighted and detrimental to readiness.

In order to move the Department to sustainment-based outcomes regarding corrosion control and prevention versus budget-driven decisions, the committee has included a provision in this Act that would require the Department to examine corrosion control and prevention for improvements in system acquisition.

Additionally, the committee disputes the military services' practice of relying upon congressionally directed funding for specific corrosion control programs. This strategy places corrosion abatement and equipment readiness at risk. The committee expects the services to program for corrosion control and prevention projects in future annual budget requests.

Defense Travel System

The committee is concerned that the Defense Travel System (DTS) still books less than one-third of Department of Defense temporary duty (TDY) travel despite the Department's spending approximately $500.0 million over 10 years in an effort to field a comprehensive TDY travel management system. The system in large part does not support users at remote locations isolated from large military installations, such as reserve, national guard, and Army Corps of Engineer travelers. The committee believes remote users would benefit most from a user-friendly, comprehensive web-based system, yet these users must rely on inefficient legacy travel systems. The committee recognizes that improvements have been made, and acknowledges expert testimony that the DTS, despite its problems, remains the Department's best option for a future user-friendly, efficient system capable of capturing necessary financial data.

In that regard, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to aggressively pursue efforts to: make DTS user-friendly with minimal training; implement DTS for remote users, Navy ships afloat, and permanent change of station travel; mandate the discontinuance of all legacy systems; review and simplify complex travel rules where possible; and explore the use of restricted air fare tickets. The committee further directs the Secretary to establish timelines to accomplish these measures and directs the Secretary to report

on the Department's progress in meeting these timelines, and any legislative changes he considers necessary, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2008.

Report on Feasibility of Department of Defense Civilian Law Enforcement Force

The committee is concerned with the military services, particularly the Department of the Army, over-relying on contractors to provide security at military installations. It is the committee's position that the creation of a Department-wide professional law enforcement force would ensure consistency in training standards, provide incentives for civilians to consider such positions as a long-time career, and enhance security at military installations. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the feasibility of establishing a corps of civilian police and security officers under the authority and direction of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and report on the results of this review. The report shall include findings and recommendations of the Secretary that address the following:

(1) Current and future security needs and functions, including security guards, at all military installations;

(2) Feasibility and cost-effectiveness of consolidating all civilian police and security officers of the military defense departments and defense agencies into a single civilian corps of police and security officers under the authority of the Secretary;

(3) Recruitment, training, and equipment standards necessary for Department of Defense (DOD) employees who perform law enforcement and security functions;

(4) Personnel infrastructure necessary to oversee the establishment and management of a DOD civilian corps of police and security officers;

(5) Anticipated interaction with other federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies, including rendering assistance upon request; and

(6) Any statutory, regulatory, or policy changes affecting pay, benefits, and law enforcement powers.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on his findings, recommendations, and any necessary statutory changes, to the congressional defense committees by March 30, 2009.

Report on Improving Supply Chain Management to Enhance Joint Logistics Capability

The committee is concerned about the risk associated with the Department of Defense's supply-chain management. The committee notes that the Comptroller General identified supply-chain management as one of the Department's high-risk areas and initiated a review of the Department's progress in improving supply chain management. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, by March 1, 2009, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the Department's plan to improve defense logistics capability, particularly to meet the demands of the combatant commanders in a

joint and globally responsive fashion. The report shall include, at a minimum: implementation plans for the joint logistics capability portfolio management; long-term strategies for improving joint logistics; and recommendations for statutory, regulatory, or organizational changes needed to facilitate improved supply-chain management and enhanced joint logistics capability.

Space-Available Priority for Military Retirees with Specialty Medical Care Referral

Section 374 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) addresses the space-available (Space-A) priority level of military retirees residing in the U.S. territories who need to travel from the territory to receive special medical care. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report on implementation of section 374 to include the number and frequency of affected military retirees who have availed themselves of Space-A seats in the previous year, and those who requested transportation under this authority but were not accommodated. The Secretary shall submit his report, along with any recommendations for improvements, to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2009.

Space Wargames and Exercises

The committee is concerned that our armed forces have had relatively little experience in dealing with the loss or degradation of key space capabilities. The committee notes the Schriever wargame series managed by Air Force Space Command is the primary Department of Defense wargame that examines space operations and the only wargame focused on space protection across the national security space enterprise. However, as a major command wargame, it is limited to examining future space capabilities and concepts of operations for the Air Force. The committee believes wargames and exercises can improve our military and policymakers' preparedness to cope with conflicts involving space. The committee therefore encourages the Department to: embed space capability effects in joint and service-level wargames and exercises; incorporate scenarios that deny space capabilities in a realistic manner; seek greater participation from the defense, intelligence, civil, commercial, and international sectors; and adequately fund such events.

Tactical and Medium-Altitude Unmanned Aerial Systems Pilot Training and Management

The committee is aware that there are disparate military service approaches to training and managing unmanned aerial systems (UAS) operators in the Department of Defense. As one example, the Army certifies enlisted operators through a common core program that is comprised of approximately nine weeks of Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) compliant instruction and testing. Graduates of the program receive FAA Ground School certification and go on to an additional 12 weeks of ground, simulator, and flight training if they are to operate Shadow or Hunter UASs. Sky Warrior UAS operators receive up to 25 weeks of additional instruction following the Common Core program, which includes instruction on the Na-

tional Airspace System. Operators must pass an FAA instrument written examination to achieve certification.

Conversely, the Air Force requires medium-altitude UAS operators to be pilots and has historically filled UAS operator billets with rated officers who have previously flown aircraft such as F–16s or F–15s. Recent press reports have indicated that UAS operator manning shortfalls, driven by increased demand for UAS support of on-going combat operations, have resulted in substantial force management problems for the Air Force. Under current Air Force policy, completion of Undergraduate Pilot Training takes approximately one year. Follow-on UAS training requires approximately four months. If the Air Force continues to mandate manned-aircraft experience prior to assignment as a UAS operator, development and training is increased by another four and one-half years. Consequently, it can take the Air Force approximately six years to produce a UAS operator.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide for an independent assessment of the training and force management policies of the military services with regard to UAS operators, to be conduced by a federally-funded research and development center selected by the Secretary. The assessment shall be provided to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2009, and shall examine each of the military services' current standards and practices to include:

(1) Current and planned UAS mission operator requirements and the ability of current military service programs to produce sufficient UAS operators to meet current and planned UAS programs;

(2) Qualifications needed for UAS operators compared to current qualifications established by each military service for those operators, and whether the establishment of a common qualification standard and training system is justified in terms of cost of training UAS operators and length of time to produce a fully qualified UAS operator;

(3) Historical performance and proficiency in terms of accident and safety data associated with UAS operations, to include specific accident data for UAS systems that do not have automatic landing capability;

(4) Recommendations for the feasibility and advisability of changing the current individual military service's UAS training system to include options such as a creation of a modified Undergraduate Pilot Training course that would serve as a joint training environment to produce well trained, certified, and ready UAS operators;

(5) Recommendations for improving force management, retention, and recruiting to support UAS operator requirements for the Department; and

(6) Recommendations for reducing accidents and improving safety, with specific considerations for reducing accidents in the landing/recovery phase.

Tire Privatization

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has implemented the Tire Commodity Management Privatization initiative in compliance with the Base Closure and Realignment Act of

1990 (Public Law 101–510) as amended. Under this initiative, the Department shifted responsibility for the supply, storage, and distribution for all tires managed by the Department from the Defense Logistics Agency to a contractor who would be in charge of procuring and distributing all ground and air military tires worldwide for the Department and the military services.

The committee recognizes the initiative's intent was to lower costs and streamline and improve the process of getting tires to the warfighter. The Defense Logistics Agency has created incentives for the qualification of additional suppliers on tires that are currently obtained from a single source, and has required the contractor to ensure that a minimum of 35 percent of all tires purchased under the program come from suppliers other than the prime contractor for tire types where more than one supplier exists. The committee is aware that the Defense Logistics Agency is continuing to examine whether the 35 percent minimum requirement is sufficient to maintain the domestic industrial base for military tire manufacturing; support future innovations for military tires; and preserve a competitive environment for current and future competitions. As part of this effort, the committee understands that the Defense Logistics Agency is undertaking a Milestone C evaluation for cost and performance of the tire privatization contract, which is expected to be completed in June 2008. The committee directs the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency to provide a copy of the evaluation to the congressional defense committees within 30 days after the completion of the evaluation.

Furthermore, the committee reiterates its concern that the current contract was awarded to the prime contractor in a manner similar to that of using a "lead systems integrator," which is an acquisition strategy the committee has addressed in several previous defense bills. The committee is concerned that such an approach may not provide all qualified tire manufacturers equal footing in the defense market. The performance period of the current contract, which is structured to have a five-year base and a five-year option, could prove detrimental to the industrial base and follow-on competitions.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize $154.5 billion in operation and maintenance funding for the military departments and defense-wide activities.

SUBTITLE B—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

Section 311—Authorization for Department of Defense Participation in Conservation Banking Programs

This section would authorize the Department of Defense to participate in conservation banking programs as defined in "Guidance for the Establishment, Use, and Operation of Conservation Banks" (68 Federal Register 24753, May 2, 2003), or to make an 'in-lieu-fee' payment for habitat conservation purposes as defined in "Fed-

eral Guidance on the Use of In-Lieu-Fee Arrangements for Compensatory Mitigation Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act" (65 Federal Register 66915, November 7, 2000). Conservation banking and in-lieu-fee arrangements are additional tools to help the Department mitigate the impacts of military activities on the environment.

Section 312—Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for Certain Costs in Connection with Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer not more than $64,049.40 to the Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site 10–6J Special Account. This transfer is to reimburse the Environmental Protection Agency for its costs in overseeing a remedial investigation/feasibility study performed by the Department of the Army under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program at the former Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington.

Section 313—Expand Cooperative Agreement Authority for Management of Natural Resources to Include Off-Installation Mitigation

This section would amend section 103a(a) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670c–1(a)) to expand the authority of the secretaries of the military departments to enter into cooperative agreements with states, local governments, nongovernmental organizations, and individuals for the maintenance and improvement of natural resources located off of military installations or to undertake mitigation measures necessary to address potential natural resource impacts caused by Department of Defense activities. Such cooperative agreements are expected to be complimentary with other relevant natural resource management strategies affecting the Department's installations, such as Integrated Natural Resource Management Plans, and with broader landscape conservation initiatives, such as State Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plans. This section would not waive any requirement under federal or state law.

SUBTITLE C—WORKPLACE AND DEPOT ISSUES

Section 321—Time Limitation on Duration of Public-Private Competitions

This section would restrict to 540 days the time from the beginning of preliminary planning to the rendering of the performance decision for any public-private competitions conducted pursuant to Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76. The time period would take into account any delays resulting from a protest before the Government Accountability Office or the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. The committee does not intend this language to be used by the Department of Defense to stop an A–76 competition that has overrun the 540 days and then be restarted at a later date.

Section 322—Comprehensive Analysis and Development of Single Government-wide Definition of Inherently Governmental Function

This section would require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and appropriate representatives of the Chief Acquisition Officers Council and the Chief Human Capital Council to review the existing statutory and regulatory definitions of "inherently governmental" functions and to develop a single consistent definition. The single definition should address any deficiencies in the current definitions and be sufficiently generic to enable federal agencies to determine which functions or positions should be performed only by government civilian or military personnel. Criteria should be developed to enable federal agencies to identify the functions and positions that, though not falling within the definition of inherently governmental, should nevertheless be performed by government employees. In developing the single government-wide definition, public comment should be solicited. This section also requires a report on the actions taken to develop the single definition and make recommendations for any necessary legislative actions. The report shall be submitted one year after date of enactment of this Act to the appropriate committees of Congress. Implementing regulations shall be issued 180 days after submission of the report.

Section 323—Study on Future Depot Capability

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services an independent, quantitative assessment of the organic capability that will be required to provide depot-level maintenance in the post-reset environment. The study would examine all active and reserve capability in the public and private sectors involved in lifecycle sustainment of weapons systems. It also would examine relevant Department of Defense guidance, regulations, and applicable federal law and would address the current and future lifecycle sustainment maintenance strategy, implementation plan, and maintenance environment.

The report provided by the independent entity would include recommendations on the requirement for an enduring organic depot capability, appropriate changes to law, and incentives to achieve efficiency and cost-effectiveness. It also would include a proposed roadmap to meet materiel readiness goals of availability, reliability, total ownership cost, and repair cycle time. The Comptroller General shall review the report and provide findings within 90 days of submission.

Within funds contained in this Act for analysis and support for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the committee recommends that not more than $1.5 million of these funds shall be available for the required study.

Section 324—High-Performing Organization Business Process Reengineering

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop guidelines for establishing high-performing organizations conducted through a business process reengineering initiative. Such guidance shall include an assessment of the affected number of employees, functions to be included, the high-performing business location, and

timeline for implementation of the high-performing organization. This section would impose certain requirements prior to the establishment of a high-performing organization, including compliance with collective bargaining statutes and a 45 day congressional notification. This section also would require an annual performance evaluation, with a report to the congressional defense committees.

Section 325—Temporary Suspension of Studies and Public-Private Competitions Regarding Conversion of Functions of the Department of Defense Performed by Civilian Employees to Contractor Performance

This section would suspend public-private competitions within the Department of Defense until the end of fiscal year 2011. The committee is concerned that the turbulence caused by the Department's efforts to increase the services' end strengths; implementation of the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment decisions; and execution of transformational initiatives while concurrently conducting sustained combat operations could impede sound out-sourcing decisions. The committee, therefore, recommends the suspension to ensure that the Department is not making force-management decisions at a time of substantial transition and transformation.

Section 326—Consolidation of Air Force and Air National Guard Aircraft Maintenance

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from consolidating Air National Guard with active-duty Air Force maintenance activities and facilities without first consulting with, and obtaining the consent of, the National Guard Bureau. It would require the Secretary of the Air Force to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the assumptions and criteria used to evaluate the feasibility of consolidation. Before any consolidation actions are taken, this section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the feasibility study findings and recommendations, the Air Force's assessment of the findings and recommendations, any plans developed for implementation, and all infrastructure costs anticipated as a result of implementation.

Section 327—Guidance for Performance of Civilian Personnel Work Under Air Force Civilian Personnel Consolidation Plan

This section would provide guidance to the Air Force as it proceeds with its consolidation of personnel management functions. This section would require that the Air Force, in making determinations, consider the size and complexity of the civilian workforce and the impact that any consolidation may have on accomplishment of the mission at an installation. This section describes certain functions being performed at large civilian centers that may not be included in any personnel management consolidation.

Section 328—Report on Reduction in Number of Fire Fighters on Air Force Bases

This section would require a report by the Secretary of the Air Force on the effect of the reduction in fire fighters on Air Force bases as a result of Program Budget Decision (PBD) 720. The report would include an evaluation of risks, if any, associated with the reductions and the adequacy of fire fighting capabilities within the surrounding communities to respond to an aircraft fire. Additionally, the section requires a plan to restore personnel if it is determined that PBD 720 negatively impacted the mission. The report would be submitted to Congress within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBTITLE D—ENERGY SECURITY

Section 331—Annual Report on Operational Energy Management and Implementation of Operational Energy Strategy

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs as established within title IX of this Act, to submit an annual operational energy management report to the congressional defense committees on operational energy consumption and initiatives. The committee is aware that buildings and facilities account for approximately one quarter of the Department of Defense's annual energy consumption, and the remaining three-quarters of the energy consumption is for operational purposes. While the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment produces an annual energy management report for installations, no similar product exists for energy required to support military operations. This section seeks to correct this apparent reporting disparity.

Section 332—Consideration of Fuel Logistics Support Requirements in Planning, Requirements Development, and Acquisition Processes

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to consider the fully-burdened cost of fuel and energy efficiency in planning, capability requirements development, and acquisition processes. This section would require the Secretary to prepare a plan for implementation of the requirements of this section within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Lastly, this section would establish a deadline for implementation of within three years of the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 333—Study on Solar Energy for Use at Forward Operating Locations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the feasibility of using solar energy to provide electricity at forward operating locations. The report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009.

Section 334—Study on Coal-to-Liquid Fuels

This section would require a study on alternatives to reduce the life cycle emissions of coal-to-liquid fuels. The study shall be conducted by a federally funded research and development center and

shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees and the Secretary of Defense by March 1, 2009.

SUBTITLE E—REPORTS

Section 341—Comptroller General Report on Readiness of Armed Forces

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a report on the readiness of the regular and reserve components of the armed forces. The committee is concerned with the state of readiness of the armed forces and requires this review to determine the current state of readiness and what actions the services are taking to increase their readiness posture.

Section 342—Report on Plan to Enhance Combat Skills of Navy and Air Force Personnel

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the plans of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force to improve the combat skills of the members of the Navy and the Air Force, respectively. The committee is concerned about combat training being conducted by the Navy and the Air Force, both in support of the current operations and as the services posture themselves for future missions. Ground combat training is already being conducted by the Army and Marine Corps to a high level of proficiency on installations with robust infrastructure to support this type of training. The committee is concerned that the Navy and Air Force will seek to duplicate training facilities and schools without maximizing the use of existing expertise and infrastructure. The committee strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to oversee this expansion of combat training to ensure that the services do not reinvent existing capabilities or create multiple standards for ground combat operations.

Section 343—Comptroller General Report on the Use of the Army Reserve and National Guard as an Operational Reserve

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the use of the Army Reserve and National Guard forces as an operational reserve. This report would include a description of current and programmed resources, force structure, and organizational challenges that the Army Reserve and National Guard forces may face serving as an operational reserve. This would include an examination of:

(1) Equipment availability, maintenance, and logistics issues;

(2) Manning and force structure;

(3) Training constraints limiting facilities and ranges, access to military schools and skill training, or access to the Combat Training Centers; and

(4) Any conflicts with requirements under title 32, United States Code.

The Commission on the National Guard and Reserves noted that Congress should examine the use of the reserve forces as an oper-

ational reserve. The committee recognizes that the expanded use of the Army Reserve and National Guard may require an additional investment by the Army to meet their training, manpower, and equipment needs. This report would assist the committee in understanding those needs in making future policy and resourcing decisions.

Section 344—Comptroller General Report on Link Between Preparation and Use of Army Reserve Component Forces to Support Ongoing Operations

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to analyze and report on the preparation and operational use of the Army's reserve component forces. The report shall contain an analysis of the Army's ability to train and employ reserve units for both wartime missions and non-traditional missions to which the units are assigned. The report shall also consider how mobilization and deployment laws, goals, and policies impact the Army's ability to train and employ reserve component units for combat or non-combat missions. The committee would like to ensure that the Army's reserve component units are receiving all required training and resources prior to employment in combat. Ongoing combat operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan have required the re-missioning of many types of units. This report would examine the employment of reserve units to determine if there are any factors limiting the preparation of these units for ongoing operations.

Section 345—Comptroller General Report on Adequacy of Funding, Staffing, and Organization of Department of Defense Military Munitions Response Program

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to report on the adequacy of the funding, staffing, and organization of the Department of Defense's Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP). The report would also include an assessment of the MMRP mechanisms for the accountability, reporting, and monitoring of the progress of munitions response projects and suggested methods to reduce the time such projects take to complete. This report would be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 346—Report on Options for Providing Repair Capabilities to Support Ships Operating Near Guam

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to estimate the requirement for voyage repairs to U.S. Navy vessels operating at or near Guam. Additionally, this section would require the Secretary to assess voyage repair options for ships operating at or near Guam, including the anticipated costs and strategic and operational risks associated with each option. The Secretary shall report by March 1, 2009, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the voyage repair options along with the plan and schedule for implementing a course of action to ensure that the required voyage repair capa-

bility will be available by October 2012, in order to support the relocation of U.S. military forces from Okinawa to Guam.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 351—Extension of Enterprise Transition Plan Reporting Requirement

This section would extend the requirement for the Business Transformation Agency to report to Congress on the Enterprise Transition Plan for the Department of Defense until 2013. Without legislative action, that requirement would currently expire in 2009.

Section 352—Demilitarization of Loaned, Given, or Exchanged Documents, Historical Artifacts, and Condemned or Obsolete Combat Materiel

This section would amend section 2572, title 10, United States Code, to clarify that any item authorized to be donated under this section should be considered as demilitarized materiel and made unserviceable in the interest of public safety.

Section 353—Repeal of Requirement that Secretary of Air Force Provide Training and Support to Other Military Departments for A–10 Aircraft

This section would repeal outdated language regarding fleet support and depot maintenance for A–10 aircraft. The committee notes that there are no Department of Defense users of A–10 aircraft other than the Department of the Air Force, nor are there plans for any in the future.

Section 354—Display of Annual Budget Requirements for Air Sovereignty Alert Mission

This section would require a consolidated budget justification by the Secretary of Defense on all programs and activities for the Air Sovereignty Alert (ASA) mission of the U.S. Air Force. The report would be submitted to Congress as part of the defense budget materials for each fiscal year. The committee is aware that while the Air National Guard has volunteered to undertake this critical mission, funds for the program must come from the active duty Air Force accounts and have not been properly prioritized or allocated on a timely basis. This has led to a 34 percent shortfall for the ASA mission for Fiscal Year 2009. This section would facilitate the committee's oversight to ensure sufficient resources are budgeted to fully execute this priority mission.

Section 355—Sense of Congress that Air Sovereignty Alert Missions Should Receive Sufficient Funding and Resources

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Air Force should ensure that the air sovereignty alert mission of the Air National Guard is provided with the necessary resources to perform this priority mission. The committee also proposes a provision, at section 354 of this Act, which would require a consolidated budget justification by the Secretary of Defense on all programs

and activities for the air sovereignty alert mission of the U.S. Air Force.

Section 356—Revision of Certain Air Force Regulations Required

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to bring the Air Freight Transportation Regulation No. 5, issued by the Air Mobility Command, into full compliance with Department of Defense transportation regulations requiring commercial best practices.

Section 357—Transfer of C–12 Aircraft to California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

This provision would allow the Secretary of the Army to transfer three surplus C–12 aircraft to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection at no cost to the United States.

Section 358—Availability of Funds for Irregular Warfare Support Program

This section would require as much as $75.0 million to be made available for the Irregular Warfare Support (IWS) program from funds made available for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) in fiscal year 2009.

The committee applauds the achievements resulting from the IWS–JIEDDO collaborative partnership in support of both unconventional and irregular approaches to warfare. The committee further applauds JIEDDO's practice of leveraging IWS initiatives to thwart the threat of improvised explosive devices. The committee believes that the IWS program has both the promise and potential to make a greater contribution in pursuit of national security objectives.

The committee notes that the Irregular Warfare Support program leverages ongoing research efforts at Special Operations Command and other parts of the federal government to analyze, modify, design, and demonstrate enduring technical and operational capabilities. Promising projects include: counter-motivation, counter-enterprise, counter-infrastructure, counter-financing, and sanctuary-denial methodologies for the tactical and operational warfighter. IWS personnel and agents alternatively provide both a mentoring and a support role to uniformed personnel performing in the field or in analytical and command positions. The committee supports efforts to further mature this concept.

A separate provision in title IX of this Act requires the Secretary of Defense to designate an Assistant Secretary of Defense to be responsible for overall management and coordination of irregular warfare. The committee believes funding certainty, programmatic stabilization, and a more focused management regime would enhance and improve future IWS activities and strategies. The committee believes the designation of a responsible assistant secretary will provide appropriate and necessary management oversight. The committee also strongly believes appropriate management and funding certainty is necessary to improve and properly focus the Department's efforts. As a result, the committee further urges the Department to provide stable and adequate funding levels beyond

fiscal year 2009 and submit them to the congressional defense committees for consideration.

Section 359—Sense of Congress Regarding Procurement and Use of Munitions

This section would express the sense of the committee that the Department of Defense should develop methods to account for the full life-cycle costs of munitions, including the cost of failure rates on the cost of disposal. This provision also suggests that the Department review live-fire training practices to reduce munitions-constituent contamination. Military readiness should remain the prime consideration in the procurement and use of munitions and ammunition.

The committee is aware of the high cost of cleaning up munitions constituent contamination on ranges and formerly used defense sites in the United States. A review and modification of procurement and use of military munitions with the intention of limiting future contamination may also reduce the cost of future munitions-constituent remediation.

Section 360—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Air Combat Command Management Headquarters

This section would prohibit the Commander, Air Combat Command from obligating each quarter in fiscal year 2009 more than 80 percent of the average obligation of the preceding fiscal year's corresponding quarter until the Secretary of the Air Force complies with section 137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), and the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department will program funding in the Air Force Future Years Defense Plan for 76, commonly configured B–52 aircraft by the submission of the fiscal year 2010 President's budget request to Congress.

Section 361—Increase of Domestic Sourcing of Military Working Dogs Used by the Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Executive Agent for Military Working Dogs, to identify the Department of Defense's requirements for military working dogs and take steps to ensure that this requirement is met. This section would require the Department to coordinate with federal, state, or local agencies as well as nonprofit organizations, universities, or private sector entities to increase the training capacity for military working dog teams. This section also would require the Secretary work toward the goal of procuring all military working dogs from domestic breeders while maintaining quality and best value for the U.S. Government.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for proposing to permanently increase the authorized end strength for the active

Army to 547,000, and to 202,000 for the active Marine Corps by fiscal year 2012, and to accelerate efforts to increase the permanent end strength for the Army in fiscal year 2009 by 5,100. The committee also recognizes the Secretary for his efforts to include the cost of the permanent end strength increase within the base budget in fiscal year 2009. The committee is pleased that the Department of Defense finally recognizes the importance of increasing the end strength of the Army and the Marine Corps to meet current operational requirements placed on these services. The increase in end strength for the Army and the Marine Corps will help reduce the pressure on the current forces and will hopefully reduce the deployment lengths for the Army as well as reduce the number of deployments for service members.

The committee remains concerned that, despite the requirement in section 721 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) that prohibited further military-to-civilian conversions within the military health care system, the President's budget request included further conversions and failed to provide funds to support the restoration of military positions that are required by law. Congress took this vital action because of the concerns that such conversions are having an adverse impact on access and quality of care being provided to service members and their families. The committee continues to hear directly from military families who face difficulties accessing care at military treatment facilities. The committee expects the services to meet both the intent and spirit of the law, and restore the military medical positions that are proposed for conversion in fiscal year 2009, restore positions that were converted in earlier years that have not been filled as of October 1, 2008, and plan and budget accordingly to restore military positions that were proposed for conversion beginning in October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2012, as required by law. In order to ensure that the intent of the law is met, the committee extends the current prohibition of conversion within title VII of this Act.

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, 2009:

Service	FY 2008	FY 2009		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2009 Request	FY 2008 Authorized
Army	525,400	532,400	532,400	0	7,000
Navy	329,098	325,300	326,323	1,023	−2,775
USMC	189,000	194,000	194,000	0	5,000
Air Force	329,563	316,600	317,050	450	−12,513
DOD Total	1,373,061	1,368,300	1,369,773	1,473	−3,288

The committee recognizes that the delayed passage of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) had an effect on restoring the military-to-civilian posi-

tions within the military medical community. However, the law prohibits conversions within the military medical community, and the committee expects the Department of Defense to comply fully with the law in its fiscal year 2010 budget submission. In order to ensure that the Department meets the requirements in fiscal year 2009, the committee increases the active duty end strength for the Navy by 1,023 and the Air Force by 450. The budget request already provides an increase of 7,000 for the Army from which the committee expects the Army to restore military medical positions in response to the prohibition.

Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would establish new minimum active duty end strengths for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force as of September 30, 2009. The committee recommends 532,400 as the minimum active duty end strength for the Army, 326,323 as the minimum active duty end strength for the Navy, 194,000 as the minimum active duty end strength for the Marine Corps, and 317,050 as the minimum active duty end strength for the Air Force.

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, 2009:

Service	FY 2008	FY 2009		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2009 Request	FY 2008 Authorized
Army National Guard	351,300	352,600	352,600	0	1,300
Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	67,800	66,700	66,700	0	−1,100
Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600	0	0
Air National Guard	106,700	106,700	106,700	0	0
Air Force Reserve	67,500	67,400	67,400	0	−100
DOD Total	837,900	838,000	838,000	0	100
Coast Guard Reserve	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	0

Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserve Components

This section would authorize the following end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves as of September 30, 2009:

Service	FY 2008	FY 2009		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2009 Request	FY 2008 Authorized
Army National Guard	29,204	29,950	32,060	2,110	2,856
Army Reserve	15,870	16,170	17,070	900	1,200
Naval Reserve	11,579	11,099	11,099	0	−480

Service	FY 2008	FY 2009		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2009 Request	FY 2008 Authorized
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261	0	0
Air National Guard	13,936	14,337	14,337	0	401
Air Force Reserve	2,721	2,733	2,733	0	12
DOD Total	75,571	76,550	77,200	650	979

The committee recognizes the increasing requirements on Army National Guard and Army Reserve for full-time support personnel given the transformation of those components from a strategic reserve to an operational reserve. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase above the budget request for reserves on active duty of 2,110 for the Army National Guard and 900 for the Army Reserves to support the reserves.

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, 2009:

Service	FY 2008	FY 2009		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2009 Request	FY 2008 Authorized
Army National Guard	26,502	27,210	27,210	0	708
Army Reserve	8,249	8,395	8,395	0	146
Air National Guard	22,553	22,452	22,452	0	−101
Air Force Reserve	9,909	10,003	10,003	0	94
DOD Total	67,213	68,060	68,060	0	847

Section 414—Fiscal Year 2009 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, 2009:

Service	FY 2008	FY 2009		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2009 Request	FY 2008 Authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0
Army Reserve	595	595	595	0	0
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	0
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total	2,635	2,635	2,635	0	0

Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized to be on Active Duty for Operational Support

This section would authorize, as required by section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, the maximum number of reserve component personnel who may be on active duty or full-time national guard duty during fiscal year 2009 to provide operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by sections 401 or 412.

Service	FY 2008	FY 2009		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2009 Request	FY 2008 Authorized
Army National Guard	17,000	17,000	17,000	0	0
Army Reserve	13,000	13,000	13,000	0	0
Naval Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200	0	0
Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
Air National Guard	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	0
Air Force Reserve	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0
DOD Total	69,200	69,200	69,200	0	0

Section 416—Additional Waiver Authority of Limitation on Number of Reserve Component Members Authorized to be on Active Duty

This section would amend section 123a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to waive the limitations on the number of reserve component personnel who can be on active duty for operational support under section 115 of title 10, United States Code. This waiver authority would allow a surge of reserve component members to be on active duty voluntarily to respond to a major disaster or emergency. A Presidential waiver granted under this provision would extend until 90 days after such major disaster or emergency is determined to be terminated.

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize $124.7 billion 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:

Title IV -- Military Personnel

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	2009 Amount	House Change	House Authorized
MILITARY PERSONNEL	**125,246,933**	**-587,165**	**124,659,768**
Restore Military to Civilian Conversions for Navy Medicine (sec. 401)		[26,750]	
Restore Military to Civilian Conversions for Air Force Medicine (sec. 401)		[38,800]	
Restore Military to Civilian Conversions Undistributed		[35,535]	
Increase Full Time Support Authorization for Army National Guard (sec. 412)		[85,000]	
Increase Full Time Support Authorization for Army Reserve (sec. 412)		[36,000]	
Senior Leadership Diversity Commission (sec. 595)		[250]	
Military Pay Raise Increase (sec. 601)		[288,000]	
Prohibition on Charging for Meals at MTFs (sec. 602)		[1,000]	
BAH Parity E8 and E9 (sec. 603)		[11,000]	
Increase in Maximum Temporary Lodging Expenses (sec. 604)		[37,000]	
Partial Family Separation Allowance for Dual Military Couples (sec. 605)		[1,000]	
Save Pay (sec. 606)		[1,000]	
Nurse Candidate Accession Bonus and Monthly Stipend (sec. 616)		[2,000]	
Critical Skills Bonus for Psychology anad other mental health (sec.620)		[13,000]	
Weight Allowance Increase Mid-grade and Senior NCOs (sec. 631)		[29,000]	
200 Pounds Professional Wight Allowance for Spouses (sec. 632)		[13,000]	
Guaranteed Bonuses for Wounded Service Members (sec. 662)		[1,000]	
Unobligated Balances		[-1,076,000]	
Unobligated Balances, Military Personnel, Army National Guard		[-88,000]	
Unobligated Balances, Military Personnel, Army Reserve		[-42,500]	

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

OVERVIEW

The committee continues its ongoing efforts to provide greater flexibility to for officer and reserve personnel management. The committee supports efforts to establish a career intermission pilot program that would allow those who are seeking a military career time off from active duty for a period of several years in order to pursue other life achievements and a return to military service without penalty. The committee commends the Army for its support of the Early Commissioning Program and is encouraged to learn that the Army expects to provide an appropriate level of funding for this program in future budget requests to assist in increasing the number of junior officers within the Army.

The committee commends the service military educational institutions for incorporating lessons learned from the preparation and execution of military strategy in Iraq into their curriculum. The committee encourages the services to continue their efforts to improve the educational and training courses for their students that build up on lessons learned.

The committee continues efforts to improve the quality of life for service members and their families and recognizes the personal contributions that those who are serving in uniform are making. Just as importantly, the committee acknowledges the sacrifices their families are making in support of current operations. The committee recommends additional funding to help local educational agencies who are providing support to military children by including $50.0 million for local educational agencies that are heavily impacted by the attendance of military dependents and an additional $15.0 million for local educational agencies that experience significant increases or decreases in the average daily attendance of military dependent students due to military force structure changes.

Efforts to provide greater support to military spouses and dependents continues to be a focus for the committee, which has provided education and training opportunities for military spouses who are seeking degrees or careers that will be portable as they move from duty station to duty station with their military member. The committee also remains committed to enhancing and improving programs and policies that support military families, particularly those of deployed service members. The committee notes that there are numerous innovative and novel programs that are being developed and proposed by organizations that wish to support military families. Programs such as Coming Together Around Military Families, Family Support Training Programs and Centers for National Guard and Reserves, Franklin Covey, Project SOAR, and Project Navigate are just a few of such programs that have been brought to the committee's attention. The committee believes that there are a number of worthwhile family support programs that should be considered and recommends an increase of $15.0 million for family support programs.

In addition, the committee commends the Army and the Marines Corps for recognizing the importance of family support to military readiness. The Army's Family Covenant sends an important message to our soldiers and their families, and the Marine Corps has

also made improvements to their family support programs. Both services have recognized that additional full-time support personnel are needed to help alleviate the burden being placed on families, particularly volunteers who have carried a heavy load during these last several years. The committee is pleased that the Army and Marine Corps are moving forward to address the needs of their families, and urges the Secretaries of the Navy and the Air Force to review their family support programs, and assess the demand for additional full-time personnel to support families and to budget accordingly for such additional requirements, if necessary. The committee is particularly concerned with the support that is being provided to individual augmentees who are deployed in a contingency operation and their families within the Navy and Air Force and advises that these individuals and their families be afforded the support that they need. The committee also urges all the services to ensure that similar levels of support are being provided to their reserve component members and families, as also recommended by the Commission on National Guard and Reserves.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Advance Deployment Notice to Reserve Component Members

The committee notes that section 515 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requires the secretary of a military department to provide, as is practicable, notification to reserve component members not less than 30 days before being called or ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days, with a goal of 90 days. This provision allows the Secretary of Defense to waive the notification requirement and requires the Secretary to submit to Congress a report detailing the reason for the waiver. The committee is concerned that while it has not received any waivers from the Secretary, it is unclear whether there are established procedures or policies that would provide the Secretary the oversight necessary to comply with the provision of law.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the current procedures and/or policies to ensure that the services are complying with the law, and provide the committee a summary of the number of reserve component members who have been notified of a mobilization since the enactment of Public Law 110–181, and of those notified how many had received their notification 30, 90, or more than 90 days prior to mobilization. The report shall also include the number of reservists who were provided less than 30 days notification, along with a detailed reason on why the 30 day notification requirement could not be met, and whether a waiver was provided by the Secretary. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a report on the results of the review by March 31, 2009.

Air Force Academy Athletic Association

The committee sees great promise in the respective constructs of the athletic associations of the Naval Academy and West Point. To improve the ability of the Air Force Academy Athletic Association

(AFAAA) to support the Academy's mission of building future Air Force leaders of character and to provide for the maximum benefit of the Air Force Academy and its cadets, the committee believes changes should be made in the oversight, management, and fundraising ability of the AFAAA. Therefore, the committee directs the Air Force to establish the AFAAA as a non-profit entity with all profits and proceeds going directly back into the Academy itself. The Air Force Academy will implement this directive as expeditiously as possible, with the implementation completed within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. One objective of the non-profit entity should be to raise funds through such initiatives as admission tickets, concession item and apparel sales, licensing trademarks, commercial sponsorships and partnerships, radio and television rights revenue, accepting gifts and other means appropriate to an intercollegiate sports program and use those funds in support of the Academy. If additional statutory authority is required to achieve the objectives of the AFAAA as a non-profit entity, the Secretary of the Air Force should submit those proposals to Congress by March 1, 2009. Furthermore, the committee directs that this non-profit entity be governed by a board of directors made up of at least nine members. The Director of Athletics shall be a standing member of the board and serve as chairman. The Superintendent will appoint the remaining members of the board, which may include a cadet representative and will include at least one Air Force Academy alumnus with no current official ties to the Academy, after receiving the approval of the Secretary of the Air Force for each individual appointment. The Secretary of the Air Force will ensure oversight of the activities of the Association.

Competitions to Provide Unofficial Information Services to Service Members

The committee has learned that competition between morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) activities and the military exchange services to provide unofficial information services (such as internet access, internet cafes, recreational gaming, cable television, and wireless internet services), has become disruptive and counterproductive. The committee needs a better understanding of the status of the current situation, the circumstances and conditions that led to the current situation, and the requirements of regulations and law regarding the provision of such services on military installations and to military personnel residing off the installation. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prohibit new competitions for unofficial information services to be undertaken after the date of enactment of this Act until the Secretary reviews the applicable regulations and laws, clarifies what constitutes unofficial information services, and defines the roles and functions of MWR activities and the military exchange systems in providing such information services. The committee directs the Secretary to report his findings, conclusions, and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Financial Counseling for Homeowners in the Armed Forces

The committee is concerned that the recent nationwide mortgage housing crisis may also be affecting the men and women of the armed forces. These people and their families purchase homes in communities in which they are stationed. Unfortunately, unlike many civilian homeowners in the United States, military homeowners are frequently forced to move to different bases within the United States and even overseas to meet the needs of their respective services. In this current housing environment, these required permanent changes of station can result in military homeowners having to sell their homes at a loss. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement an information program for members of the armed forces, including members of the National Guard and reserves, who are returning from deployment or are facing a permanent change of station, that would advise members of actions that can be taken to protect themselves from the financial impacts of owning and maintaining a home. The information provided should also include actions that can be taken to prevent or forestall mortgage foreclosures, information on credit counseling, home mortgage counseling, and other information the Secretary considers appropriate.

National Longitudinal Survey of Youth

The committee understands that the Department of Defense has funded additional questions within previous versions of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth sponsored by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The committee believes that these surveys provide important information to Department of Defense recruiting and retention managers and to Congress on attitudes, motivations, qualifications, experiences, and income as the cohorts move through the stages of life. The committee notes that the nation is overdue to initiate a new study because the most recent cohort was initiated over 10 years ago in 1997. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to request that a new cohort of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth be launched by 2010 and that the Secretary promote the initiative by committing resources to support aspects of the survey of particular interest to the Department.

Report on Duty Status of the Reserve Component

The Commission on National Guard and Reserves issued its final report on January 31st of this year. The commission found that today's reservists are managed under 29 different and distinct statuses that are confusing and frustrating to reserve component members and their commanders. The committee has heard the challenges reserve members face to meet mission requirements when transitioning from one duty status to another. Unfortunately, reserve component members and their families are often times caught in the middle of transitions in which pay and benefits change from one duty status to another.

The greater utilization of reserve component members to meet operational requirements requires simple and straightforward management. The commission recommended that the 29 duty statuses be reduced to 2—title 10 or title 32 status. However, reducing the number of duty statuses brings numerous challenges

that were not specifically addressed by the commission. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to undertake a review of all the duty statuses currently being used by the services and the Department and to provide a strategic plan that would significantly reduce the number of duty statuses to allow for a clear, simple structure under which reserve members are called to serve. The committee directs the Secretary to report the results of the review, and a strategic plan, along with any recommendations for modification to the current law that may be necessary to reduce the duty statuses of reserve component members to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2009.

Review of Full-Time Manning for the Army National Guard and Army Reserves

The committee notes the importance of full-time manning, which includes active guard and reserve personnel, as well as military technicians, to the training, readiness and performance of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve, particularly during times of increased operational tempo. Both the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve have become operational reserves and the requirements for full time manning can be expected to increase over present levels. The committee does not believe the full-time manning for either the Army Guard or the Army Reserve is adequate. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review the projected five-year requirements for Army National Guard and Army Reserve full-time manning and implement a plan to increase full-time manning in both those components to the required levels. The Secretary of the Army shall report the results of his review and implementation plan to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2009.

Review of Reserve Officer Joint Requirements

The committee notes that the budget request included a legislative proposal to increase the controlled grade limit for lieutenant colonels serving in a full-time support capacity in the Marine Corps Reserve. The proposal was included by the committee in section 512 of this Act. The documentation submitted to support this proposal cited growth in full-time lieutenant colonel requirements in a variety of headquarters staffs caused by the expansion of reserve component roles to encompass missions that traditionally were reserved for the active components. The committee is concerned that this increase in demand for more senior officers with greater experience is a trend that affects all the reserve components and that the current authorized levels of senior officer full-time support are inadequate to meet operational requirements across the reserve forces. The committee is also concerned that in the case of the Marine Corps Reserve, there has been a deliberate decision to sacrifice critical positions authorized for the grade of major in an effort to increase the number of lieutenant colonel positions that are considered a higher priority. The committee fears that the Marine Corps Reserve may have traded one controlled grade problem for another

that will become apparent when it realizes that there are insufficient numbers of majors to support missions.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the full-time support controlled grade requirements within all the reserve components to determine if the number of authorizations is adequate to meet mission requirements in this era of increasing activity of our reserve forces. Specifically, the committee directs the Secretary to examine the number of full-time support authorizations in the grade of major within the Marine Corps Reserve to determine if the reduction in positions was an appropriate management decision. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2009.

Searchable Military Decorations Database

The committee notes that there have been a number of examples of individuals in recent years who have fraudulently claimed to have been awarded the Medal of Honor or other decorations of valor. The committee believes that the frequency of such incidents could be reduced and the prestige of all military valor decorations preserved if the general public was afforded access to a searchable database listing those individuals who have been awarded decorations for valor.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the potential for establishing a searchable database listing individuals who have been awarded military medals for valor. The Secretary shall consider the cost of the database, the administrative challenges in assembling the database, the implications for the privacy of the individuals listed in the database, and the options for the general public to gain access to the database. The Secretary shall also consider the feasibility of listing recipients of multiple valor decorations in the database, but shall, at a minimum, report his findings regarding feasibility of a database that only includes recipients of the Medal of Honor. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2009.

Strategic Plan to Address Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and Education

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense lacks a strategic plan to address the growing shortages in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) professions, both military and civilian, within the services and other Departmental agencies. The committee is concerned that the nation is facing an increasing shortage of qualified STEM professionals, directly impacting our national security. The committee further notes that one of the top recommendations from the 2007 National Academy of Science report, "Rising Above The Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future," is for increasing America's talent pool by improving primary and secondary math and science education. The committee is aware that the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military services all have numerous STEM programs, but is concerned that these programs

lack the coherent and coordinated approach necessary to address STEM issues across the Department of Defense.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on this issue, including an assessment of all the programs within the military services, defense agencies, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense that encourage, assist, and maintain individuals to pursue an interest in STEM. At a minimum, the study shall include a description of each program, the target students or employee range, the period of the program, the amount requested and expended, the numbers of individuals impacted, and other appropriate metrics. The study should also address how each program adds to the continuum of education from kindergarten through high school, as well as post-secondary through graduate and post-graduate education. The study should include at a minimum review of STARBASE, the STEM Learning Modules, eCybermission, as well as efforts within Senior Reserve Officer Training (ROTC) programs that provide a continuum approach to STEM education. In addition, the study shall provide a plan that documents the Department's coordinated efforts toward addressing the declining science, engineering, and technical workforce. The study shall also include recommendations, if any, for the enhancement and coordination of STEM programs within the Department. The committee directs the Secretary to submit his findings to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2009.

Youth Information in Recruiting Databases

The committee is concerned about the procedures employed by the Department in managing databases that include youth information. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to verify that well-publicized and efficient procedures are available to youth or parents or the guardian of the youth to remove information from all Department of Defense recruiting databases and to protect youth from unsolicited contact by any Department of Defense recruiting agency. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary to verify that all information maintained on youth in Department of Defense recruiting databases are carefully managed to ensure that youth information is not released to any agency outside of the Department and that it is only used to support recruiting programs within the Department. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on his findings and remedial actions, if any, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2009.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY GENERALLY

Section 501—Mandatory Separation Requirements for Regular Warrant Officers for Length of Service

This section would establish 60 days following completion of 30 years of active service as the mandatory retirement date for warrant officers in all components, except the Army, which would establish the mandatory retirement for warrant officers based on 30 years of active service as a warrant officer.

Section 502—Requirements for Issuance of Posthumous Commissions and Warrants

This section would eliminate the requirement for a line of duty determination to be conducted before a posthumous promotion to a commissioned or warrant grade could be conferred and would substitute the requirement for the secretary concerned to certify that the service member was qualified for appointment to the higher grade.

Section 503—Extension of Authority to Reduce Minimum Length of Active Service Required for Voluntary Retirement as an Officer

This section would extend the period during which the Secretary of Defense may authorize the secretaries of the military departments to lower the years of officer service required before a member may be retired as an officer from a minimum of 10 years to a minimum of 8 years. This section would authorize the approval of retirement as an officer with a minimum of eight years of service during fiscal year 2014.

Section 504—Increase in Authorized Number of General Officers on Active Duty in the Marine Corps

This section would amend sections 525 and 526 of title 10, United States Code, to allow an increase of one general officer in the rank of Lieutenant General for the Marine Corps

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MANAGEMENT

Section 511—Extension to All Military Departments of Authority to Defer Mandatory Separation of Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would extend to the Secretary of the Air Force the same authority previously granted to the Secretary of the Army to delay mandatory separation of dual status military technicians for years of service or other policy consideration until age 60.

Section 512—Increase in Authorized Strengths for Marine Corps Reserve Officers on Active Duty in the Grades of Major and Lieutenant Colonel to Meet Force Structure Requirements

This section would increase the number of full-time lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps Reserve by seven. This section would not increase the overall number of officers in controlled grades because the proposal would decrease the number of majors to offset the growth in lieutenant colonels.

Section 513—Clarification of Authority to Consider for a Vacancy Promotion National Guard Officers Ordered to Active Duty in Support of a Contingency Operation

This section would amend section 14317 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize national guard officers to be considered for promotion when they are ordered to or are serving on active duty in support of a contingency operation. At present, only Army and Air Force Reserve officers are allowed to be considered for vacancy promotions when ordered to or are serving on active duty in support of a contingency operation. This section would also clarify that na-

tional guard and reserve officers who are ordered to or who are on active duty in support of a contingency operation may be promoted against vacancies other than those that exist in the unit with which they were ordered to active duty.

Section 514—Increase in Mandatory Retirement Age for Certain Reserve Officers

This section would clarify that reserve officers assigned to duties with the Selective Service System, as National Guard property and fiscal officers, or with a State headquarters staff of the Army National Guard, may be retained in an active status until age 62. This section would make the mandatory retirement age for these officers consistent with the retirement age set for other active duty and reserve officers.

Section 515—Age Limit for Retention of Certain Reserve Officers on Active-Status List as Exception to Removal for Years of Commissioned Service

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to retain reserve officers in the grade of lieutenant general beyond mandatory retirement for years of service until the officer becomes 66 years of age.

Section 516—Authority to Retain Reserve Chaplains and Officers in Medical and Related Specialties until Age 68

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to retain reserve component chaplains and officers serving in health profession specialties until age 68. The section would also clarify that chaplains and officers serving in health profession specialties in the National Guard may also be retained until age 68.

Section 517—Study and Report Regarding Personnel Movements in Marine Corps Individual Ready Reserve

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a study on how the Marine Corps Reserve moves personnel in and out of the Individual Ready Reserve.

SUBTITLE C—JOINT QUALIFIED OFFICERS AND REQUIREMENTS

Section 521—Joint Duty Requirements for Promotion to General or Flag Officer

This section would amend section 619a of title 10, United States Code, to reflect the changes made to section 661 of title 10, United States Code, by section 516 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

Section 522—Technical, Conforming, and Clerical Changes to Joint Specialty Terminology

This section would amend the terminology used in sections 663, 665, and 667 of title 10, United States Code, to correspond with changes made to section 661 of title 10, United States Code, in section 516 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). Specifically, this section would replace references to "Joint Specialty Officer" with "Joint Qualified Officer." It would also modify the reporting requirement in section 667 of title 10, United States Code, to correspond with changes made in section 516 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

Section 523—Promotion Policy Objectives for Joint Qualified Officers

This section would amend section 662 of title 10, United States Code, to comport with the standard in section 619a of title 10, United States Code, which goes into effect on October 1, 2008, so that officers must be a Joint Specialty Officer/Joint Qualified Officer to be appointed to the grade of O–7. This section also would simplify the promotion objectives as applied under the new Joint Qualification System that acknowledges all joint experiences no matter where they occur.

Section 524—Length of Joint Duty Assignments

This section would bring guidance regarding joint duty assignment lengths and exceptions in line with the Joint Qualification System developed by the Department of Defense as directed in section 516 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

Section 525—Designation of General and Flag Officer Positions on Joint Staff as Positions to be Held Only by Reserve Component Officers

This section would amend section 526 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to exempt up to three reserve general and flag officers from counting against the general and flag officer limitations.

Section 526—Treatment of Certain Service as Joint Duty Experience

This section would require that services of an officer as an adjutant general of the National Guard of a state, be treated as joint duty or joint duty experience for purposes of any provision of law requiring such duty or experience as a condition of assignment or promotion. This section would require the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to issue a report by April 1, 2009, with recommendations to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff regarding which duty of officers of the National Guard in the Joint Force Headquarters of the National Guard of the states should qualify as joint duty or joint duty experience. This section would also require that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff submit a report to Congress by April 1, 2009, April 1, 2010, and April 1, 2011 on information regarding the joint educational courses available through the Department.

This section would require that the Commander of United States Northern Command, the Commander of United States Pacific Command and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, jointly enter into a memo-

randum of understanding describing the operational relationships, and roles and responsibilities during domestic emergencies.

This section would also require that the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, to conduct a review of the role of the Department in the defense of the homeland and issue a report of that review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2009.

SUBTITLE D—GENERAL SERVICE AUTHORITIES

Section 531—Increase in Authorized Maximum Reenlistment Term

This section would increase the authorized maximum reenlistment term from six years to eight years.

Section 532—Career Intermission Pilot Program

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to conduct a pilot program under which an officer or enlisted member may be released from active duty for a maximum of three years to encourage retention by allowing members to focus on personal and professional goals and responsibilities for a temporary period. This section would authorize separations to occur during the period from January 1, 2009, to December 31, 2014, and would allow the total number of members selected annually from each armed force to be limited to 20 members. Participation in the program would require members to enlist in the Ready Reserve and report monthly to military authorities during the intermission period, and to agree to serve on active duty in a regular or reserve component for a period of not less than two months for every month of program participation following the member's return to active duty. During the intermission period, participating members and their dependents would be eligible for the same medical and dental care benefits as provided to active duty members and their families and would be issued identification cards to support access to commissary, exchange, and morale, welfare, and recreation facilities.

SUBTITLE E—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Section 541—Repeal of Prohibition on Phased Increase in Midshipmen and Cadet Strength Limit at United States Naval Academy and Air Force Academy

This section would amend section 6954 of title 10, United States Code, and section 9342 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force to increase the size of the cadets at United States Naval Academy and Air Force Academy by up to 100 cadets per year to a maximum of 4,400 cadets.

Section 542—Promotion of Foreign and Cultural Exchange Activities at Military Service Academies

This section would amend sections 403, 603, and 903 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the military service academies to support foreign and cultural exchange programs for up to two weeks

a year to foster the development of foreign language skills, cross cultural interactions and understanding, and cultural immersion of cadets and midshipmen.

Section 543—Compensation for Civilian President of Naval Postgraduate School

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to compensate the civilian President of the Naval Post Graduate School as the Secretary prescribes, but basic pay shall not exceed the rate of compensation authorized for Level I of the Executive Schedule. This section would also limit the aggregate compensation to include bonuses, awards, allowances, or other similar compensation to the salary authorized to be paid to the Vice President.

Section 544—Increased Authority to Enroll Defense Industry Employees in Defense Product Development Program

This section would amend section 7049 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 25 to 125 the number of defense industry employees who could receive instruction at the Naval Postgraduate School.

Section 545—Requirement of Completion of Service under Honorable Conditions for Purposes of Entitlement to Educational Assistance for Reserve Components Members Supporting Contingency Operations

This section would amend section 16164 of title 10, United States Code, to require service members to complete their service obligations under honorable conditions in order to qualify for the educational benefits under such section.

Section 546—Consistent Education Loan Repayment Authority for Health Professionals in Regular Components and Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the same maximum limits for education loan repayment programs for health professionals in the reserve components as the maximum limits authorized for similar programs for active duty health professionals.

Section 547—Increase in Number of Units of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the secretaries of the military departments, to develop and implement a plan to establish and support 4,000 Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps units by fiscal year 2020. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees that would provide information on how the services will achieve this goal, as well as other pertinent information, by March 31, 2009.

SUBTITLE F—MILITARY JUSTICE

Section 551—Grade of Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps

This section would amend section 5046 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps serve in the grade of major general.

Section 552—Standing Military Protection Order

This section would amend chapter 80 of title 10, United States Code, to extend a standing military protective order by a military commander until the allegation prompting the protective order is resolved by investigation, courts martial, or other command determined adjudication, or the military commander issues a new order.

Section 553—Mandatory Notification of Issuance of Military Protective Order to Civilian Law Enforcement

This section would require the commander of a military installation to notify appropriate civilian authorities in the event a military protective order is issued against a member of the armed forces and any individual involved in the order does not reside on a military installation.

Section 554—Implementation of Information Database on Sexual Assault Incidents in the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to implement a centralized, case-level database for the collection and maintenance of all information regarding sexual assault involving a member of the armed forces, including information about the nature of the assault, the victim, the offender, and the outcome of any legal proceedings in connection with the assault. Further, the database will be available to personnel of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office of the Department of Defense to conduct research. The committee notes that the department does not currently have sexual assault data available in a centralized database, and believes that such a capability is needed to properly track and analyze sexual assault data. The committee intends for the Department to use the database to improve the quality and utility of the analysis and recommendations included in the annual reports required by law to be submitted to Congress. Upon implementation of the database, annual reports shall include, but not be limited to, providing a comprehensive assessment of the successes, challenges, and lessons learned from the Department's sexual assault programs.

SUBTITLE G—DECORATIONS, AWARDS, AND HONORARY PROMOTIONS

Section 561—Replacement of Military Decorations

This section would require the secretary concerned to replace, on a one-time basis and without charge, a military decoration upon the request of the recipient of the military decoration or the next of kin of a deceased recipient.

Section 562—Authorization and Request for Award of Medal of Honor to Richard L. Etchberger for Acts of Valor during the Vietnam War

This section would authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Richard L. Etchberger, who served in the United States Air Force during the Vietnam War. This section would also waive the statutory time limitation under section 8744 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 563—Advancement of Brigadier General Charles E. Yeager, United States Air Force (Retired), on the Retired List

This section would entitle Brigadier General Yeager to hold the rank of Major General on the retired list of the Air Force. The entitlement to hold the higher grade would provide no additional pay or benefits.

Section 564—Advancement of Rear Admiral Wayne E. Meyer, United States Navy (Retired), on the Retired List

This section would authorize and request the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Rear Admiral Wayne E. Meyer to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list of the Navy. The appointment to hold the higher grade would provide no additional pay or benefits.

Section 565—Award of Vietnam Service Medal to Veterans Who Participated in Mayaguez Rescue Operation

This section would authorize the secretary of a military department to award the Vietnam Service Medal to veterans as a substitute for the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal that had been awarded for participation in the operation to rescue the SS Mayaguez during the period May 12 through May 15, 1975.

SUBTITLE H—IMPACT AID

Section 571—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would provide $50.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies that have military dependent students comprising at least 20 percent of the students in average daily attendance during a year. This section would also provide $15.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies that experience significant increases and decreases in the average daily attendance of military dependent students due to military force structure changes, relocation of military forces from one base to another, and base closures and realignments. The committee continues its efforts to ensure that local school districts with a significant concentration of military students receive the support necessary to provide for military families and their dependents.

Section 572—Calculation of Payments under Department of Education's Impact Aid Program

This section would amend section 8003 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1985 (20 U.S.C. 7703(c)) to allow local educational agencies who are heavily impacted by base closures and force structure changes to use the current school year student population to obtain impact aid funding, as opposed to the previous school year student population.

SUBTITLE I—MILITARY FAMILIES

Section 581—Presentation of Burial Flag

This section would amend section 1482 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Department of Defense to provide a ceremonial burial flag to a surviving spouse, or remarried surviving spouse, if the person authorized to direct the disposition of remains is other than a spouse.

Section 582—Education and Training Opportunities for Military Spouses

This section would amend section 1784 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense to establish a program to provide tuition assistance and other support to eligible military spouses of active duty soldiers, who often do not have the opportunities to develop a career as they move with their service member spouse from one military base to another.

SUBTITLE J—OTHER MATTERS

Section 591—Inclusion of Reserves in Providing Federal Aid for State Governments, Enforcing Federal Authority, and Responding to Major Public Emergencies

This section would modify sections 331, 332, and 333 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify Presidential authorities with respect to federal response to insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, to include the use of reserve personnel from the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

Section 592—Interest Payments on Certain Claims Arising from Correction of Military Records

This section would require that payments of claims resulting from the decision of a board for correction of military records to set aside a conviction by court-martial include interest calculated from the date of conviction through the date on which the payment is made. This section would set the rate of interest to be paid as not less than the rate of interest paid to service members participating in the government savings plan authorized under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, on the date the payment of the claim is made. This section would further specify that the section would be applied to a decision of a board for the correction of military records on or after October 1, 2007, to set aside a court-martial conviction.

Section 593—Extension of Limitation on Reductions of Personnel of Agencies Responsible for Review and Correction of Military Records

This section would extend through December 31, 2010, the prohibition precluding the secretaries of the military departments from reducing the number of military and civilian personnel assigned to duty within the board for correction of military records until 90 days after the secretary concerned submits a report to Congress that describes the proposed reduction, provides the rationale for the reduction, and specifies the number of personnel that will be assigned to the board after the reduction is complete.

Section 594—Authority to Order Reserve Units to Active Duty to Provide Assistance in Response to a Major Disaster or Emergency

This section would amend existing law to permit the President to authorize the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when not operating as a service for the Navy, to order any unit or member of the Army Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Navy Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve to active duty for a major disaster or emergency, as those terms are defined in section 5122 of title 42, United States Code.

Section 595—Senior Military Leadership Diversity Commission

This section would establish the Senior Military Leadership Diversity Commission, which would review: efforts to develop and maintain diverse leadership at all levels of the armed forces; the successes and failures of developing and maintaining a diverse leadership; the ability of current recruitment and retention practices to attract and maintain a diverse pool of officers in pre-commissioning program; and other factors that address improvements in the diversity of the officer corps, particularly at the general and flag officer rank. The commission would be required to submit the results of their study one year after the commission first meets.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to believe that successful recruiting and retention in a wartime environment directly depends on the close oversight of compensation and benefit programs to ensure that they remain robust, flexible, and effective. Accordingly, the committee recommends an across-the-board pay raise of 3.9 percent, one-half of one percent above pay raise levels in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index (ECI). This would be the 10th consecutive year that the pay raise would exceed the ECI level and would result in an average cumulative pay increase of 52 percent over the last 10 years.

The committee also recognizes that some previously adopted compensation policies, bonuses, and special pays require modification to ensure they remain current and effective. The committee recommends a number of such adjustments, including a number of refinements to the initiative to reform special and incentive pays

adopted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

The committee believes that more needs to be done to protect the annuities of surviving military spouses and increase compensation and benefits that support members during permanent changes of station. For example, the committee would include provisions that would authorize the survivors of active duty deaths to receive a survivor indemnity allowance, increase the allowance for temporary lodging, and increase household goods shipment weight allowances for noncommissioned officers.

The committee remains committed to protecting and enhancing military exchange, commissary, and morale, welfare, and recreation programs. Accordingly, the committee includes provisions that would make military resale stores and morale, welfare, and recreation activities more efficient and effective programs.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Commissary Agency Construction Funding

Department of Defense policy requires that appropriated funding be used to support morale, welfare, and recreation, armed services exchange, temporary duty lodging, and other nonappropriated fund instrumentality facility construction determined to be required as a result of:

(1) Base Realignment and Closure and global repositioning decisions;

(2) Acts of God, fire, and terrorism; or

(3) Other relocation or replacement of such facilities for the convenience of the government or required by international agreements.

The committee notes that the policy does not include the facility requirements of the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA) determined as necessary under identical circumstances.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to modify the policy regarding the use of appropriated funding to support nonappropriated fund instrumentality construction to include similar facility construction requirements of DeCA. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report confirming that the policy regarding appropriated funding of Defense Commissary Agency construction requirements is identical to that of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2009.

Disabled Veterans Access to Commissary and Exchanges

The committee is considering options for increasing the opportunity for disabled veterans to shop at commissary and exchange stores operated by the Department of Defense. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the propriety of expanding the population eligible to shop at commissary and exchange stores from those veterans rated 100 percent disabled by the Department of Veterans Affairs to include disabled veterans with disability ratings above 30 percent. The Secretary shall submit a report on his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed

Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2009.

Post-Deployment Leave Policy

The committee notes that the services have different policies regarding the duty status of members during the rest and recovery period following lengthy deployments. For example, the committee believes it is inequitable that Army members are required to use annual leave during block leave periods following deployments while Air Force personnel are granted 10 days of recovery and reconstitution time for which they are not required to take annual leave so long as they remain in the local area. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the service policies regarding post-deployment rest and recovery periods and to recommend a policy or legislative remedy that ensures service members are treated with fairness and equity regarding the use of chargeable leave. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2009.

Telephone Services in Combat Zones

The committee notes that section 885 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requires the Secretary of Defense to ensure that contracts to provide morale, welfare, and recreation telephone service to military personnel serving in combat zones be awarded using competitive procedures. The section also requires the Secretary to review proposals for new or extended contracts to determine if it is in the best interest of the Department of Defense to require contract proposals to include options that minimize the cost of telephone services to individual users while providing those users the flexibility to use phone cards from phone service providers other than the entity offering the proposal.

The committee expresses concern over whether the process used to pursue a new or extended contract for such telephone services fully complies with the requirements of section 885 and whether service members are being provided the best possible, most cost-efficient telephone services. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to determine if there have been any new or extended contracts to provide morale, welfare, and recreational telephone services in combat zones since the passage of section 885 and, if there has been a new or extended contract, to confirm that the Department of Defense has fully complied with the requirements of section 885. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary to determine the average cost of phone calls made by service members and other Department of Defense employees in combat zones using contracted telephone resources and the average amount of that cost that is returned to the contractor as return on investment or profit. The Secretary shall report his findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Fiscal Year 2009 Increase in Military Basic Pay

This section would increase basic pay for members of the uniform services by 3.9 percent effective January 1, 2009. This raise would continue to fulfill Congress's commitment to keep pay raises for the uniformed services ahead of private sector pay raises. Accordingly, the gap between pay increases for the uniformed services and private sector employees during fiscal year 2009 would be reduced from approximately 3.4 percent to 2.9 percent.

Section 602—Permanent Prohibition on Charges for Meals Received at Military Treatment Facilities by Members Receiving Continuous Care

This section would permanently prohibit military treatment facilities from charging a service member for meals when the member is undergoing medical recuperation or therapy or is otherwise in the status of continuous care, including outpatient care, resulting from injury, illness, or disease incurred or aggravated by service in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom or other combat zone as designated by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 603—Equitable Treatment of Senior Enlisted Members in Computation of Basic Allowance for Housing

This section would authorize the same housing standard used in the calculation of basic allowance for housing for noncommissioned officers in the grade of E–8 as the standard used to calculate basic allowance for housing for noncommissioned officers in the grade of E–9.

Section 604—Increase in Maximum Authorized Payment or Reimbursement Amount for Temporary Lodging Expenses

This section would increase the maximum rate that may be paid to service members for temporary lodging expenses in connection with permanent changes of station from $180 per day to $290 per day.

Section 605—Availability of Portion of a Second Family Separation Allowance for Married Couples with Dependents

This section would require the secretary concerned to pay one member of a married couple, both of whom are members of the uniformed services who reside together with dependents, a full family separation allowance and the other member one-half of such allowance when both members are simultaneously assigned to duty under the following conditions:

(1) Permanent duty stations where dependents are not authorized;

(2) Deployed ships for more than 30 days; or

(3) Temporary duty away from the member's permanent duty station for more than 30 days.

Section 606—Stabilization of Pay and Allowances for Senior Enlisted Members and Warrant Officers Appointed as Officers and Officers Reappointed in a Lower Grade

This section would authorize a member of the armed forces who accepts an appointment or reappointment as an officer without a break in service to retain the pay and allowances to which the member was entitled in the previous grade if it is more than the pay and allowances to which the member is entitled in the grade to which he is appointed or reappointed.

Section 607—Extension of Authority for Income Replacement Payments for Reserve Component Members Experiencing Extended and Frequent Mobilization for Active Duty Service

This section would extend from December 31, 2008, to December 31, 2009, the authority for reserve component members subjected to extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service to be compensated for private sector income denied the member as a result of such service.

Section 608—Guaranteed Pay Increase for Members of the Armed Forces of One-Half of One Percentage Point Higher than Employment Cost Index

This section would mandate that pay raises for members of the uniformed services during fiscal years 2010 through 2013 must be one-half of one percent higher than the raise calculated under section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, using the level of pay increases in the private sector as measured using the Employment Cost Index.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611—Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend the authority for the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, and the Selected Reserve enlistment bonus for persons with prior service until December 31, 2009.

Section 612—Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals

This section would extend the authority for the nurse officer candidate accession program, repayment of educational loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, the accession bonus for registered nurses, the incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, the special pay for Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers, the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime

specialties, and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties until December 31, 2009.

Section 613—Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers

This section would extend the authority for the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending a period of active service, nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus until December 31, 2009.

Section 614—Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays

This section would extend the authority for the aviation officer retention bonus, assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus for active members, the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills, the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage, the accession bonus for officer candidates, and retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high priority units until December 31, 2009.

Section 615—Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Referral Bonuses

This section would extend the authority for the health professions referral bonus and the Army referral bonus until December 31, 2009.

Section 616—Increase in Maximum Bonus and Stipend Amounts Authorized under Nurse Officer Candidate Accession Program

This section would increase the bonus that may be paid to nurse officer candidates from $10,000 to $20,000 and the monthly stipend that may be paid to such candidates from $1,000 to $1,250. This section would also increase the amount of the initial installment payment of the bonus from $5,000 to $10,000.

Section 617—Maximum Length of Nuclear Officer Incentive Pay Agreements for Service

This section would authorize nuclear officer incentive pay agreements to be of any duration beyond a minimum period of three years.

Section 618—Technical Changes Regarding Consolidation of Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities of the Uniformed Services

This section would make technical changes to facilitate the utility of provisions included in the initiative to reform special and incentive pays adopted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Section 619—Use of New Skill Incentive Pay and Proficiency Bonus Authorities to Encourage Training in Critical Foreign Languages and Foreign Cultural Studies

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to pay a skill proficiency bonus of up to $12,000 annually to a member enrolled in an officer training program who is in training to acquire proficiency in a critical foreign language or expertise in foreign cultural studies. The section would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program through December 31, 2013, to pay a skill proficiency bonus to a member of a reserve component in an active status while the member participates in an education or training program to acquire proficiency in a critical foreign language or expertise in critical foreign cultural studies.

Section 620—Temporary Targeted Bonus Authority to Increase Direct Accessions of Officers in Certain Health Professions

This section would designate qualified psychologists, registered nurses, and other such mental health practitioners, as a secretary of a military department determines to be necessary, as critically-short wartime specialties. The designation would make such medical practitioners eligible for a bonus of up to $100,000 for each 12-month period of obligated service that they agree to serve on active duty or in an active status in the reserves. The designation would terminate on September 30, 2010.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Section 631—Increased Weight Allowance for Transportation of Baggage and Household Effects for Certain Enlisted Members

This section would authorize noncommissioned officers in the grades of E–5 through E–9 increased weight allowances for shipping household goods during permanent changes in station.

Section 632—Additional Weight Allowance for Transportation of Materials Associated with Employment of a Member's Spouse or Community Support Volunteer or Charity Activities

This section would authorize an additional 200 pounds in the weight allowance for shipping household goods during permanent changes in station for the purpose of shipping materials associated with the employment or community support activities of the service member's spouse.

Section 633—Transportation of Family Pets During Evacuation of Nonessential Personnel

This section would authorize service members to transport two family household pets at government expense when non-essential personnel are evacuated from a permanent station located in a foreign area.

SUBTITLE D—RETIRED PAY AND SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Section 641—Equity in Computation of Disability Retired Pay for Reserve Component Members Wounded in Action

This section would require that the calculation of retired pay for reserve component service members who are retired or placed on the temporary disability retired list be based on the member's total years of service in lieu of active duty years of service when the retirement is based on a disability incurred under circumstances for which the member was awarded the Purple Heart.

Section 642—Effect of Termination of Subsequent Marriage on Payment of Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity to Surviving Spouse or Former Spouse Who Previously Transferred Annuity to Dependent Children

This section would authorize surviving spouses or former spouses who previously transferred the Survivor Benefit Plan annuity to a child or children to reclaim eligibility for the annuity after the termination of a marriage if the child or children are no longer eligible for the annuity.

Section 643—Extension to Survivors of Certain Members Who Die on Active Duty of Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance for Persons Affected by Required Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity Offset for Dependency and Indemnity Compensation

This section would amend section 644 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to authorize the survivors of service members who die while serving on active duty to receive a special survivor indemnity allowance effective October 1, 2008, as originally authorized for other recipients.

Section 644—Election to Receive Retired Pay for Non-Regular Service upon Retirement for Service in an Active Reserve Status Performed after Attaining Eligibility for Regular Retirement

This section would authorize members of reserve components who served in an active reserve status in the Selected Reserve for not less than two years after becoming eligible for an active duty retirement to elect a non-regular retirement for which they are qualified. This section would authorize the secretary concerned to reduce the two-year service requirement for a member recalled to serve in the position of adjutant general or assistant adjutant general within the national guard when the member serves at least six months but fails to complete the two years of service due to the requirements of the law of the state, commonwealth, or territory in which the member is serving. This section would further specify that a member has attained retirement eligibility after meeting all qualifying criteria without regard to whether the person actually retired or received retired or retainer pay.

Section 645—Recomputation of Retired Pay and Adjustment of Retired Grade of Reserve Retirees to Reflect Service after Retirement

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to recompute the retired pay and adjust the retired grade of non-regular retirees who have been recalled to an active status in the Selected Reserve for not less than two years. This section would authorize the secretary concerned to reduce the two-year service requirement for a member recalled to serve in the position of adjutant general or assistant adjutant general within the National Guard when the member serves at least six months but fails to complete the two years of service due to the requirements of the law of the state, commonwealth, or territory in which the member is serving.

Section 646—Correction of Unintended Reduction in Survivor Benefit Plan Annuities Due to Phased Elimination of Two-Tier Annuity Computation and Supplemental Annuity

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to determine if the phased elimination of the two-tier annuity computation and the related Supplemental Survivor Benefit Plan resulted in some Survivor Benefit Plan annuitants receiving a smaller annuity than they would have received if the two-tier computation system had not been eliminated. This section would require the Secretary to restore the annuity to the level that would have been paid if the two-tier computation had continued to operate if the Secretary identifies annuitants that are receiving smaller annuities.

Section 647—Presumption of Death for Participants in Survivor Benefit Plan in Missing Status

This section would specify that the secretary of a military department may not declare a military retiree who has been determined as missing in Iraq or Afghanistan after August 1, 2007, as presumed dead until the earlier of a period of at least seven years has elapsed or the retiree has been confirmed dead and a death certificate provided to the next of kin. This section would also require monthly retired pay to be resumed and any retired pay that may have been due following the declaration of the presumption of death to be retroactively paid to the family of the missing retiree.

SUBTITLE E—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS AND OPERATIONS

Section 651—Use of Commissary Stores Surcharges Derived from Temporary Commissary Initiatives for Reserve Components and Retired Members

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use surcharge proceeds derived from commissary sales to reserve component members, retired members, and other authorized commissary patrons utilizing temporary or mobile equipment to offset the cost of operations to deliver the goods and services using mobile assets.

Section 652—Requirements for Private Operation of Commissary Store Functions

This section would extend a moratorium on studies to compare the cost effectiveness of commissary operations employing federal civilian employees and such operations employing private sector employees from December 31, 2008, to December 31, 2013. This section would provide the Defense Commissary Agency the opportunity to continue to reengineer their workforce to increase effectiveness and efficiency prior to competing with private sector entities.

Section 653—Additional Exception to Limitation on Use of Appropriated Funds for Department of Defense Golf Courses

This section would authorize the use of appropriated funds to purchase and maintain specialized golf carts designed to accommodate persons with disabilities and the use of such golf carts on military golf courses where they can be operated safely.

Section 654—Enhanced Enforcement of Prohibition on Sale or Rental of Sexually Explicit Material on Military Installations

This section would mandate that the Secretary of Defense establish a Resale Activities Review Board to make recommendations to the Secretary regarding material that is determined to be sexually explicit and therefore barred from being sold or rented on property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense. The board would be comprised of nine members of whom six would be appointed by the Secretary of Defense to broadly represent the interests of the eligible patron population and three would be appointed by the secretaries of the military departments. This section would require the board membership to be appointed within 120 days of the date of enactment of this Act and the board to meet within one year of the initial appointment of the board members.

Section 655—Requirement to Buy Military Decorations, Ribbons, Badges, Medals, Insignia, and Other Uniform Accouterments produced in the United States

This section would preclude a military exchange store or other nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the Department of Defense from purchasing for resale any military decorations, ribbons, badges, medals, insignia, and other uniform accouterments that are not produced in the United States. The section would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to purchase such uniform accouterments manufactured outside the United States when adequate quantity or satisfactory quality cannot be procured from U.S. manufacturers or the purchase of items produced outside the United States is in the best interests of members of the armed forces.

Section 656—Use of Appropriated Funds to Pay Post Allowances or Overseas Cost of Living Allowances to Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Employees Serving Overseas

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use appropriated funding to pay post allowances or overseas cost-of-living

allowances to nonappropriated fund employees serving at overseas locations. This section would include such allowances due for payment before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, but such payments would not be authorized under this section after December 31, 2011.

The committee is aware that there has been some confusion about the requirement for nonappropriated fund entities to pay post allowances at overseas locations when the employee is hired locally. The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) is reconsidering the current policy that requires post allowances to be paid to nonapropriated fund employees who are locally hired. Given the confusion over the specifics of the policy, the committee believes that nonappropriated fund entities should be protected from the burden of making additional unexpected retroactive and current payments until the reassessment of the policy is completed. The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to identify and allocate appropriated funding to pay post allowances to nonapropriated fund employees who were locally hired at overseas locations and ensure that no nonappropriated fund entity incurs additional cost resulting from confusion over DOD policy on these matters.

Section 657—Study Regarding Sale of Alcoholic Wine and Beer in Commissary Stores in Addition to Exchange Stores

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study evaluating the propriety, patron convenience, and financial utility of authorizing alcoholic wine and beer for sale in commissary stores and to report his findings and recommendations to Congress within 120 days following completion of the study. This section would also authorize the Secretary to conduct a pilot program involving the sale of alcoholic beer and wine over a period of not less than four months, but not more than one year as part of the study if such a pilot program is determined to be useful.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 661—Bonus to Encourage Army Personnel and Other Persons to Refer Persons for Enlistment in the Army

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to train, directly or through a contractor, members of the general public to refer recruit candidates for enlistment. This section would also authorize the Secretary greater flexibility on the timing of referral bonus payments and the use of a contractor to manage the payment of referral bonuses.

Section 662—Continuation of Entitlement to Bonuses and Similar Benefits for Members of the Uniformed Services Who Die, are Separated or Retired for Disability, or Meet Other Criteria

This section would mandate that the estate of a service member who dies, other than as a result of the member's misconduct, or is retired or separated for disability, will not be required to repay any portion of a bonus or similar benefit that had been paid to the member. This section would also mandate that the full contracted amount of any unpaid bonus or similar benefit will be paid within

90 days of death, retirement, or separation. This section would also authorize the secretary concerned to elect not to recoup bonuses and similar benefits. The secretary concerned would also be authorized to continue payment of the unpaid portion of such bonuses and benefits when the secretary determines that it would be contrary to a personnel policy or management objective, against equity and good conscience, or contrary to the best interests of the United States to deny the unpaid amount.

Section 663—Providing Injured Members of the Armed Forces Information Concerning Benefits

This section would amend section 1651 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to add additional requirements to the handbook required by that section.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee remains profoundly concerned about the ability of the Defense Health Program to support operational requirements, accessibility, and quality of health care provided to service members, retirees, and family members. After over six years of conflict, the military health system appears to be unable to keep up with current demands, as evidenced by the continuing shift of care from the direct care system to the purchased care system. The committee has learned that in the past year, entire clinical Departments and graduate medical education programs of military treatment facilities have had to close for extended periods due to deploying staff. The committee is also concerned with the Department's ability to retain the exceptional military health care providers in the face of the strains placed upon the system. The committee urges the Department to ensure that the Defense Health Program is fully funded to meet the demands placed on the system.

The committee is encouraged that the Department appears to have adopted a more responsible method of budgeting for the Defense Health Program by significantly reducing the mandated efficiencies levied on military treatment facilities. However, the committee remains troubled that the Department continues to pursue some form of converting military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions despite indications that such conversions have had an adverse effect on the military health system.

The committee is disappointed that the Department has been slow to develop a thoughtful and comprehensive strategy to control the growing cost of health care. This year, the Department once again proposed their Sustain the Benefit plan, and cut [$1.2 billion] from the budget based on anticipated savings from the proposal. The committee rejects the philosophical underpinning of Sustain the Benefit that the only way to control cost growth is to dramatically raise fees to discourage beneficiaries from seeking care or even participating in TRICARE. As such, the committee proposes a series of demonstration projects for the purpose of fundamentally elevating the role of preventive care. The committee seeks to en-

hance the medical readiness of military forces and improve the health status of all beneficiaries. This may reduce the amount of care required by the beneficiary population, which the committee finds preferable to the Department's proposal to reduce both the amount of care available to the beneficiary population and the size of the beneficiary population itself. In addition, given the GAO report that found the Department is collecting more revenue in premiums than it is paying out in care, the committee believes that it is time for the Department to recalculate the TRICARE Reserve Select premium.

The committee remains concerned about the care, rehabilitation, and support provided our wounded warriors. The committee will continue to provide vigilant oversight as the Department implements the requirements of the Wounded Warrior Act, contained in title 16 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Pain Care Initiative in Military Health Care Facilities

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to develop a plan for a pain care initiative in all health care facilities of the uniformed services. The plan shall include elements to ensure that:

(1) All active and retired members of the uniformed services and their dependents receiving treatment in health care facilities of the uniformed services are assessed for pain at the time of admission or initial treatment, and periodically thereafter, using a professionally recognized pain assessment tool or process; and

(2) They receive appropriate pain care consistent with recognized means for assessment, diagnosis, treatment, and management of acute and chronic pain, including, in appropriate cases, access to specialty pain management services.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility of including pain care standards into any contract entered into by the Department of Defense for the provision of health care. These standards shall:

(1) Be consistent with recognized means for assessment, diagnosis, treatment, and management of acute and chronic pain;

(2) Provide medical and other health services through physicians and other practitioners appropriately credentialed or experienced in pain management;

(3) Provide for referral of patients with chronic pain to specialists, and, in appropriate cases, to a comprehensive multidisciplinary pain management program;

(4) Continue treatment for as long as treatment is required to maximize the quality of life and functional capacity of the patient; and

(5) Permit physicians and other practitioners appropriately credentialed or experienced in pain management to make clinical decisions with respect to the need for and the extent and duration of pain care services.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the pain care initiative plan within nine months after the date of the enactment of this Act to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Reserve Component Dental Readiness

The committee remains concerned about the amount of time, effort, and funds that the military departments must expend to bring reserve component service members up to the appropriate level of dental readiness upon mobilization in order to deploy. The committee has become aware that the Army has developed, but not yet implemented, a program that would maintain all Army soldiers in the Selected Reserve at a deployable level of dental readiness independent of alert status and mobilization schedule. The committee believes that the Army Selected Reserve Dental Readiness System (ASDRS) is a practical approach to ensure that the Selected Reserve meets current oral health requirements and is ready to deploy in a timely manner. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review ASDRS in the context of all of the reserve components and provide recommendations for further action to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Suicide Prevention in the Armed Forces

With the continuing high operations tempo and the stresses facing service members and their families during deployment and at the home station, the committee is aware that the risk of suicide among service members is at an all-time high. The committee remains steadfast in support of all efforts towards suicide prevention within the armed forces and remains committed to ensuring that the men and women who serve receive the most advanced prevention, identification, and treatment programs available. The committee commends the Department and the military services for committing resources to institute numerous programs to provide suicide prevention support to service members and their families, but strongly encourages the Department and the military services to put even more focus on this critical issue. As such, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to review and evaluate current prevention efforts across the armed forces and make necessary changes to increase suicide prevention within the Department. The committee also directs the Secretary to study the possibility of providing a referral for second opinion to potentially suicidal service members in a combat theater and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This shall include consideration of the feasibility of a telephonic evaluation of a service member, ensuring that they or others are not placed in additional risk by transiting to a different geographic location to obtain a second opinion.

Wounded Warriors as Health Providers

The committee recognizes the improvements the Department has made to the care and management of wounded service members over the past year, the progress that still must be made, and the continued and growing need for health providers that can easily re-

late to wounded service members. The committee believes that many wounded service members who display the appropriate aptitude could be retrained by the military to become military health professionals. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility of identifying and retraining wounded service members as military health professionals and submit a report with the findings of the study to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—HEALTH CARE MATTERS

Section 701—One-Year Extension of Prohibition on Increases in Certain Health Care Costs for Members of the Uniformed Services

This section would extend the prohibition established by the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) on the Department of Defense from increasing the premium and copayment for TRICARE Prime, the charge for inpatient care for TRICARE Standard, and the premium for TRICARE Standard for members of the Selected Reserve during the period from October 1, 2008, to September 30, 2009. The committee shares the Department's concern about the rise in the cost of military health care and the potential for the escalating cost to have a negative impact on the ability of the Department to sustain the benefit over the long-term. However, the committee believes that changes to the military health care benefit require careful and deliberate consideration with a full accounting of the impact. The committee makes these recommendations to allow for a period of time to shape a more balanced approach to address the cost of military health care.

Section 702—Temporary Prohibition on Increase in Copayments under Retail Pharmacy System of Pharmacy Benefits Program

This section would limit the cost-sharing requirements for drugs provided through the TRICARE retail pharmacy program to amounts not more than $3 for generic drugs, $9 for formulary drugs, and $22 for non-formulary drugs. The cost-sharing schedules established by this section would end September 30, 2009.

Section 703—Prohibition on Conversion of Military Medical and Dental Positions to Civilian Medical and Dental Positions

This section would indefinitely extend the prohibition on conversions of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions by a secretary of a military department by removing the end date of section 721 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Section 704—Chiropractic Health Care for Members on Active Duty

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide chiropractic services and benefits as a permanent part of the Defense Health Program, including the TRICARE program, for all active duty service members.

Section 705—Requirement to Recalculate TRICARE Reserve Select Premiums Based on Actual Cost Data

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to recalculate the monthly amount of the premium for TRICARE Standard coverage. The committee notes the findings of the Government Accountability Office report that found the Department of Defense was collecting more from beneficiaries than it was paying out in health care costs. The committee believes that the report's finding suggests that beneficiaries may be overpaying for their coverage.

Section 706—Program for Health Care Delivery at Military Installations Projected to Grow

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to establish a program to build cooperative health care arrangements and agreements between military installations projected to grow and local and regional non-military health care systems. The committee notes the success achieved at Fort Drum, New York, of the pilot program established by the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) and extended by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to test such arrangements and agreements. Consequently, the committee believes that the pilot program should be institutionalized to encourage similar arrangements at installations that are projected to grow due to recommendations of the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission or Grow the Force initiatives but lack the current or planned medical treatment capacity to satisfy the proposed increase in military personnel at the installation.

Section 707—Guidelines for Combined Federal Medical Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to complete a written agreement on patient priority categories, budgeting, staffing, construction, and physical plant management before a facility could be designated a combined federal medical facility of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs. The committee notes ongoing efforts at the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center in North Chicago, Illinois, and encourages the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to consider similar facilities at other geographic locations. Specifically, the committee believes that a combined federal medical facility, or at least a shared medical building or campus, should be considered on Guam given the planned move of forces to that island from Okinawa, Japan. The committee also believes there is opportunity for a combined federal medical facility or a shared medical building in Corpus Christi, Texas.

SUBTITLE B—PREVENTIVE CARE

Section 711—Waiver of Copayments for Preventive Services for Certain TRICARE Beneficiaries

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to waive all cost shares for TRICARE beneficiaries who currently pay for pre-

ventive services, with the exception of Medicare-eligible beneficiaries, who would be eligible to receive a rebate for all preventive services.

Section 712—Military Health Risk Management Demonstration Project

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to implement a demonstration project designed to reward healthy behaviors on the part of TRICARE Prime enrollees. The demonstration project would be carried out over a period of three years in at least three geographic areas within the United States as determined by the Secretary. Non-Medicare eligible retirees and their dependents enrolled in TRICARE Prime residing in the demonstration project would be enrolled in the demonstration which would consist of a self-reported health risk assessment and physiological and biometric measures, such as blood pressure, glucose level, lipids and nicotine use. Based on the results of the health risk assessment and physiological and biometric measures, enrollees would be offered programs designed to improve or maintain their health status. The Secretary would be authorized, for the purpose of this demonstration, to offer monetary and non-monetary incentives to enrollees to encourage participation in the demonstration. The Secretary would be required to submit an annual report on the effectiveness of the demonstration program.

Section 713—Smoking Cessation Program under TRICARE

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a smoking cessation program to be made available to all eligible beneficiaries under the TRICARE program, with the exception of Medicare-eligible beneficiaries, who would be eligible to receive a rebate for all smoking cessation services. The program would include the availability of a pharmaceutical used for smoking cessation by prescription at no cost, access to a toll-free quit line that is available 24 hours a day 7 days a week, and access to printed and web-based tobacco cessation materials.

Section 714—Availability of Allowance to Assist Members of the Armed Forces and their Dependents Procure Preventive Health Care Services

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a demonstration project designed to evaluate the efficacy of providing a preventive health allowance to improve the use of preventive health services by active duty service members and their families. The demonstration program would pay individual service members (single status) $500 and military families (active duty member and dependents) $1000 per year if they fulfill all of the preventive health requirements set forth by the Secretary. The demonstration project would also require active duty service members to meet their service's medical and dental readiness requirements to be eligible.

SUBTITLE C—WOUNDED WARRIOR MATTERS

Section 721—Center of Excellence in Prevention, Diagnosis, Mitigation, Treatment, and Rehabilitation of Hearing Loss and Auditory System Injuries

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a center of excellence in the prevention, diagnosis, mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of hearing loss and auditory system injuries. This provision would ensure collaboration to the maximum extent practicable with the Department of Veterans Affairs and other appropriate public and private entities.

The committee is concerned that hearing difficulties, central auditory disorders, balance problems, and tinnitus are occurring at alarming rates in service members from military service associated with Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). One report of a study of OIF and OEF returning veterans who had been exposed to blast shows more than 50 percent had significant hearing loss, 49 percent reported tinnitus, 32 percent experienced tympanic membrane perforation, 26 percent indicated ear pain, and 15 percent complained of dizziness. A 2008 analysis of post-deployment health assessments reveals that 75 percent of deployed service members report exposure to noise. The committee notes the mounting evidence that audiologic and otologic disorders are often associated with traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder.

The committee believes the Department of the Army Hearing Program is a step in the right direction to address hearing health and soldier readiness. This program supports service members through hearing readiness, clinical services, operational hearing services (such as in-theater communication, protection, and noise control/monitoring systems), and provides garrison hearing conservation services. The committee encourages the Department of the Army to continue to dedicate sufficient resources to support the program.

Considering the vast operational, health, and quality of life issues associated with exposure to high noise levels and blasts the committee recognizes that the Department of Defense needs to focus and accelerate its efforts to address the hearing needs of service members.

Section 722—Clarification to Center of Excellence Relating to Military Eye Injuries

This section would remove the phrase "in combat" from section 1623(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to match sections 1621 and 1623 of the same Act.

Section 723—National Casualty Care Research Center

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate a National Casualty Care Research Center at the Army Medical Research and Material Command. The purpose of the center would be to establish additional linkages between military and civilian casualty research. The center would be required to provide public-private partnership for funding studies on combat injury, integrate

military and civilian research to improve care, and ensure that data from both the Joint Theater Trauma Registry and National Trauma Bank are used to establish research priorities.

Section 724—Peer-Reviewed Research Program on Extremity War Injuries

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a competitive, peer-reviewed research program within the Defense Health Program for the purpose of saving injured extremities, avoiding amputations, and preserving and restoring the function of injured extremities.

Section 725—Review of Policies and Processes Related to the Delivery of Mail to Wounded Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to review the policies and processes related to the delivery of letters, packages, messages, and other communications that are intended as measures of support and are addressed generally to wounded and injured members of the armed forces in military medical treatment facilities and other locations where members of the armed forces are treated and rehabilitated.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 731—Report on Stipend for Members of Reserve Components for Health Care for Certain Dependents

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the extent to which the Secretary has exercised the authority provided in section 704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Section 732—Report on Providing the Extended Health Care Option Program to Autistic Dependents of Military Retirees

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a report that contains a plan for including autistic dependents of military retirees in the Extended Health Care Option program under the TRICARE program.

Section 733—Sense of Congress Regarding Autism Therapy Services

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on autistic therapy services in the Department of Defense to include whether those services would be better managed under the TRICARE program.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

OVERVIEW

The committee remains deeply concerned with the methods used by the Department of Defense to determine requirements, to allocate resources, and to acquire goods and services to produce needed

capabilities for the warfighter in ways that are timely and affordable. Numerous analyses, including those of this committee, have found significant shortcomings in the Department's acquisition process. The causes for these difficulties are numerous, and many lie outside the scope of the acquisition process and outside the purview of acquisition officials. There are, however, significant structural problems in the acquisition process itself that affect major defense acquisition programs and also affect the fast growing area of contracting for services. The committee has worked, with growing emphasis in recent years, to address these issues, including the enactment of the Acquisition Improvement and Accountability Act of 2007 as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The committee continues to consider the weaknesses in the acquisition process, including cost increases, schedule delays, and breaches of integrity, to be serious impediments to the Department's ability to continue to safeguard national security.

The committee notes that at least some of the responsibility for failures in the acquisition process may be found in a lack of capacity in the acquisition workforce and in ambiguous guidelines about the appropriate government role in providing oversight to acquisition programs. Increasingly, the government has relied upon its prime contractors to provide the bulk, if not the entirety, of the systems engineering expertise and significant management direction for major programs. It is not clear, however, that industry is well suited to undertake these functions. The Department's experience with lead system integrators provides a strong indication that the shortage of such capabilities within the government is at least equaled by a similar deficit in industry. The committee believes that the government must build management capabilities equal to the complexity of modern major defense acquisition programs in order to improve performance on these programs.

The committee has also observed the same management difficulty in the area of service contracting, which now represents the majority of the Department's acquisition budget. While contracting for services enables the Department to reduce its workforce or avoid developing an organic workforce for a contracted task, it significantly increases the government capacity required for contract negotiation, contract administration, and contract oversight. There are substantial limitations to hiring contractors to manage other contractors, since it may be difficult to identify personal conflicts of interest and it is inappropriate to allow a contractor to make decisions that are inherently governmental in nature. The question of what internal capabilities to develop and maintain and what capabilities to acquire, is a fundamental matter confronted by both governmental and commercial enterprises. In all cases, such decisions are critical to the performance of the organization's mission. Therefore, this title builds on the committee's prior work to develop the military acquisition workforce necessary to provide management oversight in the area of contingency contracting and to ensure the performance of inherently governmental acquisition functions by government personnel.

The committee also remains concerned about the defense industrial base and matters of industrial security. The committee notes that foreign suppliers continue to take on increasingly important

roles in major defense acquisition programs. The committee remains committed to processes which allow for and encourage the participation of foreign suppliers on a fair, competitive basis, while continuing to ensure that critical capabilities and critical materials are maintained within the defense industrial base. The committee received compelling testimony about the difficulties the Department has experienced in ensuring the protection of classified information maintained at the facilities of defense contractors. The committee notes that much of the most critical information relating to major weapons systems resides in the possession of defense contractors, and that protection of this information must be one of the Department's highest priorities. The Government Accountability Office, however, has identified the effective protection of technologies critical to U.S. national security interests as a government-wide high risk area. The committee has recommended codification of critical aspects of the Department's industrial security program in title 10, United States Code, as part of this title and has authorized additional resources for the program elsewhere in this Act.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Acquisition Workforce

The committee has long grappled with the challenges inherent in the Department of Defense acquisition system. Most of the attention has been focused on attempts to improve the acquisition process and structure rather than the acquisition workforce. The Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA), which was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510), was the first major attempt to improve the quality and professionalism of the defense acquisition workforce. Since the passage of DAWIA, measures have been taken to reduce the size of the acquisition workforce in order to reap the benefits of improvements in training and efficiency. The Office of Personnel Management estimates that the total federal civilian workforce declined by 13 percent between 1990 and 2004. At the same time, reliance on contractors has increased. The committee is aware that the government acquisition workforce may have been downsized too much since many of the recent acquisition problems can be traced back to poor oversight, poor decision making, and poor implementation of acquisition laws and regulations. This finding has been highlighted in numerous reports by the Government Accountability Office, as well as the January 2007, final report of the Acquisition Advisory Panel and the October 2007, final report of the Commission on Army Acquisition and Program Management in Expeditionary Operations.

Congress acknowledged the need for enhancements to the acquisition workforce with the enactment of section 852 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which establishes a designated acquisition fund to hire, retain, and train acquisition personnel. The committee notes that more attention needs to be paid to the people in the acquisition field by providing better training and career paths, recognizing them as professionals, and rewarding them for the important and critical functions they perform. The committee expects that the ac-

quisition fund will enable the Department to invest in its workforce, ensuring that the Department has the people with the right skills to effectively manage and oversee the acquisition of goods and services. The taxpayer and the warfighter will benefit greatly from this effort.

Defense Industrial Security

The committee notes that the globalization of the defense industry and the increase in foreign investment in defense firms is creating new challenges for the Department of Defense's industrial security program. The committee further notes that the bulk of the classified information and technology critical to national security is maintained in facilities operated by the Department's contractors. The committee believes that additional authority is required, and has included provisions in this title adding a new subchapter to title 10, United States Code, to provide statutory authority for industrial security regulations which currently derive their authority from an executive order. Further, this subchapter would extend certain best practices relating to security to all defense contractors working on classified contracts and increase congressional oversight of these issues. To assist the Department in implanting this statutory framework, the committee has recommended authorization of an additional $20.0 million for the Defense Security Services' industrial security program in title III of this Act.

Implementation of Changes to Protections for Specialty Metals

The committee notes that sections 804 and 884 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), made significant changes to the requirements of section 2533b, title 10, United States Code, to procure strategic materials critical to national security from domestic sources. As a result, on January 29, 2008, the Department of Defense issued a memorandum entitled, "Class Deviation—Implementation of New Specialty Metals Restrictions" (henceforth referred to as "class deviation") to implement these statutory changes. While the class deviation was generally consistent with congressional intent, the committee expects the Director, Defense Procurement, Acquisition Policy, and Strategic Sourcing to thoroughly review the following issues and make necessary changes prior to finalizing the Department's policy and regulations in this area.

The committee is concerned about the way that the class deviation defines commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) subassemblies and components. The definition in the class deviation states, "A COTS item is considered to be 'offered without modification' if it is not modified prior to contractual acceptance by the next higher tier in the supply chain." The committee believes this definition could be misinterpreted without further clarification by the Department. First, the committee believes that the class deviation should clearly state that the exception for COTS items and components generally applies to items incorporated in non-commercial end items. Second, the committee supports the interpretation in the class deviation that, "If two or more COTS items are combined in such a way that the resultant item is not a COTS item, only the specialty metals involved in joining the COTS items together are subject to the re-

strictions," only if the changes made to the COTS item are incidental to installation, joining, or incorporation into the non-commercial end item. The committee believes that if a contractor is using COTS items with more substantial modifications, it must do so either using the new de minimis exception or the streamlined compliance for commercial derivative military articles.

Additionally, the committee believes the definition of the term "produced" in the class deviation requires clarification. The committee's intent in adding the term "produced" was to allow for manufacturing processes other than the traditional melting process, and it is intended to refer to melting or a process that is the equivalent of melting. The committee recommends that the Department strike the definition of the term "produced" or, at a minimum, clarify that it does not refer to secondary finishing processes such as quenching or tempering.

Further, while the committee agrees that the certifications required by the contractor to receive relief under the de minimis and commercial derivative military article exceptions should be made in "good faith" as described in the class deviation, the committee also urges the Department to make clear that compliance remains subject to all relevant contractual requirements, including potential audit. The committee further recommends that the class deviation be revised to state that the "de minimis exception does not apply to high performance magnets containing specialty metal," placing the focus on the melted magnet, rather than the individual elements combined to produce the magnet.

Moreover, the class deviation lists a number of exceptions to the requirements of section 2533b, title 10, United States Code, including "(a)(2) Acquisitions outside the United States in support of combat operations," and "(a)(3) Acquisitions in support of contingency operations." The committee notes that it would be inconsistent with existing statute to imply that acquisitions in support of contingency operations are exempt, whether or not those acquisitions take place outside the United States. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Director revise these exceptions to state, "Acquisitions outside the United States in support of combat operations or in support of contingency operations," consistent with subsection (c)(1) of the statute.

Finally, the committee notes that the national security waiver provided in subsection (k) of section 2533b of title 10, United States Code, was designed for use when items of critical importance to national security are found to contain non-compliant specialty metals. The committee intends that the authority be used as a last resort and only in the most compelling cases. Use of the authority also obligates the Department to identify and correct the cause of the non-compliance, including potential sanctions against a contractor who knowingly supplies non-compliant materials. The committee expects that the Department will exercise this national security waiver authority on an infrequent, case-by-case basis.

Implementation of Gansler Commission Recommendations

The committee notes that the report of the Commission on Army Acquisition and Program Management in Expeditionary Operations, commonly known as the Gansler Commission, called for urgent reform in the Army's approach to contracting, especially con-

tingency contracting, and recommended a significant cultural shift in how the Army views acquisition. The committee believes that following through on this recommendation will require strong commitment from the leadership of the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense. The commission's report placed significant emphasis on restoring positions for general officers in the acquisition corps and reestablishing the balance between military and civilian contracting personnel. The committee strongly endorses the majority of the recommendations of the Gansler Commission and has addressed the requirement for an attractive military career path for the acquisition corps, which includes the rank of general officer in section 813 of this Act. The committee has also addressed other Gansler Commission recommendations by providing expedited hiring authority to the Department of Defense in section 811, and authority to lift the cap on premium pay for federal employees in section 1101 of this Act. In addition the committee urges the Department to reexamine the establishment of a contingency contracting corps as part of its joint policy on contingency contracting.

Implementation of Revolving Door Requirements

The committee notes that section 847 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) added new requirements for senior Department of Defense officials seeking employment with defense contractors. The section requires such officials to obtain a written opinion from the appropriate government ethics officer on post-employment restrictions that may apply to the official's employment. The section requires defense contractors hiring former Department of Defense officials to confirm that the written ethics opinion has been obtained and requires the Department of Defense to retain these written ethics opinions for not less than five years.

The committee notes that section 847 deals with post-employment restrictions previously imposed by law and applies to senior Department of Defense officials previously covered by these restrictions. The committee believes that section 847 will ensure that the benefits of the written ethics opinion clarifying post-employment restrictions are shared by both former defense officials and defense contractors. The committee expects the Department of Defense, in implementing this section, to minimize the administrative burden of this requirement while facilitating the ability of senior defense officials to quickly obtain written ethics opinions.

Increase in Bid Protests

The committee is concerned that the submission of a bid protest is becoming pro forma in the event that a prospective contractor is rejected from the competitive range or the award of a contract is made to another vendor, and that the number of frivolous bid protests submitted to the Government Accountability Office may be increasing. While the committee remains committed to the right of prospective contractors to have an independent forum to adjudicate legitimate concerns about improprieties and errors during the bid and proposal evaluation process, the committee discourages the use of bid protests as a stalling or punitive tactic.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to conduct a review of bid protests filed with the Government Accountability Office during the last five years, which were associated with awards made by the Department of Defense. The review shall assess the extent to which bid protests may be increasing, the extent to which frivolous and improper protests are increasing, and the causes of any increase identified. Further, the committee directs the Comptroller General to provide recommendations regarding actions that could be taken by Congress or by the executive branch to disincentivize any frivolous or improper bid protests on the part of industry. Such recommendations shall discuss the consequences of authorizing the Government Accountability Office to dismiss protests for a wider range of causes, the imposition of fines or other sanctions for the submission of frivolous protests, or the inclusion of a vendor's protest track record in all past performance evaluations conducted in competitive source selections. Finally, the committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a report on his review, including his recommendations, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Iraqi Recipients of Special Immigrant Visas

In section 1059 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), Congress gave the President the ability to grant a limited number of special immigrant visas to Iraqis who worked for U.S. forces in the Republic of Iraq as translators and who might face death if they remained in Iraq. This authority was subsequently expanded and broadened in section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), allowing for the issuance of special immigrant visas to more Iraqis who worked for coalition forces in Iraq in a variety of roles.

The committee believes that the Iraqi recipients of the special immigrant visas possess skills, particularly fluency in Arabic and knowledge of the people and culture of Iraq, which could be useful while the United States is involved in Iraq. Further, the committee notes that many of the recipients of the special immigrant visas worked on behalf of the mission of the coalition forces for years and often at great risk to themselves or their families, and that many Iraqi citizens who worked for or with the coalition forces have been threatened or killed in Iraq. The committee therefore urges the Secretary of Defense to find ways of accessing these recipients of special immigrant visas, including utilizing such authorities he may have to hire them directly where appropriate and creating incentives for private sector contractors to hire them for contracts related to Operation Iraqi Freedom when those contracts require knowledge of Arabic and Iraq. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the status of efforts to hire Iraqi recipients of special immigrant visas and the status of efforts to encourage contractors to hire Iraqi recipients of special immigrant visas, and any changes in law that the Secretary considers necessary to improve efforts to access the skills of these persons.

Memorandum of Understanding on Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan

The committee notes that section 861 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), requires the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development to enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU), by July 1, 2008, on contracting in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee is aware that there are currently four separate control centers in Iraq with responsibility for tracking and coordinating contractor movements, one operated by the Department of State and three operated by the Department of Defense. These overlapping contractor movement control centers illustrate the challenge of dealing with more than 150,000 contractor personnel working for multiple organizations across three agencies. The committee expects the MOU to address significant concerns about a lack of coordination in contracting, and a corresponding lack of accountability, by ensuring that each agency is able to clearly identify its roles and responsibilities in the contracting process. The committee also expects that the MOU will establish mechanisms for agencies to share information and coordinate shared contracting responsibilities.

The committee notes that the MOU signed between the Department of Defense and the Department of State on private security contractors in December 2007, represents a step forward in coordination between the two departments. However, the MOU required by section 861 will cover significantly more contracts and far more contractor personnel than the MOU currently in place. Most critically, the new MOU applies to all contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan, not just those involving private security contractors. The committee expects that the new MOU will be significantly more comprehensive as a result.

The committee commends the Department of Defense for the memorandum issued by the Secretary of Defense on March 10, 2008, providing guidance on the application of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to contractor personnel. The memorandum effectively implements section 552 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The committee notes that the new MOU is required to address the responsibility of each signatory agency in ensuring that U.S. laws are enforced for contractor personnel during overseas operations.

Preservation of the Tool and Die Industry

The committee believes that a robust tool and die industry is a fundamental building block for manufacturing that requires tools to make parts, measure them, and assemble them into finished products. The committee further notes that the tool and die industry makes products that range in complexity. Without tooling, the foundation of manufacturing disappears and the United States' ability to develop new products and build them becomes severely compromised. Foreign competition and the resulting contraction in the U.S. tooling industry has displaced high-skilled workers and forced the closure of nearly half of the domestic tool shops. The committee is concerned that the ability to develop new defense

products and manufacture them in the near future may be limited by the capacity of the domestic tool and die industry.

Consequently, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to develop a roadmap to preserve critical capabilities within the tool and die industry necessary for the manufacture of defense components. The Secretary should consider the following elements for such a roadmap: identifying and assisting domestic companies that produce dies and molds; incentivizing companies to utilize domestic engineering, machining and manufacturing resources for producing Department of Defense components and parts; working with automotive tool shops through collaboration with other elements of the defense supply chain, such as technology fairs or demonstrations; and investing in additional research and development for critical defense technologies, such as the techniques for forming and welding advanced light-weight materials.

Service Contractor Inventory

Section 807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), requires an annual inventory of activities performed pursuant to contracts for services for, or on behalf of, the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee understands that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics has been tasked with the responsibility for developing this service contracting inventory and intends to undertake a pilot survey with professional services contracts. The committee notes that two similar reporting requirements were included in previous legislation, including section 343 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), and section 345 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107). The committee notes, however, that the inventory mandated by section 807 is intended to be of much broader scope than those that were previously performed, should cover all service contracts, and should not be limited to simply capturing data from the Federal Procurement Data System.

The committee notes that the Department of the Army has undertaken an extensive manpower and costing inventory of all Army service contractors. In September 2002, the Army's inventory was designated as the DOD pilot to test manpower and cost reporting by the Business Initiatives Council (BIC). The BIC expected the Army's pilot to provide much better visibility to the government on the contractor work force. The Army inventory captures data not only on contracting organizations, but the components administering the contract as well as the funding source for the contract and the number of full time contractor equivalent employees. The committee recommends that the Army inventory be used as a model for implementation of section 807.

The service contracting inventory also is intended to be used as a tool to allow commanders to consider in-sourcing contracts, particularly of functions that are inherently governmental or are considered to be closely associated with inherently governmental functions. The in-sourcing of contracts was authorized under section 324 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The committee, however, encourages commanders to undertake in-sourcing activities whenever appropriate

and not rely solely upon the service contractor inventory to determine which functions may be in-sourced.

Small Business Programs

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has experienced a decline in performance in fulfilling small business contracting goals. Data for fiscal year 2006 indicates that the Department saw a decline in total awards of prime contracts to small business as well as a decline in the percentage of awards made to small businesses. In fiscal year 2006, the Department also fell short of its goal for woman-owned small businesses, historically underutilized business zone small businesses, and for service disabled veteran owned small businesses (SDVOSB). The committee strongly supports the Department's goal of awarding three percent of total funds to SDVOSBs. However, the most recent data indicates that the Department awarded less than one percent of total funds to SDVOSBs. While the committee notes that awards in 2006 were substantially higher than awards to SDVOSBs in 2005, the committee continues to urge the Department to exercise all reasonable and appropriate options to increase awards to SDVOSBs in the current fiscal year and into the future. The committee also urges the Department to ensure the accuracy of the information used to compile statistics on awards made to small business.

Utilization of Local Businesses for Contracts on Guam

The committee is aware that local businesses on Guam have the potential to make substantial contributions to a wide range of contracts required to build, operate, and maintain the numerous Department of Defense facilities currently existing on Guam and those currently in planning or under construction. The committee is also aware that the island of Guam in its entirety qualifies as a historically underutilized business zone (HUBZone). Businesses on Guam qualify to participate in the HUBZone program if they are small businesses, owned and controlled by U.S. citizens, with a principal office on Guam, and with 35 percent of their employees living in a HUBZone. The committee urges the Guam Joint Program Office (JPO) to work with the Department of Defense's Office of Small Business Programs to ensure that businesses on Guam are fully aware of the HUBZone program and the process for qualifying to participate in the program. The committee further urges the Guam JPO to utilize appropriate HUBZone goals as part of detailed small business subcontracting plans for eligible contracts on Guam. The committee notes that qualified HUBZone businesses qualify for special consideration as prime contractors and urges the Guam JPO to utilize HUBZone preferences, including HUBZone set-asides, for prime contracts where appropriate. The committee also notes that the Procurement Technical Assistance Program (PTAP) could provide valuable assistance to businesses on Guam and urges the Guam JPO to explore ways for providing access to PTAP to businesses on Guam. The committee expects that the Guam JPO will keep the committee informed on progress made in utilizing the HUBZone and PTAP programs on Guam.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACQUISITION POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

Section 801—Review of Impact of Illegal Subsidies on Acquisition of KC–45 Aircraft

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force, within 10 days after a ruling by the World Trade Organization that the United States, the European Union, or both have provided an illegal subsidy to a manufacturer of large commercial aircraft, to begin a review on the impact of the illegal subsidy on the source selection for the KC–45 aerial refueling aircraft program. This section would require that the review include an opportunity for public comment on the effect of illegal subsidies on the program, consultation with experts within the federal government on the effect of illegal subsidies, and consultation with each of the offerors in the source selection process. This section would require that the review be completed within 90 days of a final ruling by the World Trade Organization on all illegal subsidy cases involving large commercial aircraft that are pending as of the date of enactment of this Act. This section would further require the Secretary of the Air Force to determine whether the illegal subsidy had a material impact on the source selection process sufficient to bring its fairness into question, and upon making such a determination, to take such measures as are necessary and appropriate to ensure that the effect of the illegal subsidy is removed and the source selection process is fair to all offerors. This section would define an illegal subsidy as a violation of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures of the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and would include subsidies provided by any political subdivision of the United States or any member government, subcentral government, or combination of member governments of the European Union.

Section 802—Assessment of Urgent Operational Needs Fulfillment

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to commission a study by a federally funded research and development center to assess the effectiveness of the urgent operational need requirements generation processes of the Department of Defense and the acquisition processes used to fulfill such requirements. Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees the written report documenting the key findings and recommendations of the study.

Section 803—Preservation of Tooling for Major Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to issue guidance requiring that unique tooling associated with the production of hardware for a major defense acquisition program be preserved and stored through the end of the service life of the related weapons system. This section would allow the Secretary to waive this requirement in the interest of national security and with notice to the congressional defense committees.

Section 804—Prohibition on Procurement from Beneficiaries of Foreign Subsidies

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from entering into a contract with a foreign person, including a joint venture, cooperative organization, partnership, or contracting team, who has received a subsidy from the government of a foreign country that is a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO), if the United States has requested a consultation with that foreign country on the basis that the subsidy is prohibited under the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures. This restriction would not apply to any major defense acquisition program that has already received milestone B approval. This section would also specify that the prohibition on procurement would be lifted after the requested consultation is resolved. This section would further allow the President to waive the requirement on the basis that doing so is necessary to address a significant and imminent threat to national security.

Section 805—Domestic Industrial Base Considerations during Source Selection

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations, within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to allow a source selection authority to consider impacts on the domestic industrial base during source selection for a major defense acquisition program. This section would authorize defense acquisition officials to impose penalties on a contractor who misleads the government regarding potential domestic industrial base impacts. This section would require the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees if a domestic industrial base evaluation factor is not utilized in a competition for a major defense acquisition program.

Section 806—Commercial Software Reuse Preference

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure contracting officials identify and evaluate, at all stages of the acquisition process, opportunities for the use of commercial computer software and, if practicable, use such software instead of developing new software. This section would also require the Secretary to review and revise defense regulations to clarify that the existing preference for commercial items in the acquisition process includes a preference for commercial computer software.

Section 807—Comprehensive Proposal Analysis Required During Source Selection

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to issue regulations regarding the evaluation of a proposal for a major defense acquisition program for which a significant proportion of the activities will be performed outside the United States. Such regulations would require the potential contractor, or subcontractor, to identify costs not borne by the contractor as a result of the activities performed outside the United States, such as foreign government-borne health care and workers compensation. This section would further require

a Department of Defense contracting officer to consider such costs in evaluating any contractor proposal for a cost-based contract, and to certify that there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the final assessed price excludes any cost that other potential contractors could not also elect to exclude.

SUBTITLE B—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 811—Acquisition Workforce Expedited Hiring Authority

This section would amend section 1705 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Defense with temporary expedited hiring authorities for acquisition positions. The section would allow the Secretary, in conformance with sections 3304, 5333, and 5753 of title 5, United States Code, to designate acquisition positions as shortage category positions and to recruit, appoint, and establish special pay criteria for qualified individuals in such positions. The authority would expire on September 30, 2012.

Section 812—Definition of System for Defense Acquisition Challenge Program

This section would amend section 2539b of title 10, United States Code, to define the term 'system' to clarify that the term includes both functional systems, such as an avionics or fuel system, and also a major system as defined in section 2302 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 813—Career Path and Other Requirements for Military Personnel in the Acquisition Field

This section would add a new section 1722a to title 10, United States Code. This section would require the secretaries of the military departments, with respect to the military departments, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, with respect to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the unified combatant commands, the defense agencies, and the defense field activities to establish policies and issue guidance to ensure the proper development, assignment, and employment of military personnel in the acquisition field. This section would require the policies established and the guidance issued to ensure a career path in the acquisition field that attracts the highest quality officers and enlisted personnel, a number of command positions and senior non-commissioned officer positions sufficient to ensure that military personnel have opportunities for promotion and advancement in the acquisition field, and a number of qualified, trained military personnel in the acquisition field sufficient to support requirements for military personnel in contingency contracting.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to establish a minimum number of general officer billets reserved for acquisition in each of the military departments and within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the unified combatant commands, the defense agencies, and the defense field activities, including billets reserved for command of contracting organizations. This section would require each secretary of a military department to submit an annual report to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition,

Technology, and Logistics on the implementation of this section. This section would also require that consideration of general and flag officer billets for acquisition be included in the strategic plan relating to general and flag officers required by section 543 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Section 814—Technical Data Rights for Non-FAR Agreements

This section would add a new section 2320a to title 10, United States Code. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to issue policy guidance regarding the negotiation and acquisition of technical data rights for agreements that are not subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), including other transaction authority agreements authorized by section 2371 of title 10, United States Code, and cooperative research and development agreements. This section would require that program managers for major weapons systems developed under such agreements assess long-term technical data requirements in accordance with subsection (e) of section 2320, United States Code. This section would also require the Secretary to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act regarding the implementation of the requirements of subsection (e) of section 2320(e) of title 10, United States Code.

The committee notes that the Department has utilized agreements that are not subject to the FAR for the initial development and prototyping of certain major weapon systems such as the design of naval surface combatants. This section would ensure appropriate guidance is in place to assist defense acquisition officials during the negotiation of such agreements in protecting the rights of the federal government to technical data.

Section 815—Clarification that Cost Accounting Standards Apply to Federal Contracts Performed Outside the United States

This section would amend section 26 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422) to clarify that the cost accounting standards established pursuant to that act apply regardless of whether a contract is entered into or performed overseas. This section would also require that the Cost Accounting Standards Board revise the cost accounting standards, within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act, to reflect the application of those standards to overseas contracts.

SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATING TO INHERENTLY GOVERNMENTAL MATTERS

Section 821—Policy on Personal Conflicts of Interest by Employees of Department of Defense Contractors

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a policy to prevent personal conflicts of interest in defense contracts. This section also would require a standard contract clause for inclusion in all solicitations and contracts to implement such policy. The committee is concerned that contractor employees who work side-by-side with government employees are not subject to the

same conflict of interest provisions as government employees. In the current environment of increased reliance on contractors to meet mission requirements for the Department of Defense, the committee finds this situation problematic. Both the Acquisition Advisory Panel, established under section 1423 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), and the Government Accountability Office recommended the development of policies to address personal conflicts of interest. Furthermore, this section would require the Department's Panel on Contracting Integrity, established by the section 813 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), to consider and make recommendations on the feasibility of applying federal procurement integrity regulations to contractor personnel.

Section 822—Development of Guidance on Personal Services Contracts

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop guidance that provides a clear definition of personal services contracts and guidance on the use of such contracts. The committee is concerned about the apparent growth in the use of personal services contracts by the Department of Defense. These are contracts characterized by an employer-employee relationship between the government and contractor personnel. Normally, the Department and all federal agencies are required to hire employees in accordance with civil service laws, and Part 37.104 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) prohibits the award of personal services contracts unless specifically authorized by statute. Despite this prohibition, however, the Acquisition Advisory Panel, established under section 1423 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), noted that many, if not all, agencies have contractors performing activities that are considered to be personal services. For example, the Government Accountability Office recently observed that the working environment for contractors at the Army's Contracting Center of Excellence reflected aspects of all six of the FAR criteria for assessing the existence of a personal services contract (Defense Contracting: Army Case Study Delineates Concerns with Use of Contractors as Contract Specialists, GAO–08–360, March 2008). The Government Accountability Office further noted that the distinction between personal and non-personal services contracts is murky. The Government Accountability Office also observed that the Department of Defense lacks guidance on mitigating the risk of a contract becoming one for personal services. This section would implement the Government Accountability Office findings.

Section 823—Limitation on Performance of Product Support Integrator Functions

This section would require that whenever the Department of Defense enters into a performance-based logistics (PBL) contract for the purchase of logistics support of a weapon system or major end item, the product support integration function shall be performed by an employee of the Department beginning in fiscal year 2011. The product support integrator (PSI) is identified in the PBL *Pro-*

gram Manager's Product Support Guide as "an entity performing as a formally bound agent . . . charged with integrating all sources of support, public and private, defined within the scope of the PBL agreements to achieve the documented outcomes." The PSI is "the single point of accountability for integrating all sources of support necessary to meet the agreed to support/performance metrics" of the PBL contract. The committee believes this is an inherently governmental function.

SUBTITLE D—DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL SECURITY

Section 831—Requirements Relating to Facility Clearances

This section would add a new section 438, relating to requirements for facility clearances, to a new subchapter on defense industrial security in title 10, United States Code. This section would provide statutory authority for existing industrial security regulations by requiring a contractor of the Department of Defense to obtain a facility clearance in order to be granted custody of classified information, and would enhance some contractor security practices and Department authorities, including granting the Secretary of Defense authority to revoke or suspend a facility clearance by the Department at any time. Additionally, this section would condition an entity's facility clearance upon the entity's compliance with the following requirements: safeguarding of classified information; safeguarding covered controlled unclassified information; adherence to Department security agreements, contract provisions regarding security, and relevant Department industrial security regulations; and employing business and management practices that do not result in the compromise of classified information or adversely affect the performance of classified contracts.

The committee notes that some entities presently holding facility clearances already carry out these responsibilities. The committee believes that this is a best practice that should apply to all entities holding facility clearances. The committee encourages the Department to generate and share best practices with all entities holding facility clearances to enhance compliance with these requirements. This section would also require an entity granted a facility clearance to provide a certification of security responsibility to the Secretary of Defense affirming the entity's responsibility to adopt policies and practices necessary to safeguard classified information and the performance of classified contracts. This certification would include a requirement to appropriately manage the entity's subcontractors and suppliers performing work on classified contracts.

This section would further require that the members of a covered entity's board of directors ensure, in their capacity as fiduciaries, that the covered entity comply with the requirements in this section. The Secretary of Defense may waive this requirement for reasons of national security. The committee notes that the National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual (NISPOM) makes a similar requirement for some entities holding a facility clearance, and that these entities have a strong record of compliance with the Department's industrial security regulations. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to require that an entity, subject to the approval of its board of directors, designate an employee who would be responsible for the covered entity's compliance with

this section. The committee notes that this section is similar to the responsibilities assigned to the Facility Security Officer and the Technology Control Officer outlined in sections 1–201 and 2–306 in the NISPOM.

This section would further require entities with facility clearances to notify the Secretary of Defense of events which would affect the clearance or compromise classified information.

Section 832—Foreign Ownership Control or Influence

This section would add a new section 439 to title 10, United States Code, relating to foreign ownership, control, and influence (FOCI) of entities with facility clearances. This section would define FOCI consistent with current regulations as a foreign interest with the power, direct or indirect, whether or not exercised, and whether or not exercisable through the ownership of the entity's securities, by contractual arrangements or other means, to direct or decide matters affecting the management or operations of that entity in a manner that may result in compromise of classified information or the performance of a classified contract. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to consider several factors to determine whether and how to mitigate the FOCI of the entity. These FOCI factors are similar to current regulations; however, they also require consideration of the role of hedge funds, joint ventures, and positions on an entity's board of directors when determining whether an entity is under FOCI.

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to impose any security method, safeguard, or restriction the Secretary believes necessary to ensure that the entity complies with the general requirements for facility clearances. This section would also require an entity under FOCI to establish a government security committee on the entity's board of directors to oversee compliance with industrial security regulations and to oversee the entity's security manager. The committee believes the Department's current framework for establishing government security committees is very effective and represents an organizational structure that ensures compliance with Department industrial security regulations. This section would allow an entity under FOCI to maintain a facility clearance for up to nine months as long as such entity is negotiating mitigation measures with the Secretary and there is no indication that classified information is at risk of compromise. This section would also require an entity to notify the Secretary of any material change to information submitted by the entity relating to FOCI. The committee notes that this notification would apply to changes in the information currently provided in the certificate pertaining to foreign interests filed by the entity. This section would further require an entity to notify the Secretary of any proposed merger, acquisition, or takeover by a foreign person.

Section 833—Congressional Oversight Relating to Facility Clearances and Foreign Ownership Control or Influence; Definitions

This section would add new sections 440 and 440a to title 10, United States Code, to ensure congressional oversight and define terms relating to facility clearances. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the Senate Committee on Armed

Services and the House Committee on Armed Services when a facility clearance is suspended or revoked and when an entity with a facility clearance has entered into negotiations for a proposed merger, acquisition, or takeover by a foreign person. This section would also require the Secretary to submit a biannual report on specific, cumulative, and trend information on entities holding facility clearances including information on foreign ownership, control, and influence of such entities, problems with compliance, and information on measures taken by the Defense Security Service to address any compliance problems. The report would be required to be submitted in an unclassified form, with a classified annex if necessary. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations to implement the sections in this subtitle relating to defense industrial security by September 1, 2009. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on investments in the defense industrial base by foreign governments, entities controlled by foreign governments, persons of foreign countries, and hedge funds.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 841—Clarification of Status of Government Rights in the Designs of Department of Defense Vessels, Boats, Craft, and Components Thereof

This section would add a new section, section 7317, to title 10, United States Code, to provide that the sole legal authority determining government rights in the designs of vessels, boats, craft, and components thereof, including hulls, decks, and superstructures is either section 2320 of title 10, United States Code, or the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement under which the item was developed. This section would prohibit any claims of exclusive private ownership of such designs under the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act (chapter 13 of title 17, United States Code).

Section 842—Expansion of Authority to Retain Fees from Licensing of Intellectual Property

This section would amend section 2260 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to register and license trademarks that are owned and controlled by the government. This section would clarify that the Secretary of Defense could use the authority provided in section 2260 to register and license trademarks belonging to defense agencies and defense field activities. This section would also clarify that the Secretary of Homeland Security can issue regulations governing the registration and licensing of trademarks owned and controlled by the United States Coast Guard.

Section 843—Transfer of Sections of Title 10 Relating to Milestone A and Milestone B for Clarity

This section would rearrange sections 2366a and 2366b of title 10, United States Code, relating to certifications of milestone decisions for major defense acquisition programs so that the section requiring certification of a Milestone A decision precedes the section requiring certification of a Milestone B decision.

Section 844—Earned Value Management Study and Report

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense conduct a study on the implementation of earned value management, the accuracy of earned value data provided by suppliers, and ways to measure the success of utilizing earned value management to achieve program objectives. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to report the results of the study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 845—Report on Market Research

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 October 1, 2009, on the market research conducted by the Secretary in implementing section 2377 of title 10, United States Code. This section would require that the report identify the total number of contracts sampled, representative outcomes of market research, training tools developed to assist with market research, additional planned actions, and other matters.

Section 846—System Development and Demonstration Benchmark Report

This section would require the secretary of a military department to submit a system development and demonstration benchmark report for each of the following programs: Broad Area Maritime Surveillance, Combat Search and Rescue Helicopter, Joint Light Tactical Vehicle, Aerial Refueling Tanker (KC–45A), Presidential Helicopter (VH–71 Increment II), and the unmanned aerial vehicle, Warrior—Alpha. The benchmark report would include a description of the requirements, estimated development cost, program schedule, and other program matters. This section would also require semi-annual contract performance reports until a full rate production decision is made for each program. This section would further require that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) establish a Configuration Steering Board for each of these programs and to notify the congressional defense committees of major cost increases and significant schedule delays. Finally, this section would prohibit the milestone decision authority from granting approval to proceed to low-rate initial production if the system development and demonstration costs for such a program grow by more than 25 percent, or if the program schedule slips by more than 15 percent. This restriction could be waived if the USD(AT&L) certifies to the congressional defense committees that proceeding to low rate initial production is in the best interest of the Department.

Section 847—Additional Matters Required to be Reported by Contractors Performing Security Functions in Areas of Combat Operations

This section would amend section 862 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), to in-

clude additional requirements for which contractors performing security duties are required to file incident reports.

Section 848—Report Relating to Munitions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009 detailing how certain munitions used by the armed forces are procured including any procurement from non-domestic sources. This section would require the report to include a plan to procure these munitions from domestic sources by 2012.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Cyber Command Responsibilities

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the roles and responsibilities of the Air Force Cyber Command within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This report shall include, but is not limited to:

(1) The current state of activities at Cyber Command, including staffing levels, mission essential tasks, lines of responsibility within the Air Force, as well as in U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM) chain of command;

(2) A description and expected timeline of the initial operating capability for Cyber Command;

(3) A description and expected timeline of the planned state for Cyber Command when it reaches full operating capability; and

(4) A description of the chief technology officer position including roles and responsibilities for the Cyber Command, and how he or she would interact with or support the larger STRATCOM mission and Department of Defense Chief Information Officer.

Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs

The committee supports the Department of Defense's efforts to monitor and reduce energy consumption by installations and fleet vehicles since the passage of the National Energy Conservation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–619). The Department's adoption of installation energy metrics, innovative funding mechanisms, and a governing structure has resulted in the achievement of a 30 percent reduction in the energy intensity of non-industrial facilities compared with a 1985 baseline. While the committee is encouraged by the Department's progress managing energy on installations, the committee is concerned about the difficulties the Department faces in managing energy needed for military operations. The operational use of energy imposes significant logistical burdens and operational vulnerabilities, increases force protection requirements, and amounts to three-quarters of the Department's annual demand.

According to a study commissioned by the Office of Force Transformation and Resources, the energy required for military operations has been increasing over time. For example, energy demand for the Department's military operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan grew from 9 to 16 gallons per soldier per day from 2005 to 2007. This same study cautioned that the heavy logistical burden imposed by fuel will, if unchanged, also impede realization of the more-distributed "new global posture" called for in the 2005 National Defense Strategy and 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review. The committee is also aware that a February 2008 Defense Science Board Task Force report concluded that the Department has failed to establish and meet operational energy goals, and that lack of leadership is a root cause. Similarly, the U.S. Comptroller General issued a March 2008 report recommending that the Department establish an overarching organizational framework to guide and oversee mobility energy initiatives. The committee weighed the recommendations of these studies at a hearing on March 13, 2008.

While the committee commends the Deputy Secretary of Defense's identification of energy as one of the Department's top 25 transformational priorities, the committee also recognizes the challenges in achieving this transformational vision. Therefore, the committee includes a provision in section 904 of this title that would establish a Director for Operational Energy Plans and Programs within the Office of the Secretary of Defense and senior operational energy officials within each of the military services. The committee also includes a provision in section 331 of this Act that would require an annual report on operational energy use and initiatives to be submitted by the Secretary of Defense acting through the Director for Operational Energy Plans and Programs. Lastly, the committee believes it would be incumbent upon the Director to oversee implementation of the requirements of section 332 of this Act that would require consideration of fuel logistics support requirements in the planning, capability requirements, and acquisition processes.

Inter-agency transformation of the United States Southern Command

The United States Southern Command (SOUTHCOM), with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, has moved quickly to transform itself into a joint, inter-agency, regional security command over the last year. It plans to complete the transformation by October 1, 2008. As part of this process, SOUTHCOM envisions altering its mission statement and its organizational structure and functioning. The combatant command (COCOM) plans to alter its current mission of "conduct[ing] military operations and promoting security cooperation to achieve U.S. strategic objectives" to a mission of "support[ing] security, stability, and prosperity in the Americas." Thus, it would elevate stability operations and prosperity-generating activities to the same level as the security activities for the COCOM mission.

With regard to the organization itself, SOUTHCOM established a director of inter-agency partnering (J9) along-side SOUTHCOM's eight other joint directorates. The J9 acts as the inter-agency "portal" for the command, identifying and coordinating inter-agency op-

portunities, and as the facilitator of the transformation. Ultimately, SOUTHCOM envisions shifting to "mission-centric" directorates as African Command is implementing, from having Directorates which are based upon traditional Joint Staffing. According to SOUTHCOM and with the guidance of Joint Forces Command, four new directorates are planned: a directorate for strategy and policy; a directorate for security and intelligence; a directorate for stability; and a directorate for inter-agency partners. These four directors would be supported by two offices, one for resources and management, and one for enterprise support. In addition, the command wishes to expand its efforts in public-private cooperation and international partnerships to the extent legally permissible. Eventually, SOUTHCOM would like to become "the regional focus point for policy implementation" for inter-agency efforts in their geographic area of responsibility.

Although the committee generally supports the efforts of SOUTHCOM to transform itself to meet the twenty-first-century challenges in the Western Hemisphere more effectively, the committee does have a series of concerns about the implications of these changes. Chief among these concerns are:

(1) The concept for how the four new, mission-centric directorates that are planned for SOUTHCOM will interface laterally with other COCOMs that maintain traditional joint directorate structures and vertically with the Joint Staff at the Pentagon;

(2) The duties and responsibilities of the two proposed deputy commanders for SOUTHCOM;

(3) A description of the warfighting chain of command, as required under title 10, United States Code, from the commander of SOUTHCOM down to the proposed joint operations center of the security and intelligence directorate, as well as the coordination of this center with the proposed stability directorate and the inter-agency partnering directorate;

(4) SOUTHCOM's plan to manage and evaluate its internal transformation, including measures of progress;

(5) The role of the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and other foreign assistance agencies in the delivery of assistance by SOUTHCOM and other COCOMs;

(6) The appropriateness of including the economic welfare of a region, in this case Central and South America and the Caribbean, within the core of the COCOM's mission;

(7) The role the Department of Defense generally, and the COCOMs more particularly, should have in establishing foreign assistance policy as part of the foreign assistance process at the Department of State or as part of the inter-agency process led by the National Security Council; and

(8) The Department's plan to incorporate lessons learned from SOUTHCOM's inter-agency transformation into other COCOMs aside from United States African Command.

In light of these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit a written response to the committee's concerns by July 31, 2008. The response shall be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services.

Long-Term Nature of Business Transformation Agency Work

The Business Transformation Agency was established to continuously guide the Department's efforts at business improvement. The committee is aware that there are elements within the Department that may view the Business Transformation Agency as a transient organization and are making resource and staff allocations based on that view. The committee is concerned that decisions have not been made to size appropriately the senior workforce, first and foremost by making permanent many of the senior executive service billets. The committee believes that such a decision should be made before the change of administration to ensure that the Business Transformation Agency is able to attract and retain the right quality of personnel and to position the agency for success in the future.

Planning Assumptions on the Level of Contract Support

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has begun reviewing the contractor support in operations and contingency plans, including the requirements for contractor services as well as the standards for supporting contractor personnel in forward areas. The committee further notes that according to guidance published by the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCSM 3122.03c), operational plans are to include information on contracted services needed to support the plan. The plans are to include a list of the contracts likely to be used in theater and the capabilities they bring. The committee notes that it would be useful for the guidance to also include information on how award of contracts and management of contractors in deployed locations will be conducted.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a status report on implementation of the guidance to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2008.

Furthermore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to include in the next Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for 1996 (Public Law 104–106), an assessment of the number and types of services logistics support contractors necessary to assist with implementation of the defense strategy. A detailed analysis on the approach used to determine the level of contractor support should be included as an appendix to the QDR.

Quadrennial Defense Review

The committee expects that the next report of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), as required by section 118 of title 10, United States Code, will be delivered to Congress in 2010. The committee encourages Department of Defense (DOD) officials to take the opportunity provided by the requirement of the review to carefully adhere to the requirements described in that section. In recent years, the committee has noted that the QDR process has become more constrained by assumptions regarding resources and budgets than the statute requires. Furthermore, the committee believes that the QDR reports have not clearly articulated the substantive national security assumptions required in the statute or

the rationales underlying those assumptions. As a result, those reports have been of limited usefulness to the committee as it conducts its oversight role relating to overarching DOD strategy and force transformation.

United States Africa Command

The committee has watched with great interest the establishment and development of U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM). The committee notes that while there is no statutory requirement for the Department of Defense to consult with Congress before making such a substantial change to the Unified Command Plan, Congress is nevertheless responsible for providing AFRICOM with the resources it requires for success. Congress, as a co-equal branch of government, also has its own perspective on what is in the national interests of the United States. Therefore, the committee believes that an opportunity to provide input to the Department of Defense during the conception and early phases of development of the command would have been beneficial to all.

The committee understands that AFRICOM currently defines its mission as better enabling "the Department of Defense and other elements of the U.S. Government to work in concert and with partners to achieve a more stable environment in which political and economic growth can take place . . . [and will help] coordinate U.S. Government contributions on the continent." The committee further understands that a stable Africa is in the national interests of the United States. Nevertheless, the committee finds that within the command's mission statement, it has listed a variety of tasks that appear to depart from traditional Department of Defense (DOD) missions, including medical HIV/AIDS assistance, humanitarian assistance, and disaster relief. The diplomatic and cultural environment on the continent of Africa is extremely varied and complex. While the Department of Defense has always played a role in those sorts of tasks, the committee is concerned that AFRICOM might become the primary agent of U.S. efforts in those areas when they might be better served by other agencies or departments taking the lead.

Given these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the heads of any other federal agencies or departments the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate, to submit, not later than one week prior to AFRICOM assuming full operational capability, a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the final determination of the full set of roles and missions of AFRICOM. The report shall also include a description of:

(1) How United States strategic interests have influenced the size and scope of the U.S. military footprint on the continent and the effect the creation of AFRICOM will have on future U.S. military operations in Africa;

(2) How various African communities, regional organizations like the African Union, major non-governmental organizations that operate in Africa, and other foreign countries, including the People's Republic of China and the European nations,

which have played roles on that continent, view the establishment, roles, and missions of AFRICOM;

(3) AFRICOM's anticipated involvement in stabilization and reconstruction activities in Africa, and the cost-sharing agreements, if any, with the Department of State, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and other agencies, relating to those activities;

(4) The anticipated total cost of establishing this command, including facilities and infrastructure improvements, personnel, equipment, force protection, permanent change of station and other related costs, any cooperative or cost-sharing agreements with other Defense Department entities like United States European Command, and any cost-sharing arrangement with other non-DOD departments and agencies; and

(5) Any challenges that AFRICOM may have in filling the inter-agency positions in the command.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

Section 901—Revisions in Functions and Activities of Special Operations Command

This section would revise the statute governing special operations activities to accurately reflect current mission requirements of Special Operations Command. This section would urge greater emphasis on unconventional and irregular warfare, as well as counterterrorism and counterinsurgency missions.

Section 902—Requirement to Designate Officials for Irregular Warfare

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate a single Executive Agent within the Department for the development and execution of irregular warfare activities. This section would also require the Secretary to designate an Assistant Secretary of Defense to exercise responsibility for overall management and coordination of these activities.

Section 903—Plan Required for Personnel Management of Special Operations Forces

This section would require the Commander, Special Operations Command, to develop and provide to congressional defense committees a plan to ensure proper personnel management of special operations forces. This section would require submission of the plan within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 904—Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs

This section would establish a Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs within the Department of Defense to develop and oversee implementation of a strategy for managing the energy required for moving and sustaining military forces and weapons platforms for military operations. In addition, this section would require the secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to designate

a senior official accountable for their service's operational energy programs.

Section 905—Corrosion Control and Prevention Executives for the Military Departments

This section would require the Assistant Secretary of each military department with responsibility for acquisition, technology, and logistics to designate an employee of the military department to act as the senior official to coordinate department-level Corrosion Prevention and Control Program activities. The service corrosion executive would coordinate Corrosion Prevention and Control (CPC) within the military department and with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, military service program executive offices, materiel commands, and major service commands. This section would provide the corrosion executive with the CPC coordination authority necessary to assure the sustained performance, readiness, economical operation, and service life of military systems and equipment, including participation in materiel development, acquisition, fielding, operation, and storage processes. The service corrosion executive would be the military department's CPC principal point of contact to the Department of Defense corrosion executive designated in section 2228 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 906—Alignment of Deputy Chief Management Officer Responsibilities

This section would rectify a conflict in the chain of command of the Business Transformation Agency by requiring that Director of the Business Transformation Agency report only to the Deputy Chief Management Officer. This section would amend section 192 of title 10, United States Code, which designates joint responsibility for supervising the Business Transformation Agency to the Vice Chair of the Defense Business Systems Management Committee (DBSMC) and the Deputy Chief Management Officer to eliminate the requirement that the Business Transformation Agency be supervised by the Vice Chair of the DBSMC.

Section 907—Requirement for the Secretary of Defense to Prepare a Strategic Plan to Enhance the Role of the National Guard and Reserves

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan for enhancing the National Guard and reserves, and submit a report on that plan to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2009. This section would require that the plan assess the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Report of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves of January 31, 2008, and the provisions of the National Guard Empowerment Act, and State-National Defense Integration Act of 2008 (HR 5603) as introduced in the House of Representatives in the 110th Congress. This section would further require that the plan include any changes to current Department of Defense organization, structure, command relationships, budget authority, procurement authority, compensation and benefits, and any other recommendations for legislation that the Secretary of Defense considers necessary.

Section 908—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would designate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps and change the title of its Secretary to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. This section would formally recognize the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy over both the Navy and Marine Corps and the Marine Corps' status as an equal partner with the Navy.

Section 909—Support to Committee Review

This section makes a number of findings concerning the Quadrennial Defense Review and the need for the House Committee on Armed Services to review in a bipartisan, thorough manner, the military capabilities needed to address challenges to the United States. The section further requires the Secretary of Defense to provide the House Committee on Armed Services information to assist the committee as it reviews U.S. defense strategy and other plans within 15 days of the receipt of a request for such information.

SUBTITLE B—SPACE ACTIVITIES

Section 911—Extension of Authority for Pilot Program for Provision of Space Surveillance Network Services to Non-United States Government Entities

This section would extend the expiring authority of the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program that would allow non-U.S. Government entities to purchase space surveillance network services from assets owned or controlled by the Department of Defense through September 30, 2010. The current authority would expire on September 30, 2009.

Section 912—Investment and Acquisition Strategy for Commercial Satellite Capabilities

This section would require the Department of Defense to conduct an assessment to determine a recommended investment and acquisition strategy for commercial satellite capabilities. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to report the results of this assessment by February 1, 2009.

SUBTITLE C—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM

Section 921—Chemical Demilitarization Citizens Advisory Commissions in Colorado and Kentucky

This section would authorize the Program Manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program to manage and fund the Colorado and Kentucky Chemical Demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commissions.

Section 922—Prohibition on Transport of Hydrolystate at Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado

This section would prohibit the transportation of hydrolysate by-product from the chemical demilitarization (Chem-Demil) facility at Pueblo, Colorado, at any time during fiscal year 2009. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to provide a comprehensive comparative cost-benefit analysis with regard to on-site and off-site treatment methodologies. This section would require this information to be provided to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2009.

The committee notes that a delay in program execution has extended the Chem-Demil effort beyond the original target completion date of April 29, 2007. The committee also notes that the budget request for fiscal year 2009 assumes a program completion date in year 2023. The committee recognizes the additional delay as resulting in part from programmatic uncertainty and management irregularities, legal challenges, and insufficient resources. The committee believes inadequate programmatic consistency, discipline, and rigor has also contributed to the current state of affairs.

The committee understands the Department has initiated a comparative cost analysis with regard to on-site and off-site disposal methodologies in the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program, an independent component of the overall Chem-Demil effort. The committee expects this cost assessment to be completed in an expeditious manner and address, among other things, transportation requirements, potential litigation, and possible clean-up recovery needs in times of spills or other accidents.

The committee urges the Department to provide such information to the committee as soon as possible and requires its delivery by February 15, 2009.

SUBTITLE D—INTELLIGENCE-RELATED MATTERS

Section 931—Technical Changes Following the Redesignation of National Imagery and Mapping Agency as National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency

This section would make technical changes to bring the United States Code and other laws into conformity with the agency name change from National Imagery and Mapping Agency to the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, as provided for in section 921(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136).

Section 932—Technical Amendments to Title 10, United States Code, Arising from Enactment of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004

This section would make technical changes to reflect in various sections of title 10, United States Code, the change from "Director of Central Intelligence" to "Director of National Intelligence" and from "Director of Central Intelligence" to "Director of the Central Intelligence Agency."

Section 933—Technical Amendments Relating to the Associate Director of the CIA for Military Affairs

This section would amend section 528(c) of title 10, United States Code, to change the term "Military Support" to "Military Affairs."

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 941—Establishment of Department of Defense School of Nursing

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a Department of Defense School of Nursing authorized by section 955 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The committee is aware of the growing shortage of military medical personnel and believes that Department of Defense schools to produce military health professionals, such as the recently established Army School of Social Work, will have a significant positive impact on the shortage. This section would also authorize the Secretary to conduct a demonstration project to encourage retired military nurses to serve as faculty at civilian nursing schools.

Section 942—Amendments of Authority for Regional Centers for Security Studies

This section would amend section 184 of title 10, United States Code, to make funds authorized under that section in any fiscal year available for programs that begin in that fiscal year, but end in the following fiscal year, beginning with fiscal year 2009. This section would also create a pilot in which the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may waive reimbursement of the costs of activities at the Regional Centers up to $1.0 million for fiscal year 2009 and 2010 for non-governmental and international organization personnel. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report describing the extent of nongovernmental and international organization participation in the programs of each regional center, including the costs incurred by the United States for the participation of each organization. The committee notes that "international organization personnel" in this section is intended to refer to personnel from nonprofit or not-for-profit entities such as the United Nations, the African Union or the European Union, and not international corporations or businesses.

Section 943—Findings and Sense of Congress Regarding the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation

This section would express the sense of congress that the Western Hemispheric Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC) is 1) one of the most effective mechanisms that the United States has to build relationships with future leaders throughout the Western Hemisphere, influence the human rights records and democracy trajectory of countries in the Western Hemisphere, and mitigate the growing influence of non-hemispheric powers; 2) succeeding in meeting its stated mission while fostering mutual knowledge, transparency, confidence, and cooperation among the participating

nations; and 3) is an invaluable education and training facility which the Department of Defense should continue to utilize in order to help foster a spirit of partnership that will ensure security and enhance stability and interoperability among the United States military and the militaries of participating nations.

Section 944—Restriction on Obligation of Funds for United States Southern Command Development Assistance Activities

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense, within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the development assistance activities carried out by the United States Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) and containing: a certification that such activities will not negatively impact the readiness of SOUTHCOM; do not divert resources from funded or unfunded requirements of SOUTHCOM; are not already, or will not be, undertaken by other federal departments or agencies; and are designed, planned, and conducted as derivative activities of SOUTHCOM's warfighting responsibilities under title 10 of the United States Code.

This section would also restrict the obligation or expenditure of 10 percent of SOUTHCOM's operation and maintenance funds until 30 days after the certification required by this section is received by the congressional defense committees.

Section 945—Authorization of Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities

This section would codify authority for Joint Forces Command to act as the Executive Agent for the Non-conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities and authorize the Department to develop a personnel recovery program for isolated personnel representing all parts of the U.S. Government.

Section 946—Report on United States Northern Command Development of Interagency Plans and Command and Control Relationships

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the heads of other appropriate federal agencies, to submit a report to Congress within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act describing progress made in addressing the recommendations of the Government Accountability Office regarding the organization of the United States Northern Command. This section would also require the commander of Northern Command to coordinate with other federal agencies to ascertain requirements for plans, training, equipment, and resources in support of homeland defense; domestic emergency response; and military support to civil authorities.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained $1.1 billion for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to $189.9 million, for operational tempo, which is contained within the operating budgets of the military services. The budget is organized in fiscal year 2009 to address four broad national priorities: (1) international support; (2) domestic support; (3) intelligence and technology; and (4) demand reduction.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2009 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

FY09 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request	$1,060.5
International Support	541.3
Domestic Support	207.6
Intelligence Technology and Other Demand Reduction	173.6
Demand Reduction	138.0
Recommended Decrease	
International Support	5.0
Recommended Increase	
Southwestern Border Fence	5.0
Recommendation	1,060.5

Items of Special Interest

Budget requests

The budget request contained $1.1 billion for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, including all counter-narcotics resources in the Department of Defense with the exception of those resources in the operating budget for the military services and those resources which are appropriated or requested in emergency budgets. The committee notes that the fiscal year 2009 budget request represents the sixth year that the Administration has funded the overwhelming majority of counter-narcotics activities in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the rest of Central Asia through the use of emergency budget requests, instead of including these amounts in the regular budget request.

International support

The budget request contained $541.3 million for international support. The committee recommends $536.3 million, a decrease of $5.0 million, for international support. The committee notes that this small decrease will not result in diminished activities as the international support program continues to receive funding from emergency budget requests.

Self-propelled semi-submersible vessels and low profile vessels without nationality

The committee recognizes that one of the emerging and most significant threats in the forty-two million square mile transit zone that includes the Caribbean Sea, the Gulf of Mexico, and the east-

ern Pacific Ocean is the use of manned and unmanned self-propelled semi-submersible (SPSS) vessels and Low Profile Vessels (LPVs) to transport illicit narcotics into the United States. Narcotics traffickers in the region have increasingly turned to this method of transportation to circumvent the effective counter-drug efforts of the United States and partner nations have. The committee has significant concerns that these vessels represent a potential platform for other dangerous cargos and for human trafficking.

Southwest border fence

The southwest border continues to be a major human and drug smuggling corridor into the United States. Since 1990, the Department of Defense has been involved in addressing the heavily used smuggling corridor in San Diego, California, by building physical barriers throughout the region. As a result, the number of drug "drive-throughs" and the number of apprehensions of illegal crossers has greatly diminished. The Southwest Border Fence has served as an invaluable counter-narcotics resource and supports the President's border security initiative and makes for more efficient and effective use of the national guardsmen deployed in support of Operation Jump Start.

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. Additional funds are required to continue work on the fourteen-mile Border Infrastructure System near San Diego, California.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for this purpose.

Temporary expansion of the Joint Inter-Agency Task Force-South

The United States African Command (AFRICOM) is scheduled to establish a counter narco-terrorism (CNT) office by October 1, 2008. This office will assume responsibility for existing programs of the United States European Command (EUCOM) CNT office. Given Joint Inter-Agency Task Force-South's (JIATF–S) existing capabilities that it has developed over nearly two decades, EUCOM–CNT is relying on JIATF–S to provide information regarding trans-Atlantic drug events as well as helping to establish intelligence analyst support in various U.S. embassies in Africa. In addition, it will take a collective effort with Western European countries that have years of experience in the region, other U.S. Government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.

JIATF–S's primary mission is to detect, monitor, and support interdiction of the south-to-north flow of illicit drugs and other narco-terrorist threats to the security of the United States within the prescribed Joint Operating Area (JOA). It also serves as a center for detection and monitoring, as well as counter-drug support to U.S. country teams in Latin America and the Caribbean. JIATF–S's JOA responsibilities currently extend from up to 100 nautical miles from the Continental United States (CONUS) for air targets, to the CONUS territorial seas for maritime targets, to the U.S. territorial seas of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands for both air

and maritime targets and also includes the territory of the Bahamas.

The committee recognizes the efforts of AFRICOM to establish an effective counter-narcotics program within the command and appreciates AFRICOM's limited resources to do so. As an interim measure, the committee recommends that the JOA of JIATF–S be expanded to include Africa. The committee recommends only a temporary expansion; as opposed to longer term expansion, because much of JIATF–S's success is attributable to its relatively small area of responsibility. The committee does not want to jeopardize ongoing and future operations of the task force. Additionally, the committee recommends an increase in the number of Tactical Analysis Teams with oversight and management by J2. Authorization of funding for this temporary expansion would be provided by section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as amended by section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), section 1022 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 109–181), and section 1024 of this Act. The committee directs the Commander of AFRICOM to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2009 on: the combatant command's overall counter-narcotics strategy; the identification of priorities for counter-narcotic efforts in AFRICOM's area of responsibility, particularly in West Africa; the role that JIATF–S will temporarily play in meeting these objectives; and the role of international and regional partnerships in executing the same.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Civil Affairs

The committee recognizes the growing need within the Department of Defense (DOD) for civil affairs skills and capabilities across the full spectrum of operations. Current operations around the world highlight the continued high demand for civil affairs skills and capabilities, placing great strain on the availability of personnel who have those skills. Therefore, the committee continues to support the plan of U.S. Special Operations Command to increase the total civil affairs force by three battalions by March 2009.

Still, the committee notes current departmental policy, as stated in DOD Directive 3000.05, that stability operations are a core military mission and should be conducted throughout the full spectrum of operations. The committee believes this policy may lead to even greater demand for civil affairs specialists. The committee also understands that the Department has reorganized U.S. Army civil affairs units, dividing them between the active and reserve components and between special and general purpose forces. The committee believes the ultimate effects of these steps remains unclear.

The committee believes that the Department should pay close attention to how the roles and requirements for civil affairs personnel, skills, and capabilities evolve as the Department identifies future stability operations requirements and then incorporates stability operations capabilities in the planning and execution of full

spectrum operations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the civil affairs requirement and role throughout the spectrum of operations. The study, at a minimum, should include:

(1) An analysis of the overall anticipated civil affairs requirement, with a description of how that requirement was determined;

(2) An analysis of whether the programmed force structure will meet the anticipated requirement;

(3) An analysis of whether stability operations competencies are being adequately developed in the civil affairs force and whether non-civil affairs general purpose forces are being trained in skills traditionally resident in civil affairs forces in order to carry out stability operations;

(4) Identification of current proponency for civil affairs and an analysis of whether it is properly placed;

(5) An analysis of whether the current and planned force mix between the active and reserve components is appropriate given the continued demands for civil affairs units; and

(6) An analysis of what innovative tools or personnel management policies may be needed to assist in bringing needed civil affairs competencies and experience into the force on a temporary basis.

The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report of findings and recommendations by April 1, 2009, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Humanitarian Assistance Requirements of the Navy

The committee notes the many humanitarian assistance and disaster response missions undertaken by the Department of Defense each year. The committee is also aware of the central role placed on humanitarian assistance and disaster response in the new maritime strategy jointly authored by the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard entitled "A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower." The new strategy declares that preventing wars is as important as winning wars, and that executing the strategy will require globally distributed, mission-tailored maritime force packages. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to undertake a comprehensive review of current and projected personnel and equipment requirements to meet the humanitarian assistance and disaster response missions described in the new maritime strategy. The committee further directs the Secretary to review current naval vessels that perform this mission, assess their current and future viability, and prepare an analysis on the potential benefit of building new humanitarian assistance platforms based on existing vessels including, but not limited to, the T–AKE and LPD–17 hull forms. The committee directs the Secretary, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to prepare and submit a report on these reviews, including any comments the Secretary considers necessary regarding the consistency of this maritime strategy with the national military strategy and the report of the Quadrennial Defense Review, among other related strategy documents, to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2009.

Inclusion of Non-Lethal Capability in Defense Civil Support Requirements Plan

In connection with the Department's mission for defense support to civil authorities, the committee notes that section 1815 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requires the Secretary of Defense to identify the military-unique capabilities required by the military services, including the reserve component, the joint commands, and defense agencies, to support civil authorities in an incident of national significance or catastrophic event. The committee urges the Department to comply with section 1815 and encourages the Department to determine whether there are non-lethal capability requirements for domestic homeland defense and defense support to civil authorities' missions.

Long-Term Plans for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance

Section 923 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) requires the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD/I) to provide a "Defense Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) Integration Roadmap" to guide the development and integration of Department of Defense (DOD) ISR capabilities from 2004 through 2018. The USD/I, in his 2005 and 2007 Roadmap updates, has yet to provide all of the elements required by section 923. Specifically, the ISR Roadmap has not addressed: how DOD intelligence information could enhance the Department's role in homeland security; how counter-intelligence activities of the armed forces and DOD intelligence agencies could be better integrated; and how funding authorizations and appropriations could be optimally structured to best support development of a fully integrated ISR architecture. Moreover, the Roadmap does not provide a sufficient level of detail to enable ISR decision makers to prioritize different needs and assess progress in achieving strategic goals. The lack of a long-term, 10–15 year, vision of what ISR capabilities are required to achieve strategic goals also makes it difficult for the Department to assess investment options to achieve the most efficient and effective use of ISR capabilities and make informed decisions on an appropriate mix of national overhead systems, such as satellites and manned and unmanned platforms. As a result, the Department is making considerable investments in unmanned aircraft systems without the benefit of a longer-term vision. Furthermore, the Department has not yet addressed all of the management aspects required to be addressed by section 923 in its Roadmap.

The committee continues to be concerned that joint requirements be integrated to provide required capabilities to warfighters as efficiently and effectively as possible. The committee is aware of the Department's effort to develop a vision of a future ISR architecture that is based on an independent analysis of expected future requirements and strategic goals and that looks at future requirements for a time period beyond the Future Years Defense Program. As it develops this future ISR architecture, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, by March 15, 2009, on its determination of: (1) the appropriate mix of national overhead systems and manned and unmanned airborne platforms to achieve strategic goals that is based on an analysis of future ISR demand; and (2) a comprehensive set of metrics to assess ISR effectiveness in meeting the Department's strategic goals. Further, the report shall include sufficiently detailed information on the Department's vision of a future ISR architecture to enable Congress to understand the bases for the Department's assessment of and prioritization of capability gaps and overlaps, enable decision makers to address tradeoffs between competing needs, and assess progress in achieving ISR strategic goals. The report shall also be consistent with and reflect the Secretary's efforts to comply with section 942 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). Finally, the report shall include detailed recommendations on how funding authorizations and appropriations can be structured to support a fully integrated ISR architecture.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary to include information in all future funding requests that explains how each request fits into the Department's ISR architecture without unnecessary duplication or overlapping with existing systems or capabilities.

National Language Service Corps

The committee remains committed to expanding the Department of Defense foreign language and cultural awareness capabilities. The committee supports the launch of the National Language Service Corps pilot program as part of the broader Department of Defense commitment to the President's National Security Language Initiative. This effort will identify Americans with skills in critical languages and develop the capacity to mobilize them during times of national need or emergency. The National Language Service Corps represents the first organized national attempt to capitalize on our rich diversity in language and culture. This pilot organization began recruiting in January 2008 and has a goal of creating a cadre of 1,000 highly proficient people, in 10 languages by 2010. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2009, on the status of the implementation of the program and future plans to institutionalize and make any recommendations regarding the possible expansion of the program beyond the pilot phase.

Nuclear Weapons Inventory Control

The committee views the inadvertent transfer of weapons from Minot Air Force Base (AFB) to Barksdale AFB in August 2007, and the discovery in March 2008, that nose cones for Minuteman III missiles were mistakenly shipped to the Republic of China on Taiwan in 2006 as grave errors. These incidents raise significant concerns about the inventory control exercised over the nation's nuclear weapons and weapons components.

The Minot AFB-Barksdale AFB transfer prompted the Secretary of Defense to charge the Defense Science Board (DSB) Permanent

Task Force on Nuclear Weapons Surety to review the Department's weapons inventory control processes and procedures. In its February 2008 report, "Unauthorized Movement of Nuclear Weapons," the DSB Task Force noted the incident "dramatized the need for uncompromising processes and procedures, clear focus on the unique demands of the enterprise at multiple levels of the national security structure, and an environment that attracts, nurtures and guides the right numbers of the best and brightest as stewards of this uniquely powerful national security force." The task force concluded, "There are currently significant deficiencies in meeting each of those needs."

While the investigation of the nose cone shipments is ongoing, the committee notes that an inter-agency review is warranted of the inventory controls protecting the nation's nuclear weapons and weapons components. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to jointly prepare a report on the steps the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy plan to take to address the deficiencies and recommendations included in the February 2008, DSB report, and any that result from the ongoing investigation of the nose cone shipment to Taiwan. The report shall also include an assessment of new technologies that might be deployed to augment existing inventory control processes and strengthen human controls. The report shall be transmitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Oversight of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Proposals for New Capabilities

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported in its March 2008 report, "Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance" (ISR) that the Department can better assess and integrate ISR capabilities and oversee development of future ISR requirements. Specifically, it noted that the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System's Functional Capabilities Board charged with oversight of new ISR requirements has not worked proactively with sponsors of new capability proposals or ensured that the sponsors completed capabilities-based assessments that thoroughly assess alternatives to new materiel solutions to ISR needs as called for in joint guidance. The Government Accountability Office found in a review of 19 new ISR capabilities proposed by service and agency sponsors, that 12 sponsors did not complete assessments, and the completeness of the remaining sponsors' assessments varied.

In its response to the GAO report, the Department agreed with the Government Accountability Office's recommendations to improve the availability of information on current capabilities and those in development to assist sponsors and reviewers in determining capabilities already developed or proposed and the implementation of oversight activities by the Joint Staff's Battlespace Awareness Functional Capabilities Board. However, the Department disagreed with the Government Accountability Office's recommendation to review staffing and expertise levels of the Board and to take steps to address capability shortfalls, if any, because a recent review had found no shortfalls, even though lack of ade-

quate numbers of qualified staff was cited by some defense officials as a reason that oversight activities were not implemented as called for in Joint Staff guidance. The committee agrees with Government Accountability Office that the Department should reexamine its process and staffing needs as a part of improving oversight activities.

The committee directs the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by March 1, 2009, on the steps taken to assist military service and agency sponsors in developing proposals for new ISR capabilities that are informed by current information on all ISR capabilities that may be available and to ensure that the Functional Capabilities Board receives complete assessments to support the Joint Requirements Oversight Council's investment decisions. In addition, in light of the improved oversight practices the Department plans to implement, the committee directs that the report reassess the number of personnel and skills required to perform thorough reviews of ISR capability proposals and report to Congress the methodology and results of the assessment.

Strengthening Inter-Agency Stabilization and Reconstruction Contingency Planning

The committee is concerned with the lack of progress in the implementation of the inter-agency planning framework called for in National Presidential Security Directive—44. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to accelerate efforts to develop a framework for integrating inter-agency stabilization and reconstruction contingency planning with military operational and contingency planning. The committee further encourages the Secretary of Defense to promulgate a concept of operations for improving the integration of the inter-agency into this stabilization and reconstruction contingency planning in every phase at the combatant command, joint task force, and major subordinate command levels.

Unmanned Aircraft Systems Task Force

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to review and determine whether the designation of one military department as executive agent for unmanned aerial systems (UAS) would serve as the best means for eliminating duplication of effort and enhancing interoperability. In lieu of establishing an executive agent for UAS, in October 2007, the Department created a UAS Task Force to coordinate critical UAS issues and to develop a way ahead to enhance operations, enable inter-dependencies, and streamline acquisition. The Task Force has established focused teams and assigned lead organizations to address several UAS acquisition and management issues that include interoperability, airspace, frequency and spectrum utilization, and payload and sensor management. A senior steering group has also been established to periodically assess progress on the goals established for the Task Force and to address unresolved issues. Notwithstanding these efforts, the Department

continues to face challenges in the management and operational use of UASs. These challenges included the lack of an oversight framework and strategic plan to guide development and investment decisions in UASs and coordinate those efforts with intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) related manned and unmanned capabilities like Constant Hawk, Angel Fire, and unmanned airship systems that have been fielded to meet current exigencies.

To ensure that the Department makes progress in overcoming UAS acquisition and management challenges, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with an annual report on the Department's progress in addressing UAS challenges. The report shall include, at a minimum, information on the issues being addressed by the Task Force, progress made in coordinating UAS issues within UAS programs, between UAS and ISR-related manned and unmanned capabilities, and its recommendations to address existing issues. In addition, the report shall describe the actions that the Department has taken to implement the Task Force's recommendations and milestones for completing any unresolved recommendations.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1001—General Transfer Authority

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to make transfers between any amounts of authorizations for fiscal year 2009 in division A of this Act. This section would limit the total amount of transferred under this authority to $4.0 billion. This section would also require prompt notification to Congress of each transfer made.

Section 1002—Requirement of Separate Display of Budget for Afghanistan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, for any annual or supplemental budget request of the Department of Defense, to clearly and separately set forth any funding requested for any U.S. operations or other activities concerning the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan at the appropriation account level, and at the program, project, or activity level. This section would further require the budget submission to include a separate detailed description of the assumptions underlying the funding request. Such assumptions should include, to the extent possible: anticipated troop levels; operating tempo; and reset requirements.

The committee believes that budget request submissions by the Department of Defense for Afghanistan have lacked transparency, in part, given the Department's combined submissions for the Republic of Iraq, Afghanistan, and other countries in the war on terrorism without separate dedicated line items for Afghanistan. This section will enable the committee to provide the level of oversight on funding for Afghanistan that is necessary.

Section 1003—Requirement for Separate Display of Budget for Iraq

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, for any annual or supplemental budget request of the Department of Defense, to clearly and separately set forth any funding requested for the Republic of Iraq at the appropriation account level, and at the program, project, or activity level. This section would further require the budget submission to include a separate detailed description of the assumptions underlying the funding request. Such assumptions should include, to the extent possible: anticipated troop levels; operating tempo; and reset requirements.

Section 1004—One Time Shift of Military Retirement Payments

This section would delay in the year 2013, one percent of the cost-of-living adjustment for military retirees provided by section 1461 of title 10, United States Code. The delay in payment would occur in September 2013 and would be restored in a one-time lump sum in October 2013. It would also transfer $40.0 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund to the Miscellaneous Receipts Fund of the United States Treasury.

SUBTITLE B—POLICY RELATING TO VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1011—Conveyance, Navy Drydock, Aransas Pass, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell the yard floating drydock AFDL–23 to Gulf Copper Ship Repair, the current lessee of the drydock. This vessel would be sold at fair market value and take into account the amounts paid by, or due and owing from, the lessee. The Secretary of the Navy would be authorized to set additional terms and conditions on the transfer as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Section 1012—Report on Repair of Naval Vessels in Foreign Shipyards

This section would amend section 7310 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Navy to notify the appropriate congressional defense committees when repairs of U.S. Navy vessels, including those operated by Military Sealift Command and the U.S. Maritime Administration, are to occur at a foreign repair facility. The notification would include: a legal justification for the scheduled repair in a foreign shipyard; the vessel to be repaired; the shipyard contracted or designated for the repair; the cost of the repair; the schedule for repair; and the homeport or location of the vessel prior to its voyage for repair. This section would require the notification to be made at least 30 days prior to repairs beginning.

Section 1013—Policy Relating to Major Combatant Vessels of the Strike Forces of the United States Navy

This section would amend section 1012 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) by requiring that in addition to future ship classes of aircraft carriers, major surface combatants, and submarines, that assault echelon amphibious ships also must be constructed with integrated nuclear

power systems if the ship's light weight displacement is greater than 15 thousand tons.

The committee believes the future naval force should not be reliant on the availability of fossil fuel for fleet operations. Removing the need for access to fossil fuel sources significantly multiplies the effectiveness of the entire battle force and eliminates the dependence on foreign nation support of deployed naval forces.

Section 1014—National Defense Sealift Fund Amendments

This section would amend section 2218 of title 10, United States Code, removing the authority of the Secretary of Defense from obligating or expending funds in the National Defense Sealift Fund for any other purpose in the National Defense Sealift fund that was not authorized by law. In addition this section would amend the definition of Department of Defense Sealift Vessels to only those vessels specifically authorized by Congress to be procured or chartered using funds from the National Defense Sealift Fund.

Section 1015—Report on Contributions to the Domestic Supply of Steel and Other Metals from Scrapping of Certain Vessels

This section would require that the Secretary of the Navy submit a report to the congressional defense committees containing the estimated contribution to the domestic market for steel and other metals from the scrapping of certain vessels not yet disposed of by the Navy, and a plan for the sale and disposal of such vessels.

SUBTITLE C—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1021—Continuation of Reporting Requirement Regarding Department of Defense Expenditures to Support Foreign Counter-drug Activities

This section would extend, by one year, the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to submit a report detailing the expenditure of funds by the Secretary during fiscal year 2008 in direct and indirect support of the counter-drug activities of foreign governments. This requirement expired in fiscal year 2008. The committee notes that the Department of Defense continues to increase its level of counter-narcotics assistance to foreign law enforcement agencies and militaries in recent years. The committee believes that it should provide closer oversight of such expenditures.

Section 1022—Extension of Authority for Joint Task Forces to Provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counter-terrorism Activities

This section would extend the authority provided in section 1022b of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), which expires at the end of fiscal year 2008, through fiscal year 2009. The current authority provides that a joint task force of the Department of Defense, which is providing support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-drug activities, may also provide, subject to all applicable laws and regulations, these law enforcement agencies with support for their counter-terrorism activities.

Section 1023—Extension of Authority to Support Unified Counter-drug and Counter-terrorism Campaign in Colombia and Continuation of Numerical Limitation on Assignment of United States Personnel

This section would extend the continuation of authorities provided in section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), which allows the Department of Defense to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking and activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations for fiscal year 2009. This section would also extend the limitation on the number of U.S. military and federally funded civilian contractor personnel in the Republic of Colombia through fiscal year 2009. Section 1021 limits the number of military personnel in Colombia to 800 people and the number of federally funded civilian contractors to 600 people. This section would extend the authorities for an additional year to provide support to Colombian efforts against the three designated, Colombian-based Foreign Terrorist Organizations: the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia; the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia; and the National Liberation Army.

Section 1024—Expansion and Extension of Authority to Provide Additional Support for Counter-drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments

This section would extend by one fiscal year the duration of authority for assistance under section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as amended by section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), section 1022 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), and section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The current authority, which would expire at the end of fiscal year 2008, enables the Department of Defense to provide counter-drug equipment to nations of the Western Hemisphere, Central Asia, and the Caucasus.

This section would expand the list of countries that could qualify for assistance under section 1033 to include three West African countries which have been recognized by the U.S. Government as major transit countries, countries of concern, or countries from which significant counter-narcotic activities for sub-regions can be conducted. These countries are: the Republic of Ghana; the Republic of Guinea-Bissau; and the Republic of Senegal. According to the 2008 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report of the Department of State, Ghana has become a "significant transshipment point for illegal drugs, particularly cocaine from South America, as well as heroin from Southeast and Southwest Asia. Europe is the major destination, but drugs also flow to South Africa and to North America." For fiscal year 2008, the President determined that Guinea-Bissau, while not a major drug transit or major illicit drug producing country, is "becoming a warehouse refuge and transit hub for cocaine traffickers from Latin America transporting cocaine to Western Europe." The Department of Defense has identified

Ghana as an "anchor country" for its emerging counter-narcotic efforts through the African Command on the continent.

This section would increase the funding limitation under section 1033 from $60.0 million to $65.0 million for fiscal year 2009.

This section would make a technical correction to section 1033 to reflect the respective name today of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The committee notes that the Department has not fully utilized the existing section 1033 authority with regard to all of the eligible countries and will again evaluate its use over fiscal year 2009.

The committee also notes that although the Republic of Ecuador is currently eligible to receive support under section 1033, it will consider that country's cooperation with the United States on counter-narcotic activities through the remainder of fiscal year 2008 and fiscal year 2009 to determine whether it should remain eligible.

Section 1025—Comprehensive Department of Defense Strategy for Counter-narcotics Efforts for West Africa and the Maghreb

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, prepare a counter-drug plan for all eligible governments under section 1033 for fiscal year 2009 and updates thereafter, as well as a region-wide, counter-drug plan for Africa, with a special emphasis on West Africa and the Maghreb.

Section 1026—Comprehensive Department of Defense Strategy for Counter-narcotics Efforts in South and Central Asian Regions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009, that outlines the Department's role, missions, objectives, and budget in support of the overall U.S. Government counter-narcotics strategy and activities in the South and Central Asian regions and other geographically proximate countries. The report would also describe measures that will be utilized to evaluate the success of these elements toward reducing the production and trafficking of illicit narcotics in these regions and countries.

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense submitted a report to the congressional defense committees on September 24, 2007, updating the inter-agency counter-narcotics plan for the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the South and Central Asian regions as directed by the committee in section 1025 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). However, with regard to South and Central Asian regions, the committee is concerned that the Department has not clearly articulated its role, missions, objectives and associated measures of progress for its efforts that support the broader U.S. counter-narcotics strategy within the South and Central Asian regions. Furthermore, the committee notes that the Department has not adequately identified how its counter-narcotics efforts in South and Central Asia complement the overall U.S. Government counter-narcotics strategy for Afghanistan.

The committee supports the efforts of the Department to use counter-narcotics resources to support the U.S. counter-narcotics

strategy in South and Central Asia. However, the committee continues to believe that the Department must only fund and manage activities within its core mission and must not take on leading roles in missions for which with other U.S. Government agencies have core responsibilities.

SUBTITLE D—BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Section 1031—Strategic Communication Management Board

This section would require the Department to create a Strategic Communication Management Board (SCMB) consisting of representation from the services, Joint Staff, combatant commands, and from divisions within the Office of the Secretary of Defense responsible for strategic communication and public diplomacy. Members of the Board will also include interagency partners as advisory members. The SCMB's purpose is to establish guidance to the Department related to strategic communication and military support to public diplomacy and will include a charter to assist with the establishment of priorities and improving intra- and inter-departmental coordination.

The committee is concerned about the state of strategic communication and public diplomacy (SC/PD) efforts within the Department of Defense. The committee believes that the dissolution of the strategic communication integration group (SCIG) was a major setback to the coordination of SC/PD efforts. While the SCIG resources and authority may not have been adequate to completely manage the Department's SC/PD effort, the Board remained a focal point within the Department and positively contributed to the effort to mitigate conflict and confusion.

The committee believes that the SCMB's near-term priority should be the development of a comprehensive Department-wide strategy that can be used to effectively inform and guide the disparate and vast community involved in strategic communication activities. Such a product should simultaneously serve as a Department perspective for informing a more comprehensive government-wide strategic communication strategy.

Section 1032—Extension of Certain Dates for Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States

This section would amend section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to modify the deadline by which the Congressional Commission on U.S. Strategic Posture must report its analysis and recommendations. The Commission's final report to Congress would be required by March 1, 2009, and an interim report would be due by December 1, 2008.

Section 1033—Extension of Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack

This section would extend the operation of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack until March 31, 2012, and require the Commission to provide an annual report beginning on March 1, 2010: (1) assessing the changes to the vulnerability of U.S. military systems and

critical civilian infrastructures resulting from the EMP threat and changes in the threat; (2) on the progress, or lack of progress, protecting U.S. military systems and critical civilian infrastructures from EMP attack; and (3) including Commission recommendations to address the threat and protect U.S. military and civilian systems from attack.

This section would authorize up to $3.0 million for the Commission's activities in a given year. This section would also add two members to the Commission: one appointed by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and one appointed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The committee notes that it expects the Commission to provide the report focused on the original requirements established in the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) to the committee by the November 30, 2008 deadline.

SUBTITLE E—STUDIES AND REPORTS

Section 1041—Report on Corrosion Control and Prevention

This section would require the Department of Defense, through the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight, to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2009, regarding the potential for improvements in corrosion control and prevention in weapons systems by planning for corrosion control and prevention earlier in the system requirements and acquisition processes. Specifically, the Department would be required to examine corrosion control and prevention as a Key Performance Parameter, as part of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System, or for incorporation into acquisition strategies. It also would require review of the report by the Comptroller General within 60 days of the submission of the report.

Section 1042—Study on Using Department of Defense Modular Airborne Fire Fighting Systems in a Federal Response to Wildfires

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to complete a study on how to utilize, in a cost-effective manner, the Department's Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System (MAFFS) assets at the initial stages of wildfire-related contingencies involving federal response capabilities. This section would require the Secretary to report the results of this study to the congressional defense committees within six months of the date of enactment of this Act.

The committee commends the Department's MAFFS units, which were critical in saving lives and reducing damage during the federal response to the Southern California wildfires in October and November 2007. The committee notes, however, that the National Interagency Fire Center (NIFC), at times, does not use the Department's MAFFS assets when responding to wildfires on the basis that using the Department's MAFFS assets is cost prohibitive. The committee believes that the current NIFC resource allocation system may result in inefficient employment distribution and lead to unnecessary risk to life and loss of property.

With regards to future employment of MAFFS assets, the committee believes that the maximum federal response should be immediately utilized whenever necessary and appropriate. The committee further believes the MAFFS capability is an important resource and should be available during the early phases of all contingencies.

Section 1043—Study on Rotorcraft Survivability

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a study on Department of Defense rotorcraft survivability, and provide a report on the study to the congressional defense committees by August 1, 2009.

Section 1044—Studies to Analyze Alternative Models for Acquisition and Funding of Inter-connected Cyberspace Systems

This section would require concurrent studies by an independent federally funded research and development center and the Joint Staff to analyze alternative models and recommend changes to the present service-based approach for acquisition and funding of interconnected systems for network centric operations.

Section 1045—Report on Non-strategic Nuclear Weapons

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy, and the Director of National Intelligence, to conduct a review of nonstrategic nuclear weapons world-wide, and submit a report to Congress, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the findings and recommendations of the review.

The report should include: an inventory of nonstrategic nuclear weapons and an assessment of the methods currently used to identify, track and monitor these weapons; an evaluation of these weapons as deterrents; an assessment of risks associated with these weapons; and recommendations for improving the security and consolidating, dismantling, and disposing of these weapons. The report should be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

Section 1046—Study on National Defense Implications of Section 1083

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to study the national defense implications of section 1083 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Section 1047—Report on Methods Department of Defense Utilizes to Ensure Compliance with Guam Tax and Licensing Laws

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the steps that the Department is taking to ensure that all contractors of the Department performing work on Guam comply with local tax and licensing requirements.

SUBTITLE F—CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITIONS

Section 1051—Sense of Congress Honoring the Honorable Duncan Hunter

This section would enumerate the accomplishments of Representative Duncan Hunter during his career and express the sincere gratitude of Congress and the nation.

Section 1052—Sense of Congress in Honor of the Honorable Jim Saxton, a Member of the House of Representatives

This section would enumerate the accomplishments and honor the service of Representative Jim Saxton during his 24–year career on the House Committee on Armed Services and in the House of Representatives, and would express the sincere gratitude of Congress and the nation.

Section 1053—Sense of Congress honoring the Honorable Terry Everett

This section would honor the leadership and character demonstrated by Representative Terry Everett during his 16–year career on the House Committee on Armed Services and in the House of Representatives, and would express the sincere gratitude of Congress and the nation.

Section 1054—Sense of Congress Honoring the Honorable Jo Ann Davis

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Honorable Jo Ann Davis, a late Representative from Virginia, performed her duties with integrity and distinction, served the House of Representatives and the American people selflessly, and deserves the sincere and humble gratitude of Congress and the nation.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1061—Amendment to Annual Submission of Information Regarding Information Technology Capital Assets

This section would change the requirement to report on programs based on life cycle cost, which is difficult to estimate for information technology systems, and substitute with a requirement based on the need to submit a Capital Asset Plan in accordance with the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11, Section 300. This section would synchronize the information the Department provides both Congress and the Office of Management and Budget for reporting on major Department of Defense information technology investments.

Section 1062—Restriction on Department of Defense Relocation of Missions or Functions from Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station

This section would prevent the future movement of any missions or functions related to Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station until the Secretary of Defense has submitted a report and certified to Congress on the costs and benefits of any move. The report and certification shall include: a cost estimate; independent vulner-

ability and risk assessment; and the Secretary's implementation plan to address the vulnerabilities and risks identified in the assessment. The report and certification shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees 30 days prior to any movement of missions or functions.

Section 1063—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments of a non-substantive nature to existing law.

Section 1064—Submission to Congress of Revision to Regulation on Enemy Prisoners of War, Retained Personnel, Civilian Internees, and Other Detainees

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services the updated, successor regulation to Army Regulation 190–8, Enemy Prisoners of War, Retained Personnel, Civilian Internees and Other Detainees (dated October 1, 1997) before the Department would be permitted to conduct activities pursuant to it.

This section also clarifies that the existing Army Regulation 190–9 would not be impaired in any way by the notification procedure of this section.

Section 1065—Authorization of Appropriations for Payments to Portuguese Nationals Employed by the Department of Defense

This section would authorize payments for salary increases based on wage survey data for fiscal years 2006 and 2007. Such Portuguese nationals employed by the Department of Defense for payments may only be paid if: (1) the wage survey methodology described in the United States—Portugal Agreement on Cooperation and Defense, signed at Lisbon on June 1, 1995, is eliminated; and (2) that agreement and any implementing regulations be revised to explicitly state that future increases in the pay of Portuguese nationals employed by the Department of Defense in Portuguese Republic are in compliance with United States law and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 1066—State Defense Force Improvement

The section would amend section 109 of title 32, United States Code, to recognize state defense forces as an integral military component of the United States, and would authorize the Secretary of Defense to coordinate, assist, train, and transfer excess equipment to a state defense force provided the Secretary determines certain conditions are met. This section would also provide that funds available to the Department may not be made available to a state defense force.

Section 1067—Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, New Jersey

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to undertake, at federal expense, appropriate measures as the Secretary determines to be necessary and in the public interest to address munitions placed on the beach during the construction of the Barnegat

Inlet to Little Egg Inlet Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction project.

Section 1068—Sense of Congress Regarding the Roles and Mission of the Department of Defense and Other National Security Institutions

This section would express the sense of Congress that to ensure the future security of the United States, all of the national security organizations of the federal government must work together more effectively and that institutionalizing effective coordination within and among those organizations may require fundamental reform.

Section 1069—Sense of Congress Relating to 2008 Supplemental Appropriations

This section would express the sense of Congress that readiness shortfalls exist within the armed forces of the United States and that Congress has provided, and will continue to provide, funds to address such shortfalls.

Section 1070—Sense of Congress Regarding Defense Requirements of the United States

This section would express the sense of Congress that the defense requirements of the United States should be based on a comprehensive national security strategy and fully funded to counter present and emerging threats.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Implementation of Existing Policies for Medical Care for Department of Defense and Non-Department of Defense Civilians Injured or Wounded in Support of Contingency Operations

The committee is concerned that Department of Defense (DOD) civilians who are injured or wounded while serving in support of a contingency operation may not be receiving adequate medical treatment or administrative support for such injuries. The committee is aware that the Deputy Secretary of Defense issued a memorandum, "Policy Guidance for Provision of Medical Care to Department of Defense Civilian Employees Injured or Wounded While Forward Deployed in Support of Hostilities," on September 24, 2007. However, the committee is concerned that this policy may not be sufficient to address the full scope of medical care and treatment that may be required, and may not be communicated to such eligible employees and providers.

In addition, the committee is concerned that non-DOD federal civilian personnel who become ill, injured, or wounded while serving in a combat zone in support of United States armed forces may be eligible for care with military medical facilities in theatre, but the conditions for such medical care eligibility are not well-defined, nor well-communicated to non-DOD federal agencies and their employees.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to:

(1) Review and establish a process to provide oversight of the implementation of all existing policies, directives, and instructions to ensure comprehensive coverage to meet the medical requirements of injured or wounded DOD federal civilians;

(2) Establish a toll-free number to provide injured and wounded DOD federal civilian personnel a one-stop opportunity to obtain information and assistance; and

(3) Define for non-DOD federal civilian personnel the process and conditions for approving medical care for non-DOD federal civilian personnel at military medical facilities in theatre, and to distribute such information to appropriate individuals within other federal agencies for dissemination to their employees.

The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the status of these actions to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2009.

Information Technology Workforce Analysis

The committee is concerned about the government's ability to compete with industrial and academic sectors to attract and retain the high-quality information technology workforce needed to support future networked military forces. In order to collect substantial data and develop a quantifiable analysis on this concern, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This report shall include an analysis of the sufficiency of the Department of Defense (DOD) workforce. The analysis shall address the number of billets in the Department, available and filled, and an analysis of the knowledge, skills, and attributes required for these billets. The report shall also address the adequacy of the workforce supply pipeline, and include an examination of educational curricula and expected future needs for DOD software engineering programs at the university and postgraduate level.

Review of Medical Care for Federal Civilian Employees Serving in a Contingency Operation

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a working group within the Department of Defense to examine the medical care for civilian employees serving in a contingency operation.

The working group should be comprised at least of the following members:

(1) A member from one of the services' medical departments;

(2) A member from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness;

(3) A member from the Office of Personnel Management;

(4) A member from the Office of Management and Budget;

(5) A member from the Department of State;

(6) A member from the Defense Business Board;

(7) A member from one of the federal employee organizations;

(8) A member from the Department of Labor;

(9) A member from the Department of Justice;

(10) A member from the United States Agency for International Development; and

(11) A member from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The working group should be tasked with reviewing access to medical care for federal civilian employees serving in a contingency operation. The review should include consideration of whether federal civilian employees who are injured or wounded in a contingency operation are adequately supported and compensated by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA) in chapter 81, title 5, United States Code; whether existing policies, directives, and instructions on medical coverage for injured or wounded civilians are adequate and fully communicated to employees and their supervisors; the development of a training regime to ensure awareness of agency policies and FECA procedures and requirements for employees and their supervisors; the need to provide mental health support to federal civilian employees in theatre and upon their return; whether recovery care coordinators should be established for injured or wounded federal civilians; and whether such individuals should have access to specialized treatments that are occurring within the military medical community. These reviews should include a recommendation on who is responsible for such care and treatment, and if the Department is determined to be able to provide the best course of action, then how the Department will be reimbursed for such services.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit the results of the working group's assessment to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2009.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1101—Temporary Authority to Waive Limitation on Premium Pay for Federal Employees

This section would extend, for one additional year, the authority of the head of a federal agency to waive the limitations on the amount of premium pay that may be paid to a civilian employee who performs certain work in an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of the U.S. Central Command, or in support of a military operation or responding to an emergency declared by the President. The total compensation would be limited to $212,100 per calendar year.

Section 1102—Extension of Authority to Make Lump-Sum Severance Payments

This section would extend, from 2010 to 2014, existing authorities under section 5595 of title 5, United States Code, to allow the Department of Defense to pay, upon request, severance pay in one lump sum in lieu of bi-weekly payments to eligible employees being involuntarily separated. If an employee receiving a lump sum payment is reemployed by the federal government or the District of Columbia during the severance pay time period, the employee must pay back the portion of the payment that would not have been received under the bi-weekly option.

Section 1103—Extension of Voluntary Reduction-in-Force Authority of Department of Defense

This section would extend, from 2010 to 2014, existing authorities under section 3502 of title 5, United States Code, to allow an employee who is not affected by a reduction in force (RIF) to volunteer to be separated to protect another employee from being involuntarily separated by RIF procedures. The intent of this authority is to minimize the negative impact of downsizing within the Department of Defense.

Section 1104—Technical Amendment to Definition of Professional Accounting Position

This section would update the current statutory definition of professional accounting positions in section 1599d of title 10, United States Code, to recognize the establishment of the National Security Personnel System, which does not utilize the General Schedule in defining positions.

Section 1105—Expedited Hiring Authority for Health Care Professionals

This section would amend section 1599c of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Defense with temporary expedited hiring authority for health care professionals. For purposes of sections 3304, 5333, and 5753 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary would be allowed to designate health care positions as shortage category positions, and to recruit, appoint, and establish special pay criteria for qualified individuals in such positions. This section also would require the Department of Defense to utilize preferences for hiring veterans and other statutory categories of personnel. The committee recognizes the Department's immediate need for health care professionals to meet the medical needs of our military men and women. This section would expire in 2012.

Section 1106—Authority to Adjust Certain Limitations on Personnel and Reports on Such Adjustments

This section would permit the Department of Defense and the military services to exceed the limitation on personnel by no more than five percent each year above the baseline, if it is determined to be necessary to eliminate a contract being performed for an inherently governmental function, or a contract that is being performed that is closely associated with an inherently governmental function, such as a lead systems integrator function which was prohibited in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The baseline personnel limitation for fiscal year 2009 is the current statutory limitation. This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a new baseline each year based on the lesser of the previous year's five percent increase, or the actual personnel increase. This section also would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report accompanying the budget request documenting the use of this authority. Finally, this section would require the Comptroller General to conduct an evaluation of the Department's use of this authority

and report to the congressional defense committees on the Comptroller's findings by April 15, 2009.

Section 1107—Temporary Discretionary Authority to Grant Allowances, Benefits, and Gratuities to Personnel on Official Duty in a Combat Zone

This section would provide temporary discretionary authority to federal agencies to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities—comparable to those provided to members of the foreign service—to an agency's civilian employees on official duty in a combat zone. This authority would expire in 2011.

Section 1108—Requirement Relating to Furloughs During the Time of a Contingency Operation

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, before issuing any furlough notices to civilian employees of the Department of Defense on the basis of a lack of funds during contingency operations, to certify to the congressional defense committees that he has no other legal measures to avoid such furloughs. The committee believes the certification should include a description of the measures the Secretary of Defense has taken to avoid such furloughs, as well as measures taken to obtain the required funding.

Section 1109—Direct Hire Authority for Certain Positions at Personnel Demonstration Laboratories

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense with temporary direct hire authority for scientific and engineering positions within certain defense laboratories. For purposes of sections 3304, 5333, and 5753 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary would be allowed to designate scientific and engineering positions as shortage category positions, and to recruit, appoint, and establish special pay criteria for qualified individuals in such positions. This section also would limit the authority, in any calendar year, to no more than two percent of the total number of positions within the laboratory. This section would expire in 2013.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Combatant Commanders' Initiative Fund

The committee welcomes the Department of Defense's added emphasis on using the Combatant Commanders' Initiative Fund (CCIF), as established in section 166a of title 10, United States Code, and modified by the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), as a valuable tool for combatant commanders to tailor programs and initiatives for their respective areas of responsibility. The committee also notes the Department's plans to increase the use of this authority, as amended, so that combatant commanders can better provide urgent and unanticipated humanitarian relief and reconstruction as-

sistance to countries, particularly where U.S. armed forces are engaged in contingency operations.

Because the use of this modified authority is a relatively recent development, the committee expects that the Department will update its guidelines for use of the CCIF, especially as it relates to humanitarian relief and reconstruction activities, to ensure that the authority can be used quickly and without bureaucratic delay in urgent situations. As noted in the conference report accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the committee underscores that CCIF authority, particularly as it relates to humanitarian relief and reconstruction activities, is not intended for use in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan or the Republic of Iraq so long as the Commanders' Emergency Response Program or other similar authority is available for use in those countries.

Finally, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report on the exercise of CCIF authority for fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011. Each report shall be due to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the end of the respective fiscal year and shall, at a minimum, identify each foreign nation that received assistance under CCIF authority for that fiscal year, the amount of that assistance, and the national security rationale for providing that assistance.

Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Iraq

The committee notes with significant concern the increasing requests for funding for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) in the Republic of Iraq at a time when the Government of Iraq is experiencing unanticipated increases in national revenue, has a growing institutional capability to undertake its own humanitarian and reconstruction projects, and has itself contributed its own national funds to projects administered under CERP authority. Moreover, the committee notes that the increasing requests do not reflect comparable growth of CERP projects to address similar needs in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan theater of operations. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision elsewhere in this title to limit the expenditure of U.S. CERP funds in fiscal year 2009 to no more than twice the amount obligated by the Government of Iraq for its CERP account in calendar year 2008.

The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, detailing: how the Department of Defense formulated base budget and supplemental budget requests for the CERP program to date and how the Department takes into account the increasing receipts of the Government of Iraq; the increasing capability of the Government of Iraq in undertaking humanitarian and reconstruction projects to benefit the Iraqi people; contributions from the Government of Iraq; and the needs in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan when formulating CERP requests.

Foreign Disclosure

The committee notes that the protection of classified information is one of the paramount responsibilities of the Department of Defense. Military officers, civilians employed by the Department of Defense, and in some cases contractor personnel, interact with foreign personnel of allied militaries and coalition partners in environments where the protection of classified information is challenging, and where the proper sharing of information is essential to the mission. The committee encourages the Department to provide training to all such personnel on the rules regarding foreign disclosure of sensitive information. Such training is especially important for members of the reserve component called to duty in positions requiring the handling of sensitive information and foreign disclosure.

Foreign Military Sales

The committee notes that the training and equipping of foreign security forces is an increasingly important element of U.S. national security policy and is an area with growing involvement by the Department of Defense. Foreign military sales (FMS) can be a highly beneficial and effective part of this effort. For example, in recent years, the Government of Iraq has increasingly utilized the FMS process to acquire and sustain U.S.-origin military equipment because the FMS process provides high-quality equipment while minimizing concerns about procurement integrity that otherwise have inhibited the Republic of Iraq's efforts to make major investments in equipment. As the United States focuses increasingly on building partnership capacity around the world, it is often doing so with countries that are not traditional FMS customers. These countries have underdeveloped institutional capacities, particularly in matters of budgeting and acquisition, which present challenges for an FMS sales system that has traditionally focused on sales to longer-term, more developed allies.

These trends have correctly led to a reexamination of the policies and processes associated with FMS, including the appointment of a dedicated FMS task force by the Deputy Secretary of Defense. The committee is pleased to note that the efforts of this task force led to a significant reduction in the time needed to process high-priority FMS requests. The committee expects that the Department will continue to examine the policies and processes associated with FMS to ensure that they are appropriately tailored to the changing environment for this program.

At the same time, the committee notes that processes other than FMS that have been and are still being used to equip foreign security forces, particularly the special funds for Iraqi and Afghan security forces, have proven extremely vulnerable to materiel diversion, corruption, and accountability failures. These failures can not only limit the effectiveness of U.S. assistance, in extreme cases, they can and have led to outcomes that work at cross purposes to U.S. policy and the military mission. The FMS program is a better long-term alternative to these more ad hoc programs, which have limited institutional support and under-developed accountability processes.

The FMS program suffers from its own accountability issues as highlighted in reports issued by the Government Accountability Office and by the recent discovery of the accidental delivery of classified parts to the Republic of China on Taiwan. The Government Accountability Office identified numerous cases of shipments leaving U.S. ports in which the defense articles were not authorized by the FMS agreement, the FMS agreement was closed, or the value of the articles exceeded the amount authorized. The Government Accountability Office also found that there is no effective system for tracking shipments after they have left a U.S. port, which increases opportunities for diversion, improper delivery, or theft. The committee expects the Department to work and share information with other federal agencies to correct problems with tracking FMS shipments at U.S. ports and during transport to the country of destination.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, working in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit a report, by September 1, 2008, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs containing an analysis of the implications of the Department's efforts to build partner capacity around the globe for the FMS program, measures needed to address problems with the tracking of FMS shipments, and efforts within the Department to update its policies and processes for handling FMS.

Graduates of the Jordanian International Police Training Center

The committee has previously noted its concern about the ability to track the status of those Iraqi Police Forces who have been trained and equipped by coalition forces. In particular, the committee is concerned about the status of past graduates of the Jordanian International Police Training Center (JIPTC). The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act to the congressional defense committees on the current status of all Iraqi graduates of the JIPTC, including the number who are still part of the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF), the number who are no longer part of the ISF, and the number, if any, who have been detained by coalition or Iraqi authorities.

Honoring and Acknowledging Service Members Redeploying from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom

The committee believes that the service, contributions and sacrifices made by the men and women of the armed forces in support of their missions in Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) have resulted in many significant accomplishments that will provide lasting benefits, and that their accomplishments should be honored not only by the people of Iraq and Afghanistan but by all Americans. The committee believes that the service, sacrifice, and accomplishments of these service members should be honored and acknowledged by their leaders prior to their redeploying from OIF and OEF. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to transmit guidance throughout the Department, in a manner and form the Secretary deems appropriate,

to implement the issuance of statements to service members honoring and acknowledging their service prior to their redeployment from theater.

Integrating Inter-agency Capabilities into Department of Defense Planning for Stability Operations

The committee commends the "Report to Congress on the Implementation of DOD Directive 3000.05 Military Support for Stability, Security, Transition and Reconstruction (SSTR) Operations" required by section 1035 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The report served as a useful, informative guide to the evolution of SSTR-related policies at the Department of Defense (DOD). The report recognizes the essential contribution that civilian agencies must make to successful stability operations. The committee also commends the military services' ongoing efforts in this area, particularly Army Field Manual 3–0, which acknowledges and incorporates the role of civilian expertise. The committee shares the Department's view that this is an area that deserves substantial attention and one where policies will continue to evolve.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act a report containing an update on the further implementation of DOD Directive 3000.05, including:

(1) Efforts to identify and prioritize needed SSTR capabilities, both military and civilian, during every phase of an operation;

(2) The development of measures of effectiveness to evaluate progress in achieving these capabilities;

(3) Steps taken to integrate civilian personnel and capabilities more fully into military planning and scenario development;

(4) Efforts to update DOD planning guidance to require that the SSTR planning review process includes validation that lessons learned, especially lessons learned from the establishment and operation of Provincial Reconstruction Teams in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, have been considered and adopted as appropriate; and

(5) Continuing challenges or obstacles to integrated interagency support for SSTR operations, and potential solutions for mitigating them, including methods for achieving greater interagency participation in the development of military plans.

Oversight of Department of Defense Policies on Iran

The committee remains seriously concerned about certain activities undertaken by the government of the Islamic Republic of Iran and believes that many of Iran's policies and actions threaten the internal security of its neighbors and the collective stability of the Middle East region. The committee notes that it has held briefings and hearings throughout the last year on a range of security issues involving Iran, including:

(1) Coalition measures to stop Iranian support for insurgents and militias in the Republic of Iraq;

(2) Efforts under the Gulf Security Dialogue to help build stability and security in the Middle East region;

(3) The activities of Iranian Navy's patrol craft in close proximity to U.S. military ships in the Strait of Hormuz;

(4) Iranian conventional military capabilities: and

(5) Iranian nuclear intentions and capabilities as assessed in the November 2007 National Intelligence Estimate.

The committee appreciates the information that has been provided by the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and other federal agencies on Iran. The committee encourages the Department of Defense and other agencies to remain actively engaged with the committee on security matters involving Iran, and to keep the committee fully informed on these matters.

Reconstruction, Security, and Stabilization Assistance

The committee believes that the authority provided in section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Action for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), provides the Department of State with critical resources to engage in reconstruction, security, or stabilization activities. The committee reaffirms that the resources provided under this authority are intended to meet immediate, short-term needs. They are not intended for long-term development programs, even when other funding authorities that currently exist are not sufficient or appropriate. Nor is this authority intended to be used for broader security assistance initiatives that would be better suited for traditional foreign military financing authorities; as stated in the conference report accompanying Public Law 109–163, Congress does not believe it is appropriate to provide long-term funding from the Department of Defense to the Department of State so that the Department of State can fulfill its statutory requirements. Finally, this authority should not be used for broader security assistance programs undertaken under the type of authority provided under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 1206 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

Report on Command and Control Structure for Military Forces Operating in the Republic of Korea

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, by December 1, 2008, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the command and control structure for military forces operating in the Republic of Korea (ROK), which include ROK, U.S., and other international forces, following the U.S. transfer of wartime operational control of ROK forces to the ROK by 2012. The report shall address the command and control structure for such forces in both peacetime and wartime and include a detailed explanation of how such command and control structure achieves unity of command and U.S. security objectives on the Korean peninsula.

Report on Efforts to Train and Equip the Afghan National Security Forces

The committee notes that in recent committee hearings and briefings, senior Department of Defense officials have emphasized

that training and equipping the Afghan National Army and Afghan National Police of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) is a cornerstone of the U.S. strategy in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and a key to success there. The committee is seriously concerned that efforts to train and equip the ANSF continue to be hampered by a chronic shortage of qualified trainers and mentors for the ANSF, and that the ANSF continues to be plagued by corruption, absenteeism, and other problems. The committee urges the Department of Defense to strengthen its efforts to address these problems, and to build and sustain a strong and fully capable ANSF that will be able to independently and effectively conduct operations and maintain long-term security and stability in Afghanistan.

The committee notes that it receives a monthly report from the U.S. Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan (CSTCA–A) on the ANSF, which includes the shortfall of U.S. trainers and mentors for the ANSF. However, the committee notes that the report does not include the shortfall of all personnel required to train, mentor and support the ANSF, which has been the subject of public statements and testimony before the committee by the Secretary of Defense. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the monthly report, beginning on the first month following the date of the enactment of this Act, contains the shortfall of all personnel required to train, mentor, and support the ANSF. The report shall clearly set forth the shortfall of all U.S. personnel, including U.S. personnel that are part of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Operational Mentoring and Liaison Teams (OMLTs) for the Afghan National Army. The report shall also describe the mechanism employed to identify U.S. requirements for ANSF trainers and mentors, and include any commitments from NATO countries for OMLTs. The report shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex if necessary.

The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense, by December 1, 2008, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on any ongoing and planned actions of the Department of Defense to: address the shortfall of U.S. trainers and mentors for the ANSF; encourage NATO countries to fulfill the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) Combined Joint Statement of Requirements (CJSOR) shortfalls for OMLTs; and increase contributions from NATO countries and other international partners for building and sustaining the ANSF.

Review of Provincial Reconstruction Team Personnel and Training, and Department of Defense Measures to Support the Development of a Corps of Civilian and Military Personnel for Future Stabilization and Reconstruction Operations

The committee notes that military and civilian personnel have performed admirably in filling positions on Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRT) in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq. However, the committee is concerned that current civilian and military personnel systems may not be adequate to identify and select personnel to serve on PRTs, recognize and reward the service of those who have volunteered for PRT assignments, or attract qualified personnel with the skills and experience

needed to perform successfully on PRTs in the future. Further, the committee notes that the pre-deployment training for military and civilian personnel serving in PRTs in Afghanistan and Iraq has developed in an ad hoc manner and varies greatly depending on the theater in which the personnel will serve. For example, it appears certain PRT personnel had no pre-deployment PRT mission-specific training requirement.

The committee believes that the United States likely will be called upon again to provide the sustained effort necessary to stabilize and rebuild a nation and that such effort is likely to require a corps of military and civilian personnel with unique skills and expertise. The committee believes that this likelihood mandates that the Department of Defense carefully review the selection, training, and performance of PRT personnel, and begin to consider how to establish and maintain a corps of future commanders, leaders, and other personnel for organizations designed to perform stability and reconstruction missions.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to undertake such a review and submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within six months after the date of enactment of this Act. At a minimum, the report shall include the following:

(1) In the case of military officers and enlisted personnel who served on a PRT, a listing of the types of personnel selected for service as part of a PRT, including information regarding skill sets and experience levels compared to the skill sets and experience levels required by the PRTs; whether the military or civilian skills of reserve component members on PRTs were used to meet PRT requirements and how civilian skills of reservists' were assessed in the selection process; the number and type of decorations and awards received by PRT personnel relative to their peers; promotion, command, or leadership selection for military personnel who served on a PRT relative to their peers; and if credit for serving in a joint or inter-agency billet was provided to personnel who served as part of a PRT.

(2) In the case of Department of Defense civilian personnel who served on a PRT, a listing of the types of personnel selected including information regarding skill and experience levels compared to the skill sets and experience levels required by the PRTs; the number and type of awards received by personnel who served on a PRT relative to their peers; and advanced training, education, and promotion opportunities that were provided following assignment to PRTs, relative to their peers.

(3) A description of Department of Defense plans to work with the Department of State and other federal departments and agencies, as appropriate, to integrate and standardize training for personnel assigned to PRTs in the future, including measures to ensure that both Department of Defense and non-Department of Defense PRT personnel can train together as early in the pre-deployment schedule as possible; measures to ensure that all PRT personnel receive pre-deployment PRT mission-specific training, as appropriate; measures to ensure that in the future PRT personnel would be able to train with the maneuver units with which they would work, where such

is appropriate and practicable; measures to standardize training on force protection and combat life saving skills; measures to ensure the cross-utilization of training facilities for all personnel, including courses offered by the Foreign Service Institute, if appropriate; and measures to ensure that the cost of training personnel and providing personnel to conduct training are shared with other agencies, as required.

(4) A discussion of the Department of Defense consideration of measures to develop a corps of civilian and military personnel for stabilization and reconstruction operations in the future, including potential requirements to develop specific security, stability, transition, and reconstruction (SSTR) operations career tracks for officers, enlisted personnel, and civilian personnel, as well as special skills identifiers or experience identifiers for these assignments; coordination with the Secretary of State to augment exchange programs between the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense, particularly the unified combatant commands; and requirements to provide for the professional education and training of military and civilian personnel and to coordinate the development of inter-agency stability and reconstruction curriculum for use in programs at appropriate educational institutions of the Department of Defense and other agencies.

Security Developments in Pakistan and Implications for Afghanistan

The committee is seriously concerned about instability in Pakistan, which has steeply increased since mid–2007, and the implications for U.S. national security and security in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the region. The committee notes that it has held hearings and briefings throughout the last year on a range of security issues involving Pakistan, including:

(1) The security and stability situation in Pakistan's border areas, and any implications for Afghanistan;

(2) The security of Pakistan's nuclear weapons, including the command and control structure;

(3) U.S. strategy and policy involving Pakistan, in light of Pakistan's recent presidential and parliamentary elections;

(4) Information regarding reported U.S. military involvement in Pakistan, including the status of any conversations with the Pakistani Government, and any Department of Defense plans;

(5) The U.S. Security Development Plan in Pakistan, including efforts to train and equip the Pakistani Frontier Corp and establish Border Coordination Centers; and

(6) Department of Defense Coalition Support Fund reimbursements to Pakistan and the status of efforts relating to section 1232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which includes a requirement for itemized descriptions of such reimbursements to Pakistan.

The committee appreciates the information that has been provided by the Department of Defense and the interagency on Pakistan. The committee encourages the Department of Defense and the interagency to remain actively engaged on security matters in-

volving Pakistan, and to keep the committee fully informed of any significant developments.

Security for Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Iraq

The committee is concerned about Department of Defense plans to provide security for Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) and Provincial Support Teams (PSTs) in certain provinces of the Republic of Iraq after the primary responsibility for security in those provinces is transferred to the Iraqi Government through the Provincial Iraqi Control (PIC) process. The committee also notes that such planning may be further complicated by the expiration of United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1790. Because PRTs and PSTs provide key services, support, and mentoring to the communities in which they operate, their continued presence is integral to the U.S. strategy to improve the delivery of services and the capacity of the Government of Iraq. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on how security will be provided for PRTs and PSTs as provinces transition under the PIC process and under any legal structure that replaces or supersedes UNSCR 1790.

Special Inspector General for Afghanistan

The committee is seriously concerned that the President has not yet appointed a Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR), pursuant to section 1229 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which required such appointment within 30 days after the date of enactment of Public Law 110–181. The committee emphasizes that appointment of the SIGAR is critical, given the need for independent and objective audits of U.S. Government programs and operations for Afghanistan reconstruction. The committee expects the President to appoint the SIGAR at the earliest possible time.

Unity of Command in Provincial Reconstruction Teams

The committee notes that Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) operate under complicated, and at times, unclear chains of command and receive direction from multiple sources. The lack of "unity of command" at every level (tactical, operational, and strategic) has at times resulted in uncoordinated, and perhaps even counterproductive, outcomes.

The committee further notes that "unity of command" is a time-tested principle of military leadership and management that marries accountability with responsibility and provides personnel in the field a clear source of guidance and direction. This principle has corollaries in other activities, both in government and in industry, such as the principle of "line management" which denotes clear lines of authority and direction. The committee strongly recommends that the Department of Defense and the Department of State seek to unify leadership and command within the PRT effort to clarify accountability and authority in the field and that the

President consider whether there is adequate guidance in terms of roles, missions, and leadership responsibilities for United States Government personnel in other zones of conflict.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

Section 1201—Extension of Authority to Build the Capacity of the Pakistan Frontier Corps

This section would amend section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), by extending the authority through fiscal year 2010.

Section 1202—Military-to-Military Contacts and Comparable Activities

This section would amend section 168(e) of title 10, United States Code, so that funds provided under that section in any fiscal year may be used for programs that begin in that fiscal year, but end in the next fiscal year, beginning with fiscal year 2009.

Section 1203—Enhanced Authority to Pay Incremental Expenses for Participation of Developing Countries in Combined Exercises

This section would amend section 2010 of title 10, United States Code, so that funds authorized under that section in any fiscal year are available for programs that begin in that fiscal year, but end in the following fiscal year, starting in fiscal year 2009.

Section 1204—Extension of Temporary Authority to Use Acquisition and Cross-servicing Agreements to Lend Military Equipment for Personnel Protection and Survivability

This section would extend the authority first granted by section 1202 in the John Warner National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), and amended by section 1254 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), from September 30, 2009, to September 30, 2010. This section would add two additional elements to the existing reporting requirement regarding the type and disposition of equipment lent to foreign nations under this authority but not returned to the United States.

Section 1205—One-Year Extension of Authority for Distribution to Certain Foreign Personnel of Education and Training Materials and Information Technology to Enhance Military Interoperability

This section would amend section 1207 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), to extend the authority provided in that section through fiscal year 2009. This section would also prohibit the Secretary of Defense from providing any type assistance under this authority that is otherwise prohibited by law and from providing any type of assistance to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law.

Section 1206—Modification and Extension of Authorities Relating to Program to Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces

This section would amend section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), to provide authority to use funds provided in a fiscal year for programs begun in that fiscal year, but continued into the next fiscal year, beginning with fiscal year 2009. It would extend the authority provided in section 1206 for an additional two years, through fiscal year 2010.

The committee is disappointed to learn that, in the case of assistance provided to the Republic of Panama, the Department of Defense pushed beyond the clearly articulated limits of this authority and is concerned about the responsible execution of this authority in the future. The committee continues to believe that capable foreign partners play a vital role in the international security environment but remain unconvinced that this authority should reside permanently with the Department of Defense. The committee expects that, over the long-term, these "train and equip"-type authorities, which appear to be migrating to the Department of Defense, might better remain within the Department of State's jurisdiction.

The committee believes military-to-military programs are beneficial in fostering a deeper sense of partnership and commitment between the United States, our allies, and friends and therefore encourages the Department of Defense to use members of the United States military to conduct the training provided under this authority whenever possible.

Section 1207—Extension of Authority for Security and Stabilization Assistance

This section would amend section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), by extending the authority from September 30, 2008, to September 30, 2010.

Section 1208—Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism

This section would strike section 1208 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), and amend chapter 3 of title 10, United States Code, to create permanent authority to provide assistance to foreign irregular forces, groups or individuals supporting special operations forces. This section would also authorize an increase from $25.0 million to $35.0 million the annual amount of assistance for activities allowed under this section.

This section would affirm committee support for current and previous activities conducted pursuant to section 1208, as noted above. The committee applauds the achievements resulting from this program.

The committee notes that the activities authorized by this section are not intended to be used for broader security assistance activities or other traditional foreign military financing authorities, such as those provided under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), and as amended.

Section 1209—Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program

This section would amend section 2249c of title 10, United States Code, to increase the authorized annual funding level for the Program from $25.0 million to $35.0 million.

SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

Section 1211—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Certain Purposes Relating to Iraq

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized by this Act or any other act to establish permanent U.S. military installations or bases in the Republic of Iraq or to exercise U.S. control of the oil resources of Iraq. The section would also provide a definition of the term permanent.

Section 1212—Report on Status of Forces Agreements between the United States and Iraq

This section would require the President to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on each agreement between the United States and the Republic of Iraq relating to: the legal status of U.S. military personnel, Department of Defense civilian personnel, and Department of Defense contractor personnel; the establishment of or access to military bases; the rules of engagement under which the U.S. armed forces would operate in Iraq; or any security commitment, arrangement, or assurance that obligates the United States to respond to internal or external threats against Iraq. This section describes the elements of the report. This section would require that if no agreement in these areas has been completed within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall notify the specified congressional committees that no agreement or agreements have been completed and shall submit the required report as soon as practicable after the completion of the agreement or agreements.

Section 1213—Strategy for United States-Led Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Iraq

This section would require that the President establish a strategy to ensure that U.S.-led Provincial Reconstruction Teams, Embedded Provincial Reconstruction Teams, and Provincial Support Teams are supporting the strategic goals of the coalition and establish measures of effectiveness and performance in meeting work plans. This section would also require the President to submit a report 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the implementation of the strategy and monitoring system.

Section 1214—Commanders' Emergency Response Program

This section would amend section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), to modify the authorized level of funding for the activities of the Commanders' Emergency Response Program. This section would authorize $1.7 billion for the activities of this program in fiscal year 2008, and $1.5 billion in fiscal year 2009. This section would also impose a new limitation on the amounts that could be obligated and expended through the Commanders' Emergency Response Program in the Republic of Iraq during fiscal year 2009 of twice the amount obligated during calendar year 2008 by the Government of Iraq through the Government of Iraq Commanders' Emergency Response Program (I–CERP). The section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive this limitation if the Secretary determined that the waiver was required to meet urgent and compelling needs that if unmet, could rationally be expected to lead to increased threats to United States military and civilian personnel and notified the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services of the waiver. The notification of the waiver would also require a discussion of the reasons the waiver was required, efforts undertaken to convince the Government of Iraq to provide funds to meet the unmet needs and why those efforts were unsuccessful, and efforts of the Department of Defense to convince the Government of Iraq to meet such needs in the future.

Section 1215—Performance Monitoring System for United States-led Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan

This section would require the President, acting through the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State, to develop and implement a performance monitoring system for the U.S.-led Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRT) in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The performance monitoring system would include: PRT-specific work plans; comprehensive performance indicators and measures of progress toward sustainable long-term security and stability in Afghanistan; performance standards; and progress goals with a notional timetable for achieving such goals. The requirements for the performance monitoring system would be consistent with the requirements of section 1230 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

This section would further require the President to submit to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a report on the implementation of the performance monitoring system.

Section 1216—Report on Command and Control Structure for Military Forces Operating in Afghanistan

This section would express the sense of Congress that the command structure for military forces operating in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, which consists of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) International Security Assistance (ISAF) forces and separate U.S. forces operating under Operation Enduring Free-

dom (OEF), should be modified to better coordinate and de-conflict military operations and achieve unity of command whenever possible in Afghanistan.

This section would further require the Secretary of Defense, by December 1, 2008, to submit to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs a report on the command and control structure for military forces operating in Afghanistan. The report would include the following:

(1) A detailed description of efforts by the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the senior leaders of NATO ISAF forces, to modify the chain of command structure for military forces operating in Afghanistan to better coordinate and de-conflict military operations and achieve unity of command whenever possible, and the results of such efforts;

(2) A comprehensive assessment of options for improving the command and control structure for military forces operating in Afghanistan, including the establishment of a three-star U.S. headquarters in Kabul, Afghanistan to lead the U.S. forces operating under OEF; to lead country-wide Department of Defense-led initiatives; and to closely coordinate efforts with NATO ISAF, the U.S. embassy in Afghanistan, and other U.S. and international elements in Afghanistan;

(3) A detailed description of any U.S. or NATO ISAF plan or strategy for improving the command and control structure for military forces operating in Afghanistan;

(4) A description of how rules of engagement are determined and managed for U.S. forces operating under NATO ISAF or OEF, and a description of any key differences between rules of engagement for NATO ISAF forces and separate U.S. forces operating under OEF; and

(5) An assessment of how possible modifications to the command and control structure for military forces operating in Afghanistan would impact coordination of military and civilian efforts in Afghanistan.

The committee believes that the restrictive national caveats of NATO ISAF forces, which limit operations in Afghanistan, are a significant obstacle to improving the command and control structure in Afghanistan. In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee expressed strong concern about such national caveats and has not observed significant improvements since that time. The committee emphasizes that the United States must significantly strengthen its efforts to effectively address NATO ISAF national caveats and rules of engagement with NATO ISAF countries.

Section 1217—Report on Enhancing Security and Stability in the Region along the Border of Afghanistan and Pakistan

This section would amend section 1232(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), by adding the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committee to the congressional notification requirement under section 1232(b) relating to Department of De-

fense Coalition Support Funds (CSF) for the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Section 1218—Study and Report on Iraqi Police Training Teams

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Government of Iraq, submit a report concerning the staffing and funding for Police Training Teams in Iraq. This section would require that the report be submitted within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1221—Payment of Personnel Expenses for Multilateral Cooperation Programs

This section would amend section 1051(a) of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense to pay the travel, subsistence, and similar personal expenses of defense personnel of developing countries in connection with the attendance of such personnel at multilateral conferences, seminars, and other similar meetings that are in the national security interests of the United States.

This section also would amend section 1051(b) of title 10, United States Code, to provide new authority for the Secretary of Defense to pay the travel, subsistence, and similar personal expenses of defense personnel of developing countries only in connection with travel to, from, and within the area of responsibility of the combatant commander in which the multilateral conference, seminar, or similar meeting is located. Lastly, this section would make available funds authorized under that section in any fiscal year for programs that begin in that fiscal year, but end in the following fiscal year, beginning with fiscal year 2009.

Section 1222—Extension of Department of Defense Authority to Participate in Multinational Military Centers of Excellence

This section would extend the authority first granted by section 1205 in the John Warner National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) and amended by section 1204 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) through fiscal year 2009.

Section 1223—Study of Limitation on Classified Contracts with Foreign Companies Engaged in Space Business with China

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to study the implications of prohibiting the Department of Defense from obligating or expending funds in fiscal year 2009, or any subsequent fiscal year, on contracts for classified work with a foreign-owned company that is engaged with the People's Republic of China in the development, manufacture, or launch of certain satellites. The prohibition would apply to companies engaged in work involving satellites which are not covered by the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR). This section would allow the Secretary of De-

fense to waive the prohibition on the use of funds if doing so is necessary to protect national security.

This section would require that the Secretary's study be completed within 60 days of the date of enactment of this Act. This section would further authorize and require the Secretary to apply the prohibition on funding if the Secretary determines after performing the study that doing so promotes the national interest. This section would also require the Secretary to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the results of the study and the Secretary's determination.

Section 1224—Sense of Congress and Congressional Briefings on Readiness of the Armed Forces and Report on Nuclear Weapons Capabilities of Iran

This section expresses the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should return the armed forces to a state of full readiness so that they are fully prepared to execute the National Military Strategy. It would require the Secretary of Defense to provide semiannual briefings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on matters pertaining to the preparation for the full range of contingencies that could occur in the Middle East region. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit a detailed annual report addressing the current and future nuclear weapons capabilities of the Islamic Republic of Iran and provide a notification to Congress when Iran has produced enough enriched uranium or plutonium for a nuclear weapon.

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

OVERVIEW

The budget request for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program contained $414.1 million for fiscal year 2009, representing a decrease of $13.9 million from the amount authorized in fiscal year 2008, excluding any supplemental funds. This request contained the following decreases: $12.9 million for strategic offensive arms elimination in the Russian Federation; $23.5 million for nuclear weapons storage security in Russia; $6.0 million for chemical weapons destruction; and $10.0 million for new CTR initiatives. The request also contained the following increases: $6.4 million for strategic nuclear arms elimination in Ukraine; $3.1 million for nuclear weapons transportation security in Russia; $26.0 million for biological threat reduction in states of the former Soviet Union (FSU); $2.3 million for weapons of mass destruction proliferation prevention in the FSU; and $0.8 million for other assessments and administrative costs.

The committee fully supports the goals of the CTR Program and continues to believe the Program is critical to U.S. national security and must be a top priority. In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee expressed concern that a lack of effective policy guidance and leadership, as well as programmatic

and funding constraints, have limited the progress of the CTR Program in recent years. The committee further noted that although the CTR Program has made significant progress over the last 10 years, much remains to be done, and emphasized that there must be a strong national commitment to reinvigorate the CTR Program.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) addressed these concerns by: repealing limitations on the use of CTR funds; expanding CTR authority outside the FSU; and increasing CTR funding by $80.0 million above the budget request for fiscal year 2008, including $10.0 million for new CTR initiatives. Public Law 110–181 also required: reports by the National Academy of Sciences and the Secretary of Defense on the development of new CTR initiatives; a report by the Secretary of Defense regarding efforts to complete the chemical weapons destruction project at Shchuch'ye, Russia; and included other provisions to ensure that wherever possible, the CTR Program addresses threats involving nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

The committee also notes that the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53), passed in the 110th Congress by both the House and Senate as H.R. 1 and commonly known as "the 9/11 bill," included a number of provisions and authorized funding to accelerate, strengthen, and expand the CTR Program.

The committee believes there are additional opportunities for the CTR Program to address the wide variety of global threats arising from the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise. The committee believes the CTR Program would continue to benefit from increased funding to develop new initiatives to address such threats.

The committee authorizes $445.1 million, an increase of $31.0 million from the budget request for fiscal year 2009, which includes an increase of $10.0 million for new CTR initiatives that are outside the scope of existing activities and may include activities within Russia and the FSU, as well as outside the FSU.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Biological Threat Reduction

The committee notes that the Biological Threat Reduction Program (BTRP) of the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program has evolved from its original focus on dismantlement activities to a more comprehensive approach for reducing the full spectrum of biological threats. As a result, in recent years, the Department of Defense has significantly increased the amount of funds requested for BTRP activities relative to other areas of CTR work.

The committee recognizes the importance of biological threat reduction activities to U.S. national security interests and believes the United States should be actively engaged in this area. However, the committee also believes that BTRP activities should be guided by a more comprehensive long-term inter-agency strategy for biological threat reduction and require: more robust inter-agency engagement and coordination; more rigorous Department of Defense management and oversight; better coordination and integra-

tion with other Department of Defense programs and activities; and concrete metrics for measuring BTRP progress.

These concerns are consistent with findings and recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences report required by section 1304 of the John Warmer National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–163) on BTRP activities. The committee also notes that the Secretary of Defense submitted an accompanying report to the committee on April 4, 2008, which stated support for key recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences with respect to BTRP activities and described planned actions to implement such recommendations.

The committee encourages actions by the Secretary of Defense to strengthen BTRP activities, particularly in the area of inter-agency engagement and coordination to ensure that the Department of Defense is the appropriate agency to undertake specific biological threat reduction activities. The committee also strongly encourages the Department to maintain a strong focus within the CTR Program on other threat reduction challenges, including preventing the proliferation of chemical and nuclear weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

Shchuch'ye Chemical Weapons Destruction Project

The committee continues to believe that completion of the chemical weapons destruction project in the Russian Federation at Shchuch'ye should be a high priority for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program. On May 23, 2007, the United States signed an agreement with the Russian Federation that significantly changed the strategy for the Shchuch'ye project and project implementation. Given these changes, the committee is conducting vigorous oversight on the project.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required a report from the Secretary of Defense on the Shchuch'ye project, which included a current and detailed cost estimate for project completion and a specific strategic and operating plan for project completion, which sets forth: plans for project management and oversight; quality assurance and sustainability measures; metrics for measuring project progress; and a projected completion date. Public Law 110–181 also urged the Secretary to take all necessary steps to ensure successful project completion so that the Shchuch'ye facility can begin to destroy the stockpile of Russian chemical weapons as soon as possible.

The committee has reviewed the report on the Shchuch'ye project, submitted by the Secretary as Appendix G to the Fiscal Year 2009 CTR Annual Report to Congress, but remains concerned about project completion. The committee expects the Secretary to keep the committee fully informed of significant developments with respect to the project, and continues to urge the Secretary to take all necessary steps to successfully complete the project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would define the programs and funds that are Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs and funds as those authorized to be appropriated in section 1301 of this Act and specify that CTR funds shall remain available for obligation for three fiscal years.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate specific amounts for each program element under the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program from within the overall $445.1 million that the committee would authorize for the CTR Program. The allocation under this section reflects an $31.0 million increase from the budget request of $414.1 million for fiscal year 2009 as follows: $20.0 million for weapons of mass destruction proliferation prevention in Kazakhstan; $1.0 million for chemical weapons destruction; and $10.0 million to develop new CTR initiatives that are outside the scope of existing CTR activities and may include activities carried out in Russia and the former Soviet Union (FSU) or outside the FSU. This section would also require notification to Congress 30 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2009 funds for purposes other than those specifically authorized. In addition, this section would provide limited authority to obligate amounts for a program element under the CTR Program in excess of the amount specifically authorized for that purpose.

Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS			
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS			
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	198,150		198,150
DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY	1,291,084		1,291,084
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND			
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	1,962,253	-560,700	1,401,553
MPF (F)	[348,281]	[-348,281]	
T-AKE	[962,360]		
T-AKE Program Increase		[278,244]	
Post Delivery & Outfitting	[36,312]		
National Defense Sealift Vessel	[6,500]		
LMSR Maintenance	[94,029]		
DOD Mobilization Alterations	[142,685]		
T-AH Maintenance	[26,247]		

Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
NAVSEA R&D	[68,663]		
NAVSEA R&D Transfer to PE 0604567N		[-68,663]	
NDRF / RRF O&M	[277,176]		
Program Decrease		[-422,000]	
DEFENSE COALITION SUPPORT FUND			
DEFENSE COALITION SUPPORT FUND	22,000		22,000
NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE TRANSACTION FUND			
NDSTF TRANSFER	-1,300,000		-1,300,000
Total Revolving and Management Funds	**2,173,487**	**-560,700**	**1,612,787**
MILITARY PROGRAMS			
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM O&M	24,301,359	-42,330	24,259,029
Restore military to civilian conversions (transfer to Milpers)		[-101,085]	
Madigan Medical Center Trauma Assistance Program		[2,000]	

Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Fort Drum Regional Health Planning Organization		[800]	
Unobligated Balances Defense Health Program		[-260,000]	
Mandate DOD School of Nursing		[4,000]	
Temporary Prohibition on TRICARE Pharamcy Copayments		[65,000]	
One-year extension of Prohibtion on TRICARE Health Fees		[49,000]	
Requirement to Recalculate TRICARE Reserve Select		[3,000]	
Increase Full Time Support Authorization Army NG		[10,000]	
Increase Full Time Support Authorization Army Reserves		[2,955]	
Chiropratic Services to All Active Duty Service Members		[3,000]	
Preventive Health Care Co-Pay Initiative		[130,000]	
Preventive Health Care for TRICARE for Life		[10,000]	
Military Health Risk Management		[2,000]	
Smoking Cessation TRICARE Program		[20,000]	
Smoking Cessation TRICARE for Life Program		[3,000]	
Preventive Health Allowance		[3,000]	
DOD-VA IT Medical Information Sharing Project		[1,500]	
Wide Angel Virtual Environment for USUHS		[7,000]	
Nursing Virtual Simulation Labortory		[2,500]	
DHP LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL (TRICARE COST SHARING)	-1,184,000	1,184,000	

Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM R&D	193,938	4,800	198,738
PULSE!! Virtual Clinical Learning Lab		[1,000]	
US Army Medical Research and Material Command		[1,000]	
Copper Antimicrobial Research Program		[2,800]	
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM PROCUREMENT	303,905	-15,500	288,405
Reduction in ALHTA Block 3		[-15,500]	
Total Defense Health Program	**23,615,202**	**1,130,970**	**24,746,172**
CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	1,152,668		1,152,668
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDT&E	268,881		268,881
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	64,085		64,085
Total Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction	**1,485,634**		**1,485,634**
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES			
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	1,060,463		1,060,463
International Support		[-5,000]	
Southwestern Border Fence		[5,000]	
Total Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities	**1,060,463**		**1,060,463**

Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	246,445	24,000	270,445
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	1,400	2,000	3,400
Total Office of the Inspection General	**247,845**	**26,000**	**273,845**
CIVIL PROGRAMS			
Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600, Non-Add)	[63,010]		[63,010]
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**28,582,631**	**596,270**	**29,178,901**

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Advance Procurement Funding for Dry-Cargo Ammunition Ships (T–AKE)

The budget request contained $962.4 million in National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF) budget line item (BLI) 0120 for the purchase of two dry-cargo ammunition ships (T–AKE) vessels in fiscal year 2009. The committee notes that one of these vessels was requested in fiscal year 2008. That request was authorized and appropriated, but subsequently the Department of the Navy did not execute the funding provided for procurement of the requested vessel.

The committee also notes that the Department has revised the long range shipbuilding plan eliminating the final two vessels of the T–AKE class from the construction schedule. The committee disagrees with this course of action.

The committee recommends an increase of $300.0 million in NDSF BLI 0120, and authorizes those funds for use to procure long lead material necessary for construction of the last two vessels of the T–AKE class.

Use of the National Defense Sealift Fund for Procurement of New Construction Vessels in the Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future)

The budget request contained $68.7 million in the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF), Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA), Reasearch and Development (R&D), budget line item (BLI) 0900, for research and development efforts associated with the Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future).

The committee understands that current law allows the use of the NDSF for research and development efforts for the construction of national defense sealift vessels. However, the committee believes that funding for research and development efforts for ships specifically constructed as Department of Defense sealift vessels more appropriately belongs in the appropriation Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy (RDTE, N).

The committee authorizes $68.7 million, the amount of the budget request for research and development for the NDSF (NAVSEA R&D BLI 0900), but recommends a transfer of the funding to PE 0604567N, Ship Contract Design/Live Fire Test and Evaluation, in RDTE, N.

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY PROGRAMS

Section 1401—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize $1.5 billion for Working Capital Funds.

Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund

This section would authorize $1.4 billion for the National Defense Sealift Fund.

Section 1403—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize fiscal year 2009 funds for the Defense Health Program and other programs.

The budget request contained $15.5 million for procurement of dental modules of the Armed Forces Health Longitudinal Technology Application (AHLTA).

The committee is concerned about the recent decision made by Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs to postpone deployment of AHLTA Block 4 in favor of consolidating deployment of AHLTA Block 3. The committee is aware that there were significant concerns regarding Block 3 because user interface concerns have impeded use by practitioners. Those concerns were to be rectified in Block 4, and would likely have contributed to more widespread support of the system. The committee believes that this decision should be justified, and a path forward for deployment of Block 4 clearly articulated to the committee before further development of the system proceeds.

The committee recommends a decrease of $15.5 million from the funds available for procurement.

Section 1404—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense

This section would authorize $1.5 billion for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense.

Section 1405—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize $1.1 billion for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities.

Section 1406—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize $273.1 million for the Department of Defense Inspector General. This represents an increase of $24.0 million for operations and maintenance and $2.0 million for research and development. This increase would support increased audit, inspection policy oversight, and investigative efforts.

SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $41.2 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction fund for the operations and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2009. This section would also permit the use of additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions 45 days after Congress receives notification.

Section 1412—Revisions to Previously Authorized Disposals from the National Defense Stockpile

This section would authorize revisions on limitations in asset sales contained in section 3303(a)(7) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law

105–261), as most recently amended by section 1412(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

This section would further authorize revisions on the Fiscal Year 1998 disposal authority contained in section 3305(a)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as most recently amended by section 3302(b) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

SUBTITLE C—ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

Section 1421—Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize over $63.0 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2009.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1431—Inapplicability of Executive Order 13457

This section would make Executive Order 13457, "Protecting American Taxpayers from Government Spending on Wasteful Earmarks," inapplicable to this Act or to the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying this Act or to the committee reports of Senate Committee on Armed Services or the House Committee on Armed Services which accompany this Act.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

OVERVIEW

The committee notes that section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) requires the budget submission to Congress for each fiscal year to include:

(1) A request for the appropriation of funds for ongoing operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan;

(2) An estimate of all funds expected to be required in that fiscal year for operations; and

(3) A detailed justification of the funds requested.

The budget request for fiscal year 2008 complied with these requirements.

The committee is concerned that the budget request for fiscal year 2009 did not comply with the requirements of section 1008. Instead, the budget request included $70.0 billion for ongoing military operations with no supporting details or justification materials. However, the Secretary of Defense presented testimony to the committee that the Department of Defense anticipated a requirement for as much as $170.0 billion to fully fund ongoing military operations in fiscal year 2009.

The committee understands that on May 2, 2008, the President transmitted to Congress amendments to the FY 2009 budget totaling $70.0 billion. The budget amendments distributed the $70.0 billion previously submitted by appropriations accounts, but did not include detailed justification materials. The committee is disappointed that the amended budget request still does not comply with section 1008.

The committee notes that it is the policy of the U.S. House of Representatives, as stated in section 502 of the FY 2009 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 312) as passed by the House, that "the Administration's budget requests should comply with section 1008 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), and that the Administration should no longer attempt to fund overseas military operations through emergency supplemental appropriations requests." The committee strongly supports this policy.

The committee further notes that the fiscal year 2009 concurrent resolution on the budget included $70.0 billion for Overseas Deployments and Other Activities. In accordance with the budget resolution, the committee recommends authorization of $70.0 billion for ongoing military operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan during fiscal year 2009 to assure no disruption during the Presidential transition. In the coming months, the committee expects to receive a full-year budget request and associated budget justification materials for ongoing military operations. The committee intends to address the full-year budget request for ongoing military operations as part of this Act prior to its enactment.

SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS

The following table summarizes authorizations included in the bill for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Title XV -- Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom

(Dollars in Thousdands)

Program Title	House Authorized
Procurement	
Aircraft Procurement, Army	84,000
Procurement of WTCV, Army	822,674
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	46,500
Other Procurement, Army	1,255,050
Counter-Rocket, Artillery Munitions Program	[246,000]
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	2,496,300
JIEDDF, Transfer from Title I	[496,300]
Aerial Reconnaissance Multi-Sensor Platforms	[50,000]
Other Procurement, Navy	476,248
P-3C Zone 5 Repair	[448,300]
Procurement, Marine Corps	565,425
Logistics Vehicle Sys Rep, Transfer from Title I	[178,038]
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	4,624,842
F-22 Advanced Procurement (APAF-4)	[523,000]
15 C-17 Aircraft (APAF-5)	[3,900,000]
Other Procurement, Air Force	1,500,644
Procurement, Defense-Wide.	177,237
Rapid Acquisition Fund	102,000
Rapid Acq Fund, Transfer from Title I	[102,000]
Subtotal, Procurement	**12,150,920**
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	
RDT&E, Navy	113,228
RDT&E, Air Force	72,041
RDT&E, Defense-Wide	202,559
Special Operations Command radar warning	[74,800]
Multi-Band Multi-Mission Radio	[9,500]
Subtotal, RDT&E	**387,828**
Operation and Maintenance	
O&M, Army	37,363,243
Battle Command Training Capability	[32,000]
Combat Tng Cter support for Ex Tng Capability	[98,000]
Ground OPTEMPO	[350,000]
UH-60 Recap (20 Aircraft)	[113,000]
War Reserve Secondary Items -- Prepo Stocks	[150,000]

Title XV -- Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom

(Dollars in Thousdands)

Program Title	House Authorized
Depot Maintenance – Aircraft End Items	[291,404]
Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization	[500,000]
Human Terrain Teams	[90,600]
O&M, Navy	3,500,000
Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization	[50,000]
O&M, Marine Corps	2,900,000
Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization	[50,000]
O&M, Air Force	5,000,000
Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization	[50,000]
U-2 Dragon Lady Operating Funds	[142,000]
O&M, Defense-Wide	2,648,569
O&M, Army Reserve	79,291
O&M, Navy Reserve	42,490
O&M, Marine Corps Reserve	47,076
O&M, Air Force Reserve	12,376
O&M, Army National Guard	333,540
O&M, Air National Guard	52,667
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	**51,979,252**
Military Personnel	**1,194,000**
Pay Raise	[28,000]
Other Authorizations	
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	2,000,000
Iraq Security Forces Fund	1,000,000
Defense Health Program	1,100,000
Ctr for Excellence on Hearing Loss and Auditory Sys Injuries	[5,000]
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	188,000
Subtotal, Other Authorizations	**4,288,000**
Transfer Authority (non-add)	[4,000,000]
Mine Resistant Ambush Protection Vehicle Fund (non-add)	[2,610,000]
Total	**70,000,000**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Army Aircraft Repair and Recapitalization

The committee is concerned that the continued stress of combat operations coupled with battle losses is reducing the readiness of Army aviation. The committee is recommending increases to improve repair and recapitalization of aviation assets to strengthen Army readiness.

The committee recommends $291.4 million to inspect, overhaul, and repair crash damage on AH–64D, CH–47D, UH–60, MH–47, and MH–60K helicopters. Additionally, the committee recommends $113.0 million to support the recapitalization of 20 UH–60 aircraft.

Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Operations Integration Center

The committee is encouraged by efforts at the Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Operations Integration Center (COIC) to provide effective reach-back capability for warfighters in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The ability to fuse intelligence from national agencies with data from tactical assets to provide timely operational support to ongoing missions is a model that is more relevant to the current and future threat environment than the predominant mechanisms developed during the Cold War.

The committee is concerned that the capabilities of the COIC may be duplicative with other similar organizations within the military services and defense agencies. The committee directs the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing COICs functions and how they are deconflicted with other similar efforts within the Department of Defense and the intelligence community. This report shall be due within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) A description of the capabilities provided by the COIC, including both technical capabilities such as data links and processing systems, as well as analytical capabilities;

(2) What similar capabilities exist within the military services, combatant commands and intelligence community, and how they complement or duplicate the capabilities of the COIC;

(3) What unique capabilities exist within the COIC that are not duplicated anywhere else within the military services, combatant commands or intelligence community;

(4) What measures the COIC has taken to coordinate its efforts with these other entities (including, but not limited to, personnel exchanges, liaison assignments, and information exchanges);

(5) What processes are in place to examine capabilities on a continuous and ongoing basis to guard against unwarranted duplication or redundancy; and

(6) What actions are being taken to institutionalize processes and knowledge to ensure that long-term knowledge is preserved in the governmental personnel base.

Counter Rockets, Artillery, and Mortars Program

The budget request contained no funds for the Counter-Rockets, Artillery, and Mortars (C–RAM) program.

The committee notes the remarkable and unprecedented success of C–RAM systems in protecting forward operating bases in Iraq. According to field commanders, C–RAM is a force multiplier that is saving lives. The committee understands that in response to a Joint Urgent Operational Need Statement (JUONS), the C–RAM program office developed an architecture utilizing existing platforms that provides significant enhanced capabilities to our forward operating bases. This capability was designated the Integrated Base Defense System of Systems (IBDSoS).

The committee recommends $246.0 million, an increase of $246.0 million, for C–RAM in order to meet the targeting and surveillance requirements of forward operating bases in Iraq and Afghanistan requested by United States Central Command in the recently approved Base Expeditionary Targeting and Surveillance System—Combined JUONS by utilizing and fielding the IBDSoS as soon as possible. The capability to be provided will be the combat-proven IBDSoS capability that is being fielded by the C–RAM program office. IBDSoS capability provided to Iraq and Afghanistan will include installation, training, support, and integration with command and control systems as required by theater.

F–22

The fiscal year 2009 budget request did not include any funds for advance procurement of an additional lot of F–22s. The F–22 is a multi-mission fighter aircraft that combines a low-observable radar signature with an ability to cruise at supersonic speeds without the use of thrust augmentation, and performs air dominance, homeland and cruise missile defense, and air-to-ground attack missions.

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force asserts a requirement for 381 F–22 aircraft, but that officials in the Office of the Secretary of Defense conclude that a force structure of 183 aircraft will be sufficient to meet requirements of the National Military Strategy.

The committee understands and supports the Department of the Air Force requirement for 381 F–22 aircraft, and therefore recommends an increase of $523.0 million for the advance procurement of an additional lot of 20 aircraft in fiscal year 2010. The committee strongly encourages the Department of the Air Force to include the budget necessary to fully fund 20 F–22 aircraft in its fiscal year 2010 budget request.

Global Improvised Explosive Device Threat Estimate

Experiences in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) have illustrated the diffusion and proliferation of improvised explosive device (IED) designs, tactics, and supporting technologies. The Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) was established to handle this threat, and has invested significantly in developing countermeasures to IEDs.

OIF and OEF have also illustrated how effective an asymmetric tactic such as IEDs can be against the United States military. Even as the U.S. involvement in these wars diminishes, it is likely

that other potential adversaries in other regions of the world will have noted the tactical efficacy of IEDs in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. In order to benefit from the lessons learned, U.S. military services and intelligence agencies should now begin to analyze the threat posed by the proliferation of IED technologies and tactics, particularly related to potential future conflict zones.

The committee directs the Director of JIEDDO to provide a report, which shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, on the projected IED threat for each combatant command area of responsibility through the year 2018. The preparation of this report shall be led by JIEDDO, but coordinated with all of the military services, combatant commands and the Intelligence Community, including those responsible for domestic homeland security and law enforcement activities. As needed, the team leading this effort should be multidisciplinary and include participants from scientific and engineering organizations.

While not limited to the following items, the IED estimate should include:

(1) IED operational capability and employment trends by terrorist groups, with emphasis on areas outside of Iraq and Afghanistan;

(2) Technology trends related to deception, triggers, energetics, and other trends;

(3) Red team scenarios that explore attack tactics, techniques, and procedures as they might be implemented by various non-state actors in each combatant command's areas of responsibility; and

(4) Countermeasures development and deployment.

Increased Army Training

The committee is concerned about the declining readiness posture of Army units. Department of Defense readiness reports indicate that every non-deployed Army and Army National Guard combat brigade would face significant challenges completing their assigned full-spectrum combat missions if they were called upon to fight. The Army is expending significant effort preparing units for combat, and Army training is focusing heavily on counter-insurgency operations, resulting in an overall reduction of full-spectrum mission capability. The committee is concerned about the Army's degraded capabilities and urges the Secretary of Defense to take every measure possible to restore full combat capability and reduce strategic risk.

The committee is recommending funds in several areas to increase training and begin to restore lost full-spectrum capabilities. The committee recommends $350.0 million for increased ground operations tempo to support additional training of non-deployed units. The committee also recommends $98.0 million for exportable training programs from the combat training centers to enhance unit training at home station. Additionally, the committee recommends $32.0 million to increase Battle Command Training Capability.

Iraq Security Forces Fund

The committee notes that the amended budget request for fiscal year 2009 included $2.0 billion for the Iraq Security Forces Fund (ISFF). The committee recommends $1.0 billion for ISFF. The committee believes that the Government of Iraq should assume greater responsibility for funding activities associated with building and supporting the Iraqi Security Forces. The committee therefore has prohibited the use of U.S.-provided funds in the ISFF for the construction or rehabilitation of infrastructure as the committee believes that the Government of Iraq should more properly conduct this function. The committee believes that the funds provided will be sufficient to conduct those activities necessary under the ISFF. However, the committee also expects that the President will make a further budget request to support ongoing operations in fiscal year 2009 and will continue to monitor the need for additional funds for the ISFF.

Human Terrain Team Support

The committee supports the concept for the prototype Human Terrain Teams (HTT) currently supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. HTTs have been instrumental in saving the lives of coalition troops by reducing casualties among Afghani and Iraqi civilians. HTTs provide our warfighters with non-kinetic options in planning and carrying out their missions. The committee is aware that the first prototype HTT is credited with reducing kinetic operations by more than 60 percent during its first 6 months of deployment in Operation Enduring Freedom. HTTs are critical enablers to shaping military planning in pre-conflict environments, and are supportive of reconstruction and stabilization efforts. HTTs are currently proving their value in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the committee believes that capability would prove equally valuable in other combatant command areas of responsibility.

The committee recommends $90.6 million in Operation and Maintenance for the purpose of fielding additional HTTs to meet the current Central Command requirement of 26 teams. The committee encourages the Department to begin training, equipping, deploying, and sustaining human terrain teams with other regional combatant commands to include at least one each for Pacific Command, Southern Command, and Africa Command.

Production Rates of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles

The committee is concerned that all industrial facilities that are currently producing mine resistant ambush protected vehicles (MRAP) are not operating at maximum capacity. This is troublesome because these vehicles have been proven to save lives in combat. The committee notes the extraordinary effort it took to produce 8,000 MRAPs for the theater of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan in just 17 months since the Secretary of Defense made this program his top procurement priority.

However, the committee believes these vehicles are not being built in sufficient quantity to supply the troops in The Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and to supply vehicles for training facilities in the United States as quickly as pos-

sible. The committee believes strongly that troops in pre-deployment training for service in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan should have the ability to train in the same types of equipment that they will use while deployed in combat theaters of operation.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report on the current status of production of the MRAP vehicles that details the current and projected output of vehicles at each MRAP production facility, and the overall maximum capacity of the facility. The report should identify any additional funding necessary to complete production of the validated MRAP vehicle requirement. Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary to report on the plans, if any, to field these vehicles to training facilities to allow familiarization training prior to deployment to the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee expects this information from the Secretary as soon as practicable either by direct briefing from representative of the Secretary or by written report.

Special Operations Command Aircraft Radar Warning Receivers

The budget request contained $52.0 million for rotary wing upgrades and sustainment but contained no funding to replace existing aircraft survivability equipment (ASE) onboard MM–60 aircraft.

The committee understands that existing ASE systems aboard 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (Airborne) assets are inadequate to meet the current threat. The committee further understands that the AN/ALQ–211 suite of integrated radio frequency countermeasures (SIRFC) is under development to meet the threat. The committee recognizes that this is an unfunded requirement for Special Operations Command, supports the effort to upgrade the entire 160th fleet with SIRFC, as appropriate, and urges further acquisition of these systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $74.8 million to procure and field SIRFC systems onboard MM–60 aircraft.

Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization

The construction required to support the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment decisions, concurrent with the Grow the Force Initiative have put severe strain on military infrastructure. This strain was recently recognized in an Army barracks review that noted significant quality of life issues for our soldiers at multiple installations. In order to address the quality of life at Army installations, the Army has embarked on an expansive barracks modernization program to recapitalize older infrastructure and has elected to concentrate recapitalization efforts initially on permanent party barracks. At the same time, the Army has placed the lowest priority on recruit training and Advanced Individual Training barracks. These barracks are in a severe state of dilapidation and require a significant investment to arrest the continued deterioration. Unfortunately, the Department has decided not to request Operations and Maintenance funds to support Army Restoration and Modernization projects for fiscal year 2009. If enacted, this budget request would continue to exacerbate the accelerated decline of infrastructure in the Army.

Additionally, the Department continues to rely heavily on relocatable facilities to augment basing decisions and accelerate rebasing requirements. While the decisions to use relocatable facilities are effective in the short-term, many of these temporary facilities remain in use well beyond their effective life because the Department has not programmed sufficient, permanent facilities. While temporary, relocatable structures may be appropriate to support short-term mission requirements, they are not acceptable to use when better, long-term solutions can save money and provide better quality of life support for our soldiers and Marines.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $650.0 million to the Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization account allocated as follows: $500.0 million to support Army Facilities Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization; $50.0 million to support Air Force Facilities Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization; $50.0 million to support Navy Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization; and $50.0 million to support Marine Corps Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, by March 1, 2009, the Department's plan to replace temporary, relocatable facilities with permanent facilities by fiscal year 2015.

War Reserve Secondary Items—Prepositioned Stocks

The committee continues to be concerned about the status of prepositioned stocks of combat equipment. The Army has drawn down these stocks to support ongoing operations and to fill shortfalls across the force. This drawdown has increased the time it would take to deploy equipment to a contingency. The committee strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to work aggressively to restore the prepositioned stocks.

The committee recommends an additional $150.0 million to support the purchase of war reserve secondary items to fill the Army prepositioned stocks shortages.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1501—Purpose

This section would establish this title and make authorization of appropriations available upon enactment of this Act for the Department of Defense, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide for additional costs due to the Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Section 1502—Army Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $2.2 billion for Army procurement.

Section 1503—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $1.0 billion for Navy and Marine Corps procurement.

Section 1504—Air Force Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $6.1 billion for Air Force procurement.

Section 1505—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $177.2 million for Defense-Wide Activities procurement.

Section 1506—Rapid Acquisition Fund

This section would authorize an additional $102.0 million for the Rapid Acquisition Fund.

Section 1507—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

This section would authorize an additional $2.5 billion for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund. This section would require that of the funds appropriated to the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund, $50.0 million shall be made available for the rapid fielding of additional Aerial Reconnaissance Multi-Sensor platforms for tactical operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Section 1508—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for the Joint Improvised Explosive Devices Defeat Organization Pending Notification to Congress

This section would limit the amount of funds that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Office (JIEDDO) may obligate for science and technology until the committee is provided JIEDDO's science and technology roadmap.

The committee is aware that JIEDDO has been funding science and technology (S&T) efforts over the past three years to address the challenge of improvised explosive devices. Early investments were driven more by operational necessity than by a carefully considered strategic plan.

As the wars in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan have matured, the committee has grown more concerned that the lack of such an investment strategy is becoming a significant hindrance. It hinders the Department of Defense as it coordinates S&T across the services and agencies, it hinders Congress in providing oversight and accountability, and it hinders the industrial sector due to the lack of visibility into the needs of JIEDDO and the Department.

The committee understands that JIEDDO has been preparing an S&T investment strategy that has undergone several iterations and has been in a review and approval process for several months. The committee believes that JIEDDO must put greater emphasis on issuing an S&T investment strategy that is both timely and distributed to as wide a community as possible.

Section 1509—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

This section would authorize an additional $387.8 million for research, development, test and evaluation.

Section 1510—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize an additional $52.0 billion for operations and maintenance programs.

Section 1511—Other Department of Defense Programs

This section would authorize an additional $1.3 billion to other Department of Defense programs.

Section 1512—Iraq Security Forces Fund

This section would authorize an additional $1.0 billion to the Iraq Security Forces Fund. This section would also prohibit the use of monies in this fund for construction purposes.

Section 1513—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

This section would authorize an additional $2.0 billion to the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund.

Section 1514—Military Personnel

This section would authorize an additional $1.2 billion for military personnel.

Section 1515—Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund

This section would authorize the transfer of $2.6 billion, by transfer, into the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund.

Section 1516—Special Transfer Authority

This section would authorize the transfer of up to an additional $4.0 billion of war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title.

Section 1517—Treatment as Additional Authorizations

This section would state that amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

TITLE XVI—RECONSTRUCTION AND STABILIZATION CIVILIAN MANAGEMENT

OVERVIEW

This title would incorporate the text of H.R. 1084 of the 110th Congress, which passed the House of Representatives on March 7, 2008. The report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1084 (H. Rept. 110–537) should be considered the definitive explanation of this title. It would amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2351 et seq.) to authorize the President to furnish assistance, of up to $100.0 million a year in fiscal years 2008–2010, following pre-notification to Congress, for stabilizing and reconstructing a country or region that is in, or is in transition from, conflict or civil strife. It would establish an Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization within the Department of State to conduct reconstruction and stabilization operations. It

would authorize the Secretary of State to establish and maintain a response readiness corps and a civilian reserve corps and would authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary during fiscal years 2007–2010 for personnel, education and training, equipment, travel, and deployment costs.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1601—Short Title

This section would provide that the title may be referred to as the "Reconstruction and Stabilization Civilian Management Act of 2008."

Section 1602—Findings

This section would contain congressional findings describing efforts to improve the United States' capacity to respond to stabilization and reconstruction operations, including the establishment of the Office of the Coordinator for Stabilization and Reconstruction in June 2004, the issuance of the National Security Presidential Directive 44 which instructed the Secretary of State to coordinate and lead integrated United States Government efforts to prepare, plan for, and conduct stabilization and reconstruction operations, and release of Department of Defense Directive 3000.05 which established that stability operations are a core United States military mission that the Department of Defense must be prepared to conduct and support.

Section 1603—Definitions

This section provides definitions for use in the Act.

Section 1604—Authority to Provide Assistance for Reconstruction and Stabilization Crises

This section would amend chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by adding a new section 618—Assistance for a Reconstruction and Stabilization Crisis—which provides that the President may, in accordance with section 614(a)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act, and subject to pre-notification requirements and notwithstanding any other provision of law, furnish assistance to a country or region that is at risk of, in, or is in transition from, conflict or civil strife for stabilization or reconstruction if the President determines that it is in the national security interests of the United States for U.S. civilian agencies or non-federal employees to assist in stabilizing or reconstructing such country or region. This new section 618 would prohibit the President from providing stabilization and reconstruction assistance unless Congress is notified five working days before such assistance is provided. This section would also allow funds to be made available (subject to the same pre-notification requirements) for stabilization and reconstruction assistance under any other provision of law and under provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 that are transferred or reprogrammed for the purpose of carrying out stabilization and reconstruction assistance.

Section 1605—Reconstruction and Stabilization

This section would amend title I of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 by adding a new section 62, which would establish the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization within the Department of State and creates the Response Readiness Corps

Section 1606—Authorities Related to Personnel

This section would authorize the Secretary of State, or the head of any U.S. agency with respect to personnel of that agency, to extend to any individual assigned, detailed, or deployed under this Act certain death gratuity, training, and travel expense benefits or privileges that are provided to members of the Foreign Service under the Foreign Service Act of 1980.

Section 1607—Reconstruction and Stabilization Strategy

This section would require the Secretary of State to develop an inter-agency strategy to respond to stabilization and reconstruction operations which would include, but not be limited to: the identification of, and efforts to improve, the skills set needed to respond to and support stabilization and reconstruction operations; the identification of specific agencies that can adequately satisfy such skills sets; efforts to increase training of federal civilian personnel to carry out stabilization and reconstruction activities; efforts to develop a database of proven and best practices based on previous stabilization and reconstruction operations; and a plan to coordinate the activities of agencies involved in stabilization and reconstruction operations.

Section 1608—Annual Reports to Congress

This section would require the Secretary of State to submit a report on the implementation of this Act to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

PURPOSE

Division B provides military construction, family housing, and related authorities in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2009. As recommended by the committee, Division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $24,400,239,000 for construction in support of the active forces, reserve components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2009.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense requested $11,738,021,000 for military construction, $9,458,763,000 for Base Closure and Realign-

ment (BRAC) activities, and $3,203,455,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends authorization of $11,831,930,000 for military construction, $9,458,763,000 for BRAC activities, and $3,166,455,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2009. The committee's recommendations are consistent with a total budget authority level of $24,400,239,000 for military construction, BRAC, and family housing in fiscal year 2009.

SUMMARY OF FY 2009 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army	4,615,920	29,616	4,645,536
Navy	3,096,399	141,210	3,237,609
Air Force	934,892	41,632	976,524
Defense Agencies	1,783,998	-328,029	1,455,969
Chemical Demilitarization Construction	134,278	0	134,278
NATO Security Investment Program	240,867	0	240,867
Army National Guard	539,296	89,372	628,668
Army Reserve	281,687	920	282,607
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	57,045	0	57,045
Air National Guard	34,374	108,435	142,809
Air Force Reserve	19,265	10,753	30,018
Subtotal Construction	**11,738,021**	**93,909**	**11,831,930**
Army Family Housing Construction	678,580	-32,000	646,580
Army Family Housing Operations	716,110	0	716,110
Navy Family Housing Construction	382,778	0	382,778
Navy Family Housing Operations	376,062	0	376,062
Air Force Family Housing Construction	395,879	0	395,879
Air Force Family Housing Operations	599,465	-5,000	594,465
Defense Agencies Family Housing Operations	49,231	0	49,231
Homeowners Assistance	4,500	0	4,500
Family Housing Improvement Fund	850	0	850
Subtotal Family Housing	**3,203,455**	**-37,000**	**3,166,455**
Base Realignment and Closure IV	393,377	0	393,377
Base Realignment and Closure 2005	9,065,386	0	9,065,386
Subtotal BRAC	**9,458,763**	**0**	**9,458,763**
Subtotal Construction, Housing and BRAC FY2008 Authorizations (Non-Emergency)	**24,400,239**	**56,909**	**24,457,148**
Prior Year Savings		**-56,909**	**-56,909**
Grand Total Division B	**24,400,239**	**0**	**24,400,239**

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Army	ALABAMA	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	POWERTRAIN TRANSMISSION REPAIR FACILITY	27,000		27,000
Army	ALABAMA	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	Lake Yard Interchange		1,400	1,400
Army	ALABAMA	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	SMALL ARMS REPAIR SHOP-DEPOT LEVEL	18,000		18,000
Air Force	ALABAMA	MAXWELL AFB	AIR & SPACE BASIC COURSE COMBAT ARMS TNG FAC	15,556		15,556
Army Guard	ALABAMA	FORT MCCLELLAN	MULTIPURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE	3,000		3,000
Army	ALABAMA	FORT RUCKER	Chapel Center		6,800	6,800
Army	ALASKA	FORT RICHARDSON	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	15,000		15,000
Army	ALASKA	FORT WAINWRIGHT	BARRACKS COMPLEX	63,000		63,000
Army	ALASKA	FORT WAINWRIGHT	ORGANIZATIONAL VEHICLE PARKING	14,000		14,000
Army	ALASKA	FORT WAINWRIGHT	TACTICAL VEHICLE WASH FACILITY	21,000		21,000
Army	ALASKA	FORT WAINWRIGHT	TRAINING AIDS SUPPORT CENTER	12,400		12,400
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	C-17 RESTORE ROAD	2,000		2,000
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22 AEROSPACE GROUND EQUIP SHOP	7,200		7,200
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22 CORROSION CTRL/LO MX/COMPOSITE REPAIR FAC	22,400		22,400
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22 FLIGHT SIMULATOR	16,400		16,400
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22A 7 BAY AIRCRAFT SHELTER	20,400		20,400
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22A 8 BAY AIRCRAFT SHELTER	22,200		22,200
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22A FIELD TRAINING DETACHMENT	6,600		6,600
Air Force	ALASKA	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22A SQUADRON OPS/AMU 6 BAY HANGAR	41,100		41,100
Defense-Wide	ALASKA	FORT RICHARDSON	DENTAL CLINIC ADDITION/ALTERATION	6,300		6,300
Army	ARIZONA	FORT HUACHUCA	Air Traffic Control Radar Operations Building		2,000	2,000
Army	ARIZONA	FORT HUACHUCA	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	11,200		11,200
Army	ARIZONA	YUMA	RAW SEWAGE LAGOON AND OXIDATION POND	3,800		3,800
Navy	ARIZONA	YUMA	APPLIED INSTRUCTION FACILITY (MAWTS)	19,490		19,490
Army Guard	ARIZONA	CAMP NAVAJO	READINESS CENTER	13,000		13,000
Army Guard	ARIZONA	FLORENCE	READINESS CENTER	13,800		13,800
Army Guard	ARIZONA	PAPAGO MILITARY RES	READINESS CENTER	24,000		24,000
Army Guard	ARKANSAS	CABOT	Readiness Center		10,868	10,868
Air Guard	ARKANSAS	LITTLE ROCK AFB	Replace Engine Shop		4,000	4,000
Army	CALIFORNIA	FORT IRWIN	BARRACKS COMPLEX	17,500		17,500
Army	CALIFORNIA	FORT IRWIN	MILITARY OPERATIONS URBAN TERRAIN, PHASE 3	22,100		22,100
Army	CALIFORNIA	PRESIDIO MONTEREY	GENERAL INSTRUCTIONAL BUILDING	15,000		15,000
Army	CALIFORNIA	SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	WATER TREATMENT PLANT	12,400		12,400
Navy	CALIFORNIA	BARSTOW MCLB	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	7,830		7,830
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - (41 AREA)	32,430		32,430
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - 33 AREA	30,300		30,300

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - 43 AREA	15,150		15,150
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - 62 AREA	25,920		25,920
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - AREA 13	33,320		33,320
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - AREA 14	32,350		32,350
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - CHAPPO (22 AREA)	48,640		48,640
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - DEL MAR (21 AREA)	33,190		33,190
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - DEL MAR (21 AREA)	33,440		33,440
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - HORNO (13 AREA)	33,790		33,790
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - HORNO (53 AREA)	40,660		40,660
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - LAS PULGAS AREA	34,340		34,340
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - PICO (24 AREA)	32,870		32,870
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - PICO (24 AREA)	32,260		32,260
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - SAN MATEO AREA	34,500		34,500
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS -DEL MAR (21 AREA)	34,120		34,120
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS, SAN MATEO AREA	32,550		32,550
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS-MARGARITA (33 AREA)	31,170		31,170
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	BEQ - ARMORY, TRAINING FAC, SOI (52 AREA)	54,730		54,730
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	CONSOLIDATED COMM/ELEC MAINTENANCE & STORAGE	10,050		10,050
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	CORROSION CONTROL WATER TREATMENT FACILITY	52,520		52,520
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	INDOOR FITNESS CENTER	12,230		12,230
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	INFANTRY TRAINING CENTER	11,500		11,500
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	OPERATIONS ACCESS POINTS, RED BEACH	11,970		11,970
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	REGIMENTAL MAINTENANCE COMPLEX (PHASE 3)	33,620		33,620
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TRAINING BATTLE COURSE	22,250		22,250
Navy	CALIFORNIA	EL CENTRO	COMBINED CHILD CARE AND YOUTH CENTER	8,900		8,900
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	COMBAT TRAINING TANK COMPLEX	10,820		10,820
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	EMERGENCY RESPONSE STATION	6,530		6,530
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	IN-LINE FUELING STATION MODIFICATION	22,930		22,930
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	MILITARY WORKING DOG OPERATIONS CENTER	4,800		4,800
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	MV-22 WASH RACK	3,690		3,690
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MONTEREY	Education Facility		9,990	9,990
Navy	CALIFORNIA	NORTH ISLAND	BERTHING LIMA CONVERSION	38,992		38,992
Navy	CALIFORNIA	NORTH ISLAND	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	14,270		14,270
Navy	CALIFORNIA	NORTH ISLAND	Pool Replacement		6,890	6,890
Navy	CALIFORNIA	SAN CLEMENTE ISLAND	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	34,020		34,020
Navy	CALIFORNIA	SAN DIEGO	RECRUIT RECONDITIONING FACILITY	16,790		16,790
Navy	CALIFORNIA	SAN DIEGO	RECRUIT SUPPORT BARRACKS	34,430		34,430

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Navy	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	36,470		36,470
Navy	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	36,280		36,280
Navy	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS	BEQ AND PARKING STRUCTURE	51,800		51,800
Navy	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS	COMBINED ARMS MOUT (PHASE 2)	21,000		21,000
Navy	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS	Lifelong Learning Center Phase 1		9,760	9,760
Air Force	CALIFORNIA	EDWARDS AFB	F-35 RAMP & SECURITY UPGRADE	3,100		3,100
Air Force	CALIFORNIA	EDWARDS AFB	Runway Repair		6,000	6,000
Defense-Wide	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	SOF COMBAT CREW TRAINING FACILITY	9,800		9,800
Defense-Wide	CALIFORNIA	DEF DISTRIB DEPOT-TRACY	REPLACE GENERAL PURPOSE WAREHOUSE	41,000		41,000
Defense-Wide	CALIFORNIA	DEF DISTRIB DEPOT-TRACY	REPLACE TRUCK ENTRANCE/CONTROL FACILITY	9,300		9,300
Army Reserve	CALIFORNIA	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	3,950		3,950
Naval Reserve	CALIFORNIA	LEMOORE	MARINE CORPS RESERVE CENTER	15,420		15,420
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	BARRACKS & DINING	154,000		154,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	BATTALION COMPLEX	45,000		45,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	BRIGADE/BATTALION HQS	46,000		46,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITIES	93,000		93,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	INFRASTRUCTURE, BCT	69,000		69,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	PHYSICAL FITNESS FACILITY	22,000	-22,000	0
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	Physical Fitness Facility		28,000	28,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	15,000		15,000
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOPS	84,000		84,000
Chemical Demil	COLORADO	PUEBLO DEPOT	AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PHASE 10	65,060		65,060
Air Force	COLORADO	U S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY	UPGRADE ACADEMIC FACILITY, PHASE 5	18,000		18,000
Defense-Wide	COLORADO	BUCKLEY AIR FORCE BASE	SATELLITE PHARMACY	3,000		3,000
Army Guard	COLORADO	DENVER	READINESS CENTER	9,000		9,000
Army Guard	COLORADO	GRAND JUNCTION	READINESS CENTER	9,000		9,000
Navy	CONNECTICUT	GROTON	PIER 31 REPLACEMENT	46,060		46,060
Army Guard	CONNECTICUT	CAMP RELL	REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE	28,000		28,000
Army Guard	CONNECTICUT	EAST HAVEN	KD RANGE ADD/ALT	13,800		13,800
Air Guard	CONNECTICUT	BRADLEY IAP	TFI Upgrade Engine Shop		7,200	7,200
Air Force	DELAWARE	DOVER AFB	ADAL PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	19,000		19,000
Defense-Wide	DELAWARE	DOVER AFB	ALTER FUEL STORAGE TANK	3,373		3,373
Army Guard	DELAWARE	NEW CASTLE	ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY ADD/ALT	28,000		28,000
Air Guard	DELAWARE	NEW CASTLE COUNTY APT	TFI - INFO OPS SQUADRON (IOS) FACILITY	3,200		3,200
Naval Reserve	DELAWARE	WILMINGTON	NOSC PORTION, ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER	11,530		11,530
Navy	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	AUTONOMOUS SYSTEM RESEARCH LAB	24,220		24,220
Army	FLORIDA	MIAMI DORAL	SOUTHCOM HEADQUARTERS, INCREMENT II	81,600		81,600

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Navy	FLORIDA	JACKSONVILLE	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	12,890		12,890
Navy	FLORIDA	MAYPORT	Aircraft Refueling		3,380	3,380
Navy	FLORIDA	MAYPORT	ALPHA WHARF IMPROVEMENTS	14,900		14,900
Navy	FLORIDA	TAMPA	JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SQUADRON FACILITY	29,000		29,000
Air Force	FLORIDA	EGLIN AFB	F-35 STUDENT DORMITORY (144 ROOM)	19,000		19,000
Air Force	FLORIDA	MACDILL AFB	Combat Training Facility		5,000	5,000
Air Force	FLORIDA	MACDILL AFB	SOCCENT HDQTRS & COMMANDANT FACILITY	21,000		21,000
Air Force	FLORIDA	TYNDALL AFB	325 ACS Operations Training Complex		11,600	11,600
Defense-Wide	FLORIDA	EGLIN AFB	SOF BATTALION OPS COMPLEX	40,000		40,000
Defense-Wide	FLORIDA	HURLBURT FIELD	SOF SPECIAL TACTICS GROUP FACILITY	8,900		8,900
Defense-Wide	FLORIDA	JACKSONVILLE	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANKS	34,000		34,000
Defense-Wide	FLORIDA	MACDILL AFB	SOF ADD/ALTER 501B (HQ SOCOM)	10,500		10,500
Army Guard	FLORIDA	CAMP BLANDING	AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT	12,400		12,400
Army Guard	FLORIDA	CAMP BLANDING	Regional Training Institute Phase 4		20,907	20,907
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	AUTOMATED ANTI-ARMOR RANGE	8,800		8,800
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	BASIC 10M-25M FIRING RANGE 1	2,400		2,400
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	BASIC 10M-25M FIRING RANGE 2	2,400		2,400
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	BASIC 10M-25M FIRING RANGE 3	2,350		2,350
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	BASIC 10M-25M FIRING RANGE 4	2,500		2,500
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	BASIC 10M-25M FIRING RANGE 5	2,500		2,500
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	17,500		17,500
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	FIRE AND MOVEMENT RANGE	2,450		2,450
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	MAINTENANCE SHOP	42,000		42,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE 1	4,900		4,900
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE 2	4,900		4,900
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE 3	4,500		4,500
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	RANGE ACCESS ROAD	9,100		9,100
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	RECEPTION STATION PHASE 2	39,000		39,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	STATIONARY TANK RANGE	6,900		6,900
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	TACTICAL VEHICLE WASH FACILITY	10,800		10,800
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	TRACKED VEHICLE DRIVERS COURSE	16,000		16,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	TRAINEE COMPLEX	32,000		32,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	TRAINING AREA INFRASTRUCTURE - OSUT AREA	16,000		16,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	TRAINING AREA INFRASTRUCTURE-NORTHERN AREA	13,800		13,800
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	27,000		27,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	BARRACKS & DINING	121,000		121,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	BRIGADE COMPLEX	30,000		30,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	BRIGADE/BATTALION HQS	36,000		36,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	20,000		20,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITIES	75,000		75,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	INFRASTRUCTURE	59,000		59,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	PHYSICAL FITNESS FACILITY	28,000	-28,000	0
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	Physical Fitness Facility		22,000	22,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	SHOOT HOUSE	2,300		2,300
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOPS	67,000		67,000
Navy	GEORGIA	ALBANY MCLB	BEQ REPLACEMENT	15,320		15,320
Navy	GEORGIA	KINGS BAY NSB	Addition to Limited Area Reaction Force Facility		6,130	6,130
Air Force	GEORGIA	ROBINS AFB	AIRCRAFT HANGAR	24,100		24,100
Air Force	GEORGIA	ROBINS AFB	Avionics Facility		5,250	5,250
Defense-Wide	GEORGIA	AUGUSTA	REGIONAL SECURITY OPERATIONS CENTER INCR IV	100,220		100,220
Defense-Wide	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	CONSOLIDATED TROOP MEDICAL CLINIC	3,900		3,900
Defense-Wide	GEORGIA	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANK	3,500		3,500
Army Guard	GEORGIA	DOBBINS ARB	READINESS CENTER	45,000		45,000
Air Guard	GEORGIA	SAVANNAH CRTC	Troop Training Quarters		7,500	7,500
Naval Reserve	GEORGIA	MARIETTA	MARINE CORPS RESERVE CENTER	7,560		7,560
Army	HAWAII	POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA	Defense Access Road Phase 1		9,000	9,000
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BARRACKS	42,000		42,000
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BATTALION COMPLEX	69,000		69,000
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BATTALION COMPLEX	27,000		27,000
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BRIGADE COMPLEX	65,000		65,000
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	INFRASTRUCTURE EXPANSION	76,000		76,000
Army	HAWAII	WAHIAWA	WIDEBAND SATCOM OPERATIONS CENTER	40,000		40,000
Navy	HAWAII	BARKING SANDS	ADVANCED RADAR DETECTION LABORATORY	28,900		28,900
Navy	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	28,200		28,200
Navy	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	CHILD DEVELPMENT CENTER	29,300		29,300
Navy	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	FITNESS CENTER	45,000		45,000
Navy	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	JOINT FORCES DEPLOYMENT STAGING AREA FISC	5,990		5,990
Navy	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	SUB DRIVE-IN MAGNETIC SILENCING FAC (INCREMENT II)	41,088		41,088
Defense-Wide	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	REPLACE FUEL PIPELINE	27,700		27,700
Army Reserve	HAWAII	FORT SHAFTER	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	19,199		19,199
Army Guard	IDAHO	ORCHARD TRAINIG AREA	LIVE FIRE SHOOT HOUSE	1,850		1,850
Army Reserve	IDAHO	HAYDEN LAKE	AR CENTER/OMS/UNHEATED STORAGE	9,580		9,580
Navy	ILLINOIS	GREAT LAKES	RTC SPECIAL PROGRAMS BARRACKS	62,940		62,940
Defense-Wide	ILLINOIS	SCOTT AFB	USTRANSCOM JOINT INTEL OPERATIONS CENTER	13,977		13,977

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Army Guard	INDIANA	CAMP ATTERBURY	MULTI PURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE	5,800		5,800
Army Guard	INDIANA	LAWRENCE	READINESS CENTER	21,000		21,000
Army Guard	INDIANA	MUSCATATUCK	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility Phase 1		6,000	6,000
Air Guard	INDIANA	FORT WAYNE INTL AIRPORT	Aircraft Shelter/Fuel Stands		5,600	5,600
Army Guard	IOWA	CAMP DODGE	MOUT Site Addition/Alteration		1,500	1,500
Army Guard	IOWA	DAVENPORT	Readiness Center Addition/Alteration		1,550	1,550
Army Guard	IOWA	MOUNT PLEASANT	Mount Pleasant Air Force Readiness Center Additions/Alterations		1,500	1,500
Air Guard	IOWA	FORT DODGE	Vehicle Maintenance & Communications Training Complex		5,600	5,600
Army	KANSAS	FORT LEAVENWORTH	Chapel Complex Phase 2		4,200	4,200
Army	KANSAS	FORT RILEY, KANSAS	BATTALION COMPLEX	38,000		38,000
Army	KANSAS	FORT RILEY, KANSAS	BRIGADE COMPLEX	79,000		79,000
Army	KANSAS	FORT RILEY, KANSAS	COMMISSARY	23,000		23,000
Army	KANSAS	FORT RILEY, KANSAS	Fire Station		3,000	3,000
Army	KANSAS	FORT RILEY, KANSAS	RAIL SIDING	15,000		15,000
Army	KANSAS	MCCONNELL AFB	MXG Consolidation and Forward Logistics Center Phase 2		6,800	6,800
Defense-Wide	KANSAS	FORT RILEY, KANSAS	HOSPITAL ADDITION/ALTERATION	52,000		52,000
Army Reserve	KANSAS	DODGE CITY	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND	8,100		8,100
Chemical Demil	KENTUCKY	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PH IX	57,218		57,218
Chemical Demil	KENTUCKY	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	BLUE GRASS DEPOT DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD	12,000		12,000
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	BATTALION COMPLEX	37,000		37,000
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	8,600		8,600
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	TRAINING SUPPORT CENTER	15,513		15,513
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	47,000		47,000
Defense-Wide	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC	24,000		24,000
Defense-Wide	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	21,400		21,400
Defense-Wide	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL	SOF TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	15,000		15,000
Army Guard	KENTUCKY	LONDON	Aviation Operations Facility Phase 3		7,191	7,191
Army	LOUISIANA	FORT POLK	UNIT OPERATIONS FACILITIES	29,000		29,000
Navy	MAINE	PORTSMOUTH	Consolidated Global Submarine Component Phase 1		9,980	9,980
Army Guard	MAINE	BANGOR	REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE PHASE 1	20,000		20,000
Navy	MARYLAND	CADEROCK NSWC	RDT&E Support Facility Phase 1		6,980	6,980
Navy	MARYLAND	INDIAN HEAD	Energetics System Phase 1		12,050	12,050
Navy	MARYLAND	INDIAN HEAD	SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT UPGRADES	13,930		13,930
Navy	MARYLAND	SUITLAND	NATIONAL MARITIME INTEL CENTER (INCREMENT III)	12,439		12,439
Air Force	MARYLAND	ANDREWS AFB	ADMIN FACILITY ADDITION	28,000		28,000
Air Force	MARYLAND	ANDREWS AFB	NCR RELOCATION - ADMIN FACILITY	49,648		49,648
Defense-Wide	MARYLAND	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	USAMRICD REPLACEMENT, INCREMENT I	23,750		23,750

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Defense-Wide	MARYLAND	FORT DETRICK	USAMRIID STAGE I, INCREMENT III	209,000	-100,000	109,000
Defense-Wide	MARYLAND	FORT MEADE	SOUTH CAMPUS UTILITY PLANT PHASE 1	31,000	-17,000	14,000
Army Guard	MARYLAND	EDGEWOOD	AASF ADD/ALT	28,000		28,000
Army Guard	MARYLAND	SALISBURY	READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT	9,800		9,800
Air Guard	MARYLAND	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	Fire Station		7,900	7,900
Army Reserve	MARYLAND	BALTIMORE	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	11,600		11,600
Army Guard	MASSACHUSETTS	METHUEN	READINESS CENTER, ADD/ALT (ADRS)	21,000		21,000
Army Reserve	MASSACHUSETTS	FORT DEVENS	SHOOTHOUSE	1,900		1,900
Army Guard	MICHIGAN	CAMP GRAYLING	Live Fire Shoot House		2,000	2,000
Army Guard	MICHIGAN	CAMP GRAYLING	Urban Assault Course		2,000	2,000
Army Reserve	MICHIGAN	SAGINAW	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND	11,500		11,500
Army Guard	MINNESOTA	ARDEN HILLS	READINESS CENTER	15,000		15,000
Air Guard	MINNESOTA	MINNEAPOLIS-ST PAUL	Aircraft Deicing Apron		1,500	1,500
Air Guard	MINNESOTA	DULUTH	Replace Fuel Cell Hangar		4,500	4,500
Navy	MISSISSIPPI	GULFPORT	25 NAVAL CONSTRUCTION REGIMENT HQ FACILITY	6,900		6,900
Navy	MISSISSIPPI	GULFPORT	Battalion Maintenance Facility		5,870	5,870
Air Force	MISSISSIPPI	COLUMBUS AFB	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	8,100		8,100
Army	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Chapel Complex Increment II		3,500	3,500
Army	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	TRAINING SUPPORT CENTER	18,500		18,500
Army	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	URBAN ASSAULT COURSE	2,350		2,350
Army	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Vehicle Maintenance Shop		9,500	9,500
Air Force	MISSOURI	WHITEMAN AFB	Security Forces Animal Clinic		4,200	4,200
Defense-Wide	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	PRIMARY CARE CLINIC ADDITION/ALTERATION	22,000		22,000
Army Reserve	MISSOURI	WELDON SPRINGS	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	11,700		11,700
Air Force	NEVADA	CREECH AFB	UAS 432 WING HQ MISSION SUPT FACILITY	7,000		7,000
Air Force	NEVADA	CREECH AFB	UAS DINING HALL	9,000		9,000
Air Force	NEVADA	CREECH AFB	UAS FLIGHT SIM & ACADEMICS FACILITY	9,800		9,800
Air Force	NEVADA	CREECH AFB	UAS MAIN GATE/SEWER TRANSFER FAC/INFRASTRUCT.	6,500		6,500
Air Force	NEVADA	CREECH AFB	UAS OPS FACILITY	16,200		16,200
Air Force	NEVADA	NELLIS AFB	F-16 AGGRESSOR HANGAR/AIRCRAFT MAINT UNIT	30,800		30,800
Air Force	NEVADA	NELLIS AFB	F-16 AGRESSOR SQUADRON OPS/INFRASTRUCTURE	17,500		17,500
Air Force	NEVADA	NELLIS AFB	F-35 AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS	5,000		5,000
Army Reserve	NEVADA	LAS VEGAS	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	33,900		33,900
Army	NEW JERSEY	PICATINNY ARSENAL	Ballistic Evaluation Facility Phase 1		9,900	9,900
Navy	NEW JERSEY	LAKEHURST	ADVANCED ARRESTING GEAR TEST SITE	15,440		15,440
Air Force	NEW JERSEY	McGUIRE AFB	Security Forces Operations Facility Phase I		7,200	7,200
Air Guard	NEW JERSEY	ATLANTIC CITY INTL AIRPORT	Operations and Training Facility		8,400	8,400

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Army Reserve	NEW JERSEY	FORT DIX	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	3,825		3,825
Air Force	NEW MEXICO	CANNON AFB	CV-22 Flight Simulator Facility		8,300	8,300
Air Force	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	F-22 ALTER HANGAR FOR LO/CRF	14,500		14,500
Air Force	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	F-22A ADAL A/C MAINT UNIT	1,050		1,050
Air Force	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	F-22A ADAL FLIGHT SIMULATOR FAC	3,150		3,150
Air Force	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	F-22A ADAL JET ENGINE MAINTENANCE SHOP	2,150		2,150
Air Force	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	F-22A AEROSPACE GROUND EQUIP FAC	4,600		4,600
Defense-Wide	NEW MEXICO	CANNON AFB	SOF MAINTENANCE HANGAR	18,100		18,100
Defense-Wide	NEW MEXICO	KIRTLAND AFB	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANKS	14,400		14,400
Army	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM	BRIGADE COMPLEX-BARRACKS	29,000		29,000
Army	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM	BRIGADE COMPLEX-BARRACKS	24,000		24,000
Army	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM	Fire Station		6,900	6,900
Army	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	37,000		37,000
Army	NEW YORK	U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY	SCIENCE FACILITY, PHASE 1	67,000		67,000
Army Guard	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM	MANEUVER AREA TRAINING EQUIP SITE PH3	11,000		11,000
Army Guard	NEW YORK	QUEENSBURY	FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP	5,900		5,900
Air Guard	NEW YORK	GABRESKI AP	Replace Pararescue Operations Facility		7,500	7,500
Air Guard	NEW YORK	HANCOCK FIELD	TFI - REAPER IOC/FOC BEDDOWN	5,000		5,000
Air Guard	NEW YORK	HANCOCK FIELD	Upgrade ASOS Facilities		5,400	5,400
Army Reserve	NEW YORK	KINGSTON	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND	13,494		13,494
Army Reserve	NEW YORK	SHOREHAM	ADD/ALT ARMY RESERVE CENTER	15,031		15,031
Army Reserve	NEW YORK	STATEN ISLAND	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	18,550		18,550
Air Force Reserve	NEW YORK	NIAGRA FALLS ARS	Dining Facility		9,000	9,000
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	ACCESS ROADS PHASE 1	13,200		13,200
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	Chapel		11,600	11,600
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	Defense Access Road Funding		8,600	8,600
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	Mass Casualty Facility		1,300	1,300
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	TRAINING SUPPORT CENTER	20,500		20,500
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	UTILITY UPGRADE (CAMP MACKALL)	3,200		3,200
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - CAMP JOHNSON	38,230		38,230
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - CAMP JOHNSON	23,760		23,760
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - FRENCH CREEK	33,960		33,960
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - HADNOT POINT	39,890		39,890
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - HADNOT POINT	39,320		39,320
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS- COURTHOUSE BAY	35,890		35,890
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS- HADNOT POINT	42,950		42,950
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	13,960		13,960

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	CONSOLIDATED MESSHALL-HADNOT POINT (200 AREA)	25,000		25,000
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	INFANTRY PLATOON BATTLE COURSE - SR1	18,250		18,250
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	MESSHALL - HADNOT POINT (400 AREA)	21,660		21,660
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE	MOD K-RANGES (PHASE 2)	20,220		20,220
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CHERRY POINT MCAS	2ND MAW COMMAND OPERATIONS FACILITY	30,480		30,480
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CHERRY POINT MCAS	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	30,100		30,100
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CHERRY POINT MCAS	ENGINEERING PRODUCT SUPPORT FACILITY	16,840		16,840
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	NEW RIVER	AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON ADDITION	6,830		6,830
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	NEW RIVER	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	36,740		36,740
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	NEW RIVER	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS - MCAS	25,620		25,620
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	NEW RIVER	ENLISTED DINING FACILITY	17,090		17,090
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	28,170		28,170
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	NEW INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL (IRWIN)	27,945		27,945
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	NEW MIDDLE SCHOOL	22,356		22,356
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF EXPAND TRAINING COMPOUND	14,200		14,200
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF HEADQUARTERS FACILITY	14,600		14,600
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF SECURITY/FORCE PROTECTION	4,150		4,150
Defense-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF TRAINING FACILITY	5,300		5,300
Army Reserve	NORTH CAROLINA	RALEIGH	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND	25,581		25,581
Air Force	OHIO	WRIGHT PATTERSON AFB	Security Forces Operations Building		14,000	14,000
Army Guard	OHIO	CAMP PERRY	Barracks		2,000	2,000
Army Guard	OHIO	RAVENNA	Barracks		2,000	2,000
Air Guard	OHIO	SPRINGFIELD ANGB	Combat Communications Training Complex		12,800	12,800
Army	OKLAHOMA	FORT SILL	TRAINING COMPLEX UPGRADE	63,000		63,000
Army	OKLAHOMA	MCALESTER AAP	AP3 Connecting Rail		5,800	5,800
Air Force	OKLAHOMA	TINKER AFB	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	48,600		48,600
Air Force	OKLAHOMA	TINKER AFB	Realign Street at Tinker Gate		5,400	5,400
Defense-Wide	OKLAHOMA	ALTUS AFB	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE DIKES	2,850		2,850
Defense-Wide	OKLAHOMA	TINKER AFB	MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	65,000		65,000
Air Force Reserve	OKLAHOMA	TINKER AFB	AFR SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE HANGAR	9,900		9,900
Army	PENNSYLVANIA	CARLISLE BARRACKS	MUSEUM SUPPORT FACILITY	13,400		13,400
Army	PENNSYLVANIA	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	Replace Igloo Security Doors and Aprons		7,500	7,500
Army	PENNSYLVANIA	TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	ELECTRONICS MAINTENANCE SHOP	15,000		15,000
Navy	PENNSYLVANIA	PHILADELPHIA	FULL SCALE ELECTRIC DRIVE TEST FACILITY	22,020		22,020
Defense-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	PHILADELPHIA	CONVERT WAREHOUSE TO ADMIN SPACE	1,200		1,200
Army Guard	PENNSYLVANIA	HONESDALE	Readiness Center Addition/Alteration		6,117	6,117
Army Reserve	PENNSYLVANIA	LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	14,914		14,914

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Navy	RHODE ISLAND	NEWPORT	FITNESS FACILITY	29,900		29,900
Navy	RHODE ISLAND	NEWPORT	Unmanned ASW Support Facility		9,900	9,900
Army	SOUTH CAROLINA	FORT JACKSON	TRAINING COMPLEX UPGRADE	30,000		30,000
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	EOD/ORDNANCE OPERATIONS FACILITY	5,940		5,940
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	PARRIS ISLAND	THIRD RECRUIT TRAINING BATTALION (PHASE 2)	36,400		36,400
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	PARRIS ISLAND	THIRD RECRUIT TRAINING BN COMPLEX (PHASE 3)	28,350		28,350
Air Force	SOUTH CAROLINA	CHARLESTON AFB	C-17 FLIGHT SIMULATOR ADDITION	4,500		4,500
Air Force	SOUTH CAROLINA	SHAW AFB	Physical Fitness Center		9,900	9,900
Army Guard	SOUTH CAROLINA	ANDERSON	READINESS CENTER	12,000		12,000
Army Guard	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT	3,400		3,400
Army Guard	SOUTH CAROLINA	EASTOVER	JOINT FORCES HEADQUARTERS	28,000		28,000
Army Guard	SOUTH CAROLINA	HEMINGWAY	Field Maintenance Shop Phase 1		4,600	4,600
Army Guard	SOUTH DAKOTA	RAPID CITY	ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER	29,000		29,000
Air Guard	SOUTH DAKOTA	JOE FOSS FIELD	Aircraft Ready Shelters/AMU		4,500	4,500
Army Guard	TENNESSEE	TULLAHOMA	Readiness Center		10,372	10,372
Army Reserve	TENNESSEE	CHATTANOOGA	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	10,600		10,600
Army	TEXAS	CAMP BULLIS	Live Fire Shoot House		4,200	4,200
Army	TEXAS	CORPUS CHRISTI	DYNAMIC COMPONENT REBUILD FACILITY	39,000		39,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	BARRACKS & DINING	148,000		148,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	BARRACKS & DINING	148,000		148,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	BATTALION COMPLEX	34,000		34,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	BRIGADE/BATTALION HQS	44,000		44,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	BRIGADE/BATTALION HQS	44,000		44,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	CHAPEL	9,000		9,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITIES, BCT	90,000		90,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITIES, BCT 1	90,000		90,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX	42,000		42,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	INFRASTRUCTURE, IBCT1	98,000		98,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	INFRASTRUCTURE, IBCT2	100,000		100,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	Medical Parking Facility Phase 1		12,500	12,500
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	TRAINING SUPPORT CENTER	12,600		12,600
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	10,200		10,200
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOPS	81,000		81,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOPS	81,000		81,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT HOOD	Chapel w/ Religious Education Center		17,500	17,500
Army	TEXAS	FORT HOOD	UNIT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	32,000		32,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT SAM HOUSTON	TRAINEE BARRACKS COMPLEX	96,000		96,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Army	TEXAS	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	MANEUVER SYSTEMS SUSTAINMENT CTR, PHASE 1	6,900		6,900
Navy	TEXAS	CORPUS CHRISTI	Parking Apron Recapitalization		3,500	3,500
Navy	TEXAS	KINGSVILLE	Fitness Center		11,580	11,580
Air Force	TEXAS	FORT HOOD	TACP JOINT AIR GROUND CTR	10,800		10,800
Air Force	TEXAS	LACKLAND AFB	BMT RECRUIT DORMITORY	75,515		75,515
Defense-Wide	TEXAS	FORT SAM HOUSTON	MEDICAL INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITY	13,000		13,000
Air Guard	TEXAS	ELLINGTON FIELD	ASOS Facility		7,600	7,600
Air Guard	TEXAS	FORT WORTH NAS JRB	Security Forces Training Facility		5,000	5,000
Army Reserve	TEXAS	SINTON	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	9,700		9,700
Air Force	UTAH	HILL AFB	F-22A HEAVY MAINT FAC & COMPOSITE BACK SHOP	36,000		36,000
Air Force	UTAH	HILL AFB	Fire Station		5,400	5,400
Defense-Wide	UTAH	HILL AFB	HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	20,400		20,400
Army Guard	UTAH	CAMP WILLIAMS	AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT	17,500		17,500
Air Guard	VERMONT	BURLINGTON IAP	SECURITY FORCES AND COMM FACILITY	6,600		6,600
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT BELVOIR	EMERGENCY SERVICES CENTER	7,200		7,200
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT EUSTIS	UNIT OPERATIONS FACILITIES	14,400		14,400
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT EUSTIS	Vehicle Paint Facility		3,900	3,900
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT LEE	DINING FACILITY	10,600		10,600
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT LEE	TRAINEE BARRACKS COMPLEX	90,000		90,000
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT MYER	BARRACKS	14,000		14,000
Navy	VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	10,500		10,500
Navy	VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	Fire Station		9,960	9,960
Navy	VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	Industrial Access Improvements		9,990	9,990
Navy	VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	NORFOLK HARBOR CHANNEL DREDGING	42,830		42,830
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR, TYPE II	27,750		27,750
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON (GREEN SIDE)	36,280		36,280
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	INFRASTRUCTURE - RUSSELL ROAD (PHASE 1)	7,450		7,450
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	INSTRUCTION FACILITY ADDITION - TBS	6,350		6,350
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	INSTRUCTION FACILITY TBS (PHASE I)	25,200		25,200
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	MESS HALL - OCS	13,750		13,750
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	Officer Candidate School Facility		5,980	5,980
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	STUDENT QUARTERS - TBS (PHASE 3)	27,530		27,530
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	CRANEY ISLAND	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANKS	39,900		39,900
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	DAM NECK	SOF OPERATIONAL FACILITY INCREMENT II	31,000		31,000
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	FORT STORY	SOF SMALL ARMS RANGE	11,600		11,600
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	PENTAGON	PENTAGON ATHLETIC CENTER PHASE 2	6,967		6,967
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	PENTAGON	PFPA HAZMAT FACILITY	16,401		16,401

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Defense-Wide	VIRGINIA	PENTAGON	RAVEN ROCK WEST POWER PLANT	15,572		15,572
Army Guard	VIRGINIA	ARLINGTON	ARLINGTON HALL READINESS CENTER PHASE 2	15,500		15,500
Army Guard	VIRGINIA	FORT PICKETT	MULTIPURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE	2,950		2,950
Naval Reserve	VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	EODMU 10 OPERATIONS FACILITY	8,170		8,170
Naval Reserve	VIRGINIA	WILLIAMSBURG	ORDNANCE HANDLING CARGO OPS TRAINING SUPPORT	12,320		12,320
Army	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	BATTALION COMPLEX	54,000		54,000
Army	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	BATTALION COMPLEX	47,000		47,000
Army	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	BRIGADE COMPLEX	30,000		30,000
Army	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	BRIGADE COMPLEX, INCREMENT III	102,000		102,000
Army	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	27,000		27,000
Navy	WASHINGTON	BANGOR	LIMITED AREA PROD & STORAGE COMPLEX (INCR V)	50,700		50,700
Navy	WASHINGTON	KITSAP NB	Saltwater Cooling and Fire Protection Improvements		5,110	5,110
Navy	WASHINGTON	WHIDBEY ISLAND	Firefighting Facility		6,160	6,160
Navy	WASHINGTON	WHIDBEY ISLAND	HANGAR 5 RECAPITALIZATION (INCREMENT II)	34,000		34,000
Air Force	WASHINGTON	MCCHORD AFB	C-17 ADAL FLIGHT SIMULATOR	5,500		5,500
Defense-Wide	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	SOF RANGER BATTALION COMPLEX	38,000		38,000
Army Guard	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	AVIATION READINESS CENTER	32,000		32,000
Air Guard	WASHINGTON	MCCHORD AFB	262D Information Warfare Aggressor Squad Facility		8,600	8,600
Army Reserve	WASHINGTON	SEATTLE	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	37,500		37,500
Army Guard	WEST VIRGINIA	CAMP DAWSON	Access Control Point		2,000	2,000
Army Guard	WEST VIRGINIA	CAMP DAWSON	Multi-Purpose Building Phase 2		5,000	5,000
Army Guard	WEST VIRGINIA	CAMP DAWSON	Shoot House		2,000	2,000
Army Reserve	WISCONSIN	FORT MCCOY	AUTO QUALIFICATION TRAINING RANGE	4,000		4,000
Air Force	WYOMING	F. E. WARREN AFB	RENOVATE HISTORIC DORMITORY	8,600		8,600
Air Guard	WYOMING	CHEYENNE MAP	TFI - C-130 SQDN OPERATIONS FACILITY	7,000		7,000
Army	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	BULK FUEL STORAGE & SUPPLY, PHASE 8	26,000		26,000
Army	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	BULK FUEL STORAGE & SUPPLY, PHASE 5	22,000		22,000
Army	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	SOF HQ COMPLEX	19,000		19,000
Air Force	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	C-130 MAINTENANCE HANGAR	27,400		27,400
Air Force	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	CARGO HANDLING AREA EXPANSION	8,800		8,800
Air Force	AFGHANISTAN	BAGRAM AIR BASE	REFUELER RAMP	21,000		21,000
Navy	CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY NS	CONSOLIDATED FITNESS COMPLEX	20,600		20,600
Navy	DIEGO GARCIA	DIEGO GARCIA	WHARF UPGRADE AND WAREHOUSE	35,060		35,060
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	12,830		12,830
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER	AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	15,250		15,250
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER	TELCOM FACILITY	3,330		3,330

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Army	GERMANY	KATTERBACH	AIRCRAFT/VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	19,000		19,000
Army	GERMANY	WIESBADEN MIL CMTY	COMMAND & BATTLE CENTER	119,000	-59,500	59,500
Defense-Wide	GERMANY	GERMERSHEIM	LOGISTICS DISTRIBUTION CENTER EUROPE	48,000		48,000
Defense-Wide	GREECE	SOUDA BAY	FUEL STORAGE TANKS AND PIPELINE REPL	27,761	-19,761	8,000
Navy	GUAM	GUAM	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS, MAIN BASE	62,360		62,360
Navy	GUAM	GUAM	KILO WHARF EXTENSION (INCREMENT II)	50,912		50,912
Navy	GUAM	GUAM	WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM & UPGRADE	26,070		26,070
Air Force	GUAM	ANDERSEN AFB	COMBAT COMM MAINTENANCE FAC	5,200		5,200
Air Force	GUAM	ANDERSEN AFB	ISR/STF Realign Arc Light Blvd		5,400	5,400
Defense-Wide	GUAM	GUAM	CENTRAL UTILITY PLANT	30,000		30,000
Army	ITALY	VICENZA	BRIGADE COMPLEX-BARRACKS/COMMUNITY, INCR II	15,000	-7,500	7,500
Army	ITALY	VICENZA	BRIGADE COMPLEX-OPERATIONS SPT FAC, INCR II	15,000	-7,500	7,500
Army	JAPAN	CAMP ZAMA	SENSITIVE COMPARTMENTED INFORMATION FAC	2,350		2,350
Army	JAPAN	SAGAMIHARA	BATTLE COMMAND TRAINING CENTER	17,500		17,500
Army	KOREA	CAMP HUMPHREYS	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	20,000		20,000
Air Force	KYRGYZSTAN	MANAS AIR BASE	HOT CARGO PAD	6,000		6,000
Air Force	QATAR	AL UDEID	CAS PARKING APRON	59,638	-59,638	0
Defense-Wide	QATAR	AL UDEID	SOF TRAINING RANGE	9,200		9,200
Air Force	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF LAKENHEATH	LARGE VEHICLE INSPEC STATION	7,400		7,400
Air Force	WORLDWIDE CLASSIFIED	CLASSIFIED LOCATION	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROJECT	891		891
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	DATA CENTER	28,000		28,000
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	JOINT OPERATIONS & SUPPORT COMPLEX, PHASE 1	17,800		17,800
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	P-8A INTEGRATED TRAINING CENTER	48,220		48,220
Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	COMMON BATTLEFIELD AIRMAN TRNG COMPLEX	15,000		15,000
Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UAS FIELD TRNGING UNIT MAINT COMPLEX	22,000		22,000
Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UAS FIELD TRNING UNIT OPS COMPLEX	15,500		15,500
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	BMDS-EUROPEAN INTERCEPTOR SITE	132,600	-80,000	52,600
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	BMDS-EUROPEAN MIDCOURSE RADAR SITE	108,560	-60,000	48,560
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	ARMY-NAVY/TRANSPORT. RADAR SURVEILLANCE-2 #3	25,500	-25,500	0
NSIP	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	NATO	NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM	240,867		240,867
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	HOST NATION SUPPORT	24,000		24,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	23,000		23,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	176,807	-24,984	151,823
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	239,128	8,000	247,128
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	13,670		13,670
Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	70,494	6,820	77,314

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	15,000		15,000
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION	10,000		10,000
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	ENERGY CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	80,000		80,000
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (TMA)	3,990		3,990
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (NSA)	20,221	-2,500	17,721
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (MDA)	14,889		14,889
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (SOCOM)	16,833	-2,500	14,333
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (OSD)	43,768	-17,768	26,000
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (DODEA)	1,830		1,830
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (SOCOM)	7,697		7,697
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (MDA)	3,457		3,457
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (OSD)	3,000	-3,000	0
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (DODEA)	382		382
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (JCS)	9,228		9,228
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (TMA)	58,252		58,252
Defense-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (DLA)	4,099		4,099
Army Guard	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	48,796	1,767	50,563
Army Guard	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	11,800		11,800
Air Guard	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,200		7,200
Air Guard	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	5,374	4,835	10,209
Army Reserve	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	13,963	920	14,883
Army Reserve	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,100		3,100
Naval Reserve	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,045		2,045
Air Force Reserve	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,922	1,753	5,675
Air Force Reserve	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,443		5,443
FamHouse Con Navy	CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY NS	REPLACE BARGO HOUSING (48)	22,385		22,385
FamHouse Con Navy	CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY NS	REPLACE GRANADILLO CIRCLE HOUSING (38)	16,547		16,547
FamHouse Con Navy	CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY NS	REPLACE GRANADILLO POINT HOUSING (60)	23,666		23,666
FamHouse Con Army	GERMANY	WEISBADEN	FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION	32,000		32,000
FamHouse Con Army	GERMANY	WIESBADEN AB	FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION	20,000	-10,000	10,000
FamHouse Con Army	GERMANY	WIESBADEN AB	FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION	43,000	-11,000	32,000
FamHouse Con Army	GERMANY	WIESBADEN AB	FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION	38,000	-11,000	27,000
FamHouse Con Army	KOREA	CAMP HUMPHREYS	FAMILY HOUSING NEW CONSTRUCTION	125,000		125,000
FamHouse Con AF	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF LAKENHEATH	REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING (182 UNITS)	71,828		71,828

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
FamHouse Con Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS (1608 UNITS)	420,001		420,001
FamHouse Con Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FAMILY HOUSING PLANNING AND DESIGN	579		579
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	113,017		113,017
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	OPERATIONS	124,780		124,780
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,241		1,241
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING	192,849		192,849
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	252,189		252,189
FamHouse Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS	32,034		32,034
FamHouse Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	318,011		318,011
FamHouse Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FAMILY HOUSING PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,169		2,169
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	44,068		44,068
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	15,036		15,036
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	60,063		60,063
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	655		655
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	SERVICES ACCOUNT	13,347		13,347
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING	130,261		130,261
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	87,074		87,074
FamHouse Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS	25,558		25,558
FamHouse Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	316,343		316,343
FamHouse Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FAMILY HOUSING PLANNING AND DESIGN	7,708		7,708
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	100,997		100,997
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	1,559		1,559
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	56,837	-5,000	51,837
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	SERVICES ACCOUNT	20,166		20,166
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	42,189		42,189
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,999		1,999
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING ACCOUNT	565		565
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING ACCOUNT	93,681		93,681
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT	2,142		2,142
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE (RMPA & RMPC)	225,770		225,770
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	DEBT ACCOUNT	1		1
FamHouse Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	HOUSING PRIVATIZATION	53,559		53,559
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	OPERATIONS	35		35
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING (NSA)	10,407		10,407
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	70		70
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT (DIA)	4,359		4,359
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING (DIA)	33,066		33,066

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2009 Request	House Change	House Authorization
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	346		346
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT (DLA)	38		38
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	SERVICES ACCOUNT	33		33
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	382		382
Fam House Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	495		495
FHIF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND	850		850
HOAP	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	4,500		4,500
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	ARMY VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, ARMY	72,855		72,855
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	NAVY VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, NAVY	178,700		178,700
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	AIR FORCE VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, AIR FORCE	139,155		139,155
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	DEF-WIDE VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, DEFENSE-WIDE	2,667		2,667
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	ARMY VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE 2005, ARMY	4,486,178		4,486,178
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	NAVY VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE 2005, NAVY	871,492		871,492
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	AIR FORCE VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE 2005, AIR FORCE	1,072,925		1,072,925
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	DEF-WIDE VARIOUS	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE 2005, DEFENSE-WIDE	2,634,791		2,634,791
			Prior Year Savings		-56,909	-56,909
			GRAND TOTAL	24,400,239	0	24,400,239

Section 2001—Short Title

This section would cite Division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009."

Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law

This section would ensure that the authorizations provided in titles XXI through XXVI and title XXIX shall expire on October 1, 2011, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2012, whichever is later.

TITLE XXI—ARMY

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $4,615,920,000 for Army military construction and $1,394,690,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends authorization of $4,645,536,000 for military construction and $1,362,690,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2009.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Sierra Army Depot Drinking Water

The committee believes that the Department of the Army is being proactive in submitting a military construction project at Sierra Army Depot that would bring the water quality into conformance with the State of California drinking standards. At the same the time, the committee is also encouraged that the Herlong Public Utility District has been organized to provide potable water to the local community and is preparing a proposal for the Department of the Army's consideration to privatize the water resources.

The committee urges the Department to promptly consider the Herlong Public Utility District's proposal to privatize the water utility and if the proposal is in the government's best interest, to promptly convey the utility and offset the overall costs of the project by the proceeds provided by the military construction project.

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $15,000,000 for the Brigade Complex at Vicenza, Italy. The budget request contained $30,000,000 to construct a standard brigade set.

The committee supports the restationing of assets at Vicenza, Italy. However, the committee supports the authorizing for appropriations of an amount equivalent to the ability of a military department to execute in the year of authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2009.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $15,000,000, a reduction of $15,000,000, to support construction of this project.

(2) $59,500,000 for the Command and Battle Center at Wiesbaden Military Community, Germany. The budget request contained $119,000,000 to construct the headquarters element.

The committee supports the authorizing for appropriations an amount equivalent to the ability of a military department to execute in the year of authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded their ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2009.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $59,500,000, a reduction of $59,500,000, to support construction of this project.

(3) $30,000,000 for Planning and Design. The budget request contained $176,807,000 for general planning and design support.

The committee notes that the Department of the Army has elected to use planning and design funds to offset military construction shortfalls throughout the program. While there are no reprogramming restrictions that would prohibit this practice, the committee does not believe that it is an appropriate source of funds for future reprogrammings.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $146,807,000, a reduction of $30,000,000, to support continued planning and design support worldwide.

(4) $31,000,000 for the construction of family housing units at Wiesbaden, Germany. The budget request contained $95,000,000.

The committee notes that the German government is in the process of providing access to land that would allow the Department of Defense to construct additional family housing units. However, the timeline to provide access to the family housing complex may be delayed. Furthermore, the Department of the Army is reporting that construction would not start until summer 2009. The committee supports the authorizing for appropriations an amount equivalent to the ability of a military department to execute in the year of authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded their ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2009.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $74,000,000, a reduction of $31,000,000, to support construction of family housing units.

Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $300,000—Hatfield Gate Expansion, Fort Myer, Virginia.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2009. 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 2009.

Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2009.

Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2009 for the Army. This section would also provide 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 2008 Projects

This section would terminate certain military construction authorizations provided in the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–181).

Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Projects

This section would terminate certain military construction authorizations provided in the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–364).

Section 2107—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2009, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later.

Section 2108—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2009, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,096,399,000 for Navy military construction and $758,840,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends authorization of $3,237,609,000 for military construction and $758,840,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2009.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center (MCAGCC), Twentynine Palms, California Land Expansion

The committee understands the Marine Corps intends to expand the training area at MCAGCC and will begin the required environmental studies this year. While the committee believes the Marine Corps must have sufficient training lands for realistic training, the committee expects the Marine Corps to carefully consider and, to the maximum extent possible, minimize the loss of land to other legitimate uses in preparing its plans. In that regard, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to work with the Bureau of Land Management in ensuring the proposed expansion of MCAGCC is consistent with the development plans associated with the Pacific Gas and Electric Mojave Solar Plant and related project and will minimize the withdrawal of land from public use available for recreational activities such as off-highway vehicles. The committee is encouraged by the Marine Corps intent to include all stakeholders in the land acquisition process.

Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Navy complete planning and design activities for the following project:

(1) $1,450,000—Drydock #3, Waterfront Support Facility, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Maine.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2009. 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 2009.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2009.

Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2009 for the Navy. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

Section 2205—Modification of Authority to Carry out Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Project

This section would increase the authorization for a project at Strategic Weapons Facility Pacific, Bangor, Washington.

Section 2206—Modification of Authority to Carry out Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Projects

This section would increase the authorizations for projects at Naval Support Activity, Suitland, Maryland, and at Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, and other conforming amendments.

Section 2207—Report on Impacts of Surface Ship Homeporting Alternatives

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from issuing a record of decision for the proposed homeporting of additional ships at Naval Station Mayport until at least 30 days after the date on which the Secretary submits a report on the socioeconomic impact and economic justification of the preferred alternatives identified in the final environmental impact statement.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $934,892,000 for Air Force military construction and $995,344,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends authorization of $976,524,000 for military construction and $990,344,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2009.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $59,638,000 for a Close Air Support Parking Apron at Al Udeid, Qatar. The budget request contained $59,638,000 for construction of the aircraft parking apron.

The committee notes that the Department has made a request for this project in its request for emergency funding for ongoing military operations.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $0, a reduction of $59,638,000, to support construction of this project.

(2) $5,000,000 for Planning and Design. The budget request contained $70,494,000 for general planning and design support.

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force has elected to use planning and design funds to offset military construction shortfalls throughout the program. While there are no reprogramming restrictions that would prohibit this practice, the committee does not believe that it is appropriate source of funds for future reprogrammings.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $65,494,000, a reduction of $5,000,000, to support continued planning and design support worldwide.

Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $1,755,000—Repair Runway Pavement, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona;

(2) $1,704,000—Air Traffic Control Complex, Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota;

(3) $900,000—Security Forces Building Phase I, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas;

(4) $1,440,000—Student Officer Quarters, Phase II, Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas; and

(5) $972,000—Fire and Rescue Station, Randolph Air Force Base, Texas.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2009. 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 2009.

Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2009.

Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2009 for the Air Force. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

Section 2305—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2009, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later.

Section 2306—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2009, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,783,998,000 for defense agency military construction and $54,581,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends authorization of $1,455,969,000 for military construction and $54,581,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2009.

The budget request also contained $134,278,000 for chemical demilitarization construction. The committee recommends authorization of $134,278,000 for military construction for fiscal year 2009.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $100,000,000 for the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID) Stage 1, Increment III at Fort Detrick, Maryland. The budget request contained $209,000,000 to recapitalize and update USAMRIID.

The committee supports the authorizing for appropriations of an amount equivalent to the ability of a military department to execute in the year of authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2009.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $109,000,000, a reduction of $100,000,000, to support construction of this project.

(2) $17,000,000 for the South Campus Utility Plant Phase 1 at Fort Meade, Maryland. The budget request contained $31,000,000 to provide better mission assurity to maintain operations at Fort Mead, Maryland.

The committee believes that the Department inappropriately requested a phased project that will not provide a complete and usable facility within the phase. The committee does believe that there is a complete storm water management system within the budget request for this project that should continue. The committee supports Fort Meade's mission assurity intentions and urges the Department to submit a project for the full scope of the intended effort that has been properly coordinated with the host installation in the next budget cycle.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $14,000,000, a reduction of $17,000,000, to support the construction of the storm water management system.

(3) $19,761,000 for the Fuel Storage Tanks and Pipeline Replacement at Souda Bay, Greece. The budget request contained

$27,761,000 to recapitalize and upgrade the existing fuel storage capabilities.

The committee notes that this committee previously provided an authorization for this project but that the Department and the host nation could not reach agreement as to the necessity of this project. The committee understands that these differences have been ameliorated, but the committee believes that this project should be supported by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Programme.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $8,000,000, a reduction of $19,761,000, to support construction of this project.

(4) $80,000,000 for the Ballistic Missile Defense System—European Interceptor Site. The budget request contained $132,600,000 to start construction of the facilities to support the interceptor site.

The committee supports the full scope of the project and the integration with a radar site. However, the committee supports the authorizing for appropriations an amount equivalent to the ability of a military department to execute in the year of authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2009. Furthermore, the committee urges the Department to submit this project for funding consideration in the NATO Security Investment Programme.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $52,600,000, a reduction of $80,000,000, to support construction of this project.

(5) $60,000,000 for the Ballistic Missile Defense System—European Midcourse Radar Site. The budget request contained $108,560,000 to start construction of the facilities to support the midcourse radar site.

The committee supports the full scope of the project and the integration with a interceptor site. However, the committee supports the authorizing for appropriations an amount equivalent to the ability of a military department to execute in the year of authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded their ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2009. Furthermore, the committee urges the Department to submit this project for funding consideration in the NATO Security Investment Programme.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $48,560,000, a reduction of $60,000,000, to support construction of this project.

(6) $25,500,000 for the Ballistic Missile Defense System—Army Navy/Transportable Radar Surveillance -2 #3. The budget request contained $25,500,000 to start construction of the facilities to support the radar surveillance site.

The committee supports the authorizing for appropriations of an amount equivalent to the ability of a military department to execute in the year of authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to expend the funding in fiscal year 2009 and may not be able to make construction award in fiscal year 2009.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $0, a reduction of $25,500,000, to support construction of this project.

(7) $17,768,000 for Planning and Design for the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The budget request contained $43,768,000 to ini-

tiate planning and design projects but is out of line with previous authorizations for appropriations.

The committee believes that the budget request represents unjustified growth from a fiscal year 2006 baseline.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $26,000,000, a reduction of $17,768,000, to support planning and design efforts.

(8) $15,000,000 for Planning and Design for various Defense Agencies.

The committee notes that several Defense Agencies have elected to use planning and design funds to offset military construction shortfalls throughout the program. While there are no reprogramming restrictions that would prohibit this practice, the committee does not believe that it is appropriate source of funds for future reprogrammings.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction of $15,000,000, to support continued planning and design support worldwide.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—DEFENSE AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of defense agencies construction projects that would be authorized for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2402—Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2009 for the defense agencies. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the defense agencies may spend on military construction projects.

Section 2404—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Project

This section would increase the existing authorization for a TRICARE Management Activity at Fort Detrick, Maryland.

Section 2405—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Projects

This section would terminate certain military construction authorizations provided in the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108–375).

Section 2406—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2009, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later.

SUBTITLE B—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2411—Authorized Chemical Demilitarization Program Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized chemical demilitarization construction projects for fiscal year 2009. 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 2412—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2009 for the chemical demilitarization construction. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the chemical demilitarization office may spend on military construction projects.

Section 2413—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 1997 Projects

This section would provide an authorization to continue chemical demilitarization construction at Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado.

Section 2414—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2000 Projects

This section would provide an authorization to continue chemical demilitarization construction at Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $240,867,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP) for fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends authorization of $240,867,000 for NSIP for fiscal year 2009.

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 Act 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 $240,867,000 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 $931,667,000 for military construction of guard and reserve facilities for fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2009 of $1,141,147,000 to be distributed as follows:

Army National Guard	$628,668,000
Air National Guard	142,809,000
Army Reserve	282,607,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	57,045,000
Air Force Reserve	30,018,000

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Planning and Design, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $579,000—Readiness Center Addition/Alteration, Dundalk, Maryland;

(2) $1,005,000—Infrastructure Improvements, Arden Hills ATS, Minnesota;

(3) $200,000—Readiness Center, Fort McClellan, Alabama;

(4) $1,376,000—Training Complex, Camp Butner, North Carolina;

(5) $3,250,000—Combined Support Maintenance Shop, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania;

(6) $382,000—Readiness Center, Sumter, South Carolina;

(7) $1,085,000—Readiness Center and NGB Conference Center, Fort Belvoir, Virginia; and

(8) $323,000—Readiness Center, Ethan Allen Range, Vermont.

Planning and Design, Army Reserve

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following project:

(1) $920,000—Army Reserve Center, Bryan, Texas.

Planning and Design, Air National Guard

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $400,000—C–130 Squadron Operations Center, Greater Peoria, Illinois;

(2) $1,700,000—TFI Digital Ground Station FOC Beddown, Otis Army National Guard Base, Massachusetts; and

(3) $600,000—Replace Control Tower, Quonset State AP, Rhode Island.

Planning and Design, Air Reserve

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following project:

(1) $943,000—Joint Service Lodging Facility, Westover Air Reserve Base, Massachusetts.

Niagara Air Reserve Base, New York

The committee believes that timely infrastructure improvements should be made at Niagara Air Reserve Base and should be provided priority in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of the Air Force to accelerate projects, such as the programming to design and construct a small arms range at Niagara Air Reserve Base, New York, in the next FYDP.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize military construction for the Army National Guard for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on a location by location basis.

Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize military construction for the Army Reserve for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on a location by location basis.

Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize military construction for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on a location by location basis.

Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize military construction for the Air National Guard for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on a location by location basis.

Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize military construction for the Air Force Reserve for fiscal year 2009. The authorized amounts are listed on a location by location basis.

Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction for the guard and reserve by service component for fiscal year 2009. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2607—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2009, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later.

Section 2608—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Project

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2009, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVII—BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACTIVITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $393,377,000 for activities related to prior Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities and $9,065,386,000 for activities related to BRAC 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $393,377,000 for prior BRAC round activities and $9,065,386,000 for BRAC 2005 activities.

Title XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Comm Number	Location	State	Protect Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Air Force	80,110	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Acft Support Eq Shop	3,000	3,000
Air Force	80,110	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Add to Aerial Port	1,900	1,900
Air Force	80,110	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Add to and Alter for Squad Ops and AMU	8,200	8,200
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Add to Combat Arms Maint. and Training Simulator	1,000	1,000
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Alter Bldg 8515 for Supply and Security Forces	5,600	5,600
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Base Engineer Complex	500	500
Air Force	80,110	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Fuel Cell/Corrosion Control Facility	22,000	22,000
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Medical Training Facility	5,400	5,400
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Operations and Training Facility	8,900	8,900
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Training Fire Station	2,500	2,500
Air Force	80	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	1,500	1,500
Army	189	Redstone Arsenal	AL	Rotary Wing Center	46,000	46,000
Army	148	Redstone Arsenal	AL	AMC & USASAC Headquarters, Incr 2	0	98,000
MDA	134	Redstone Arsenal	AL	Von Braun Complex	0	127,000
Army	13	Jonesboro	AR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	23,000	23,000
Army	13	NW Arkansas (Fayetteville)	AR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	25,000	25,000
Navy	137B	MCAS Miramar	CA	HRSC Consolidation	20,940	20,940
Navy	138	MCAS Miramar	CA	Const & Alter Regional Confinement Facility	31,950	31,950
Navy	184	NAWS China Lake	CA	Weapons and Armament Fac#1	32,870	32,870
Navy	184	NAWS China Lake	CA	Renovate Facilities, Ordnance Area	9,270	9,270
Navy	184	NAWS China Lake	CA	Lab Renovation, Building 5	25,520	25,520
Navy	184	NAWS China Lake	CA	Ordnance Storage Facilities	12,110	12,110
Air Force	91	Buckley AFB	CO	BRAC AFR Training Facility	7,200	7,200
Air Force	143B	Buckley AFB	CO	BRAC ARPC Administrative	25,000	25,000
Army	15	AFRC Middletown	CT	Armed Forces Reserve Center	68,000	68,000
Army	15	Newtown Armory	CT	Armed Forces Reserve Center	66,800	66,800
Air Force	85	Bradley IAP AGS	CT	Upgrade A-10 Engine CIRF	1,100	1,100
Navy	149	Washington	DC	Navy Systems Management Activity Relocation	14,963	14,963
Navy	149	Washington	DC	Navy Systems Management Activity Warehouse	7,610	7,610

Title XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Comm Number	Location	State	Protect Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Army	169	Dover AFB	DE	Joint Medical Examiner Facility	52,000	52,000
Army	16	AFRC Newark	DE	Armed Forces Reserve Center	26,000	26,000
Army	4	Eglin AFB	FL	Special Forces Complex	148,000	148,000
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	BRAC F-35 Construction Haul Road	810	810
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	BRAC F-35 Duke Field Barners	1,550	1,550
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	F-35 (JSF) Renovate Maintenance Dock B1318	3,810	3,810
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	F-35 (JSF) Renovate Maintenance Dock B1344	2,006	2,006
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	F-35 (JSF) Renovate Warehouse B1404	1,050	1,050
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	F-35 (JSF) Utility Infrastructure Upgrades	10,400	10,400
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	JSF IFT Dining Facility	5,000	5,000
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	JSF Marine Corps/Navy Hangar (Increment 2)	0	21,800
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB	FL	JSF Munition Maintenance	8,900	8,900
Air Force	128	NAS Pensacola	FL	BRAC-CSO Bachelor Quarters	39,600	39,600
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Medical Facility, Incr 1	157,000	80,000
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Heaquarters Bldg, Armor Officer Basic Crs	7,700	7,700
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	General Instruction Complex 2, Incr 1	77,000	39,000
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Vehicle Maintenance Instruction Facility	63,000	63,000
Army	2	Fort Benning	GA	CIDC Field Operations Bldg	3,050	3,050
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Infrastructure Support, Incr 2	0	74,000
Army	2	Fort Gillem	GA	Armed Forces Reserve Center, Add/Alt	12,000	12,000
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	BRAC Add/Alter Dental Clinic	1,000	1,000
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	BRAC Child Development Center	4,000	4,000
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	BRAC Community Activity Center	4,400	4,400
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	BRAC Transient Lodging Facility	1,800	1,800
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	BRAC Visiting Quarters	2,600	2,600
Air Force	79,103	Moody AFB	GA	LOLA/Ramp/Gun Berm	2,550	2,550
Air Force	104	Hickam AFB	HI	Flight Simulator Training Facility	5,000	5,000
Air Force	116	Sioux Gateway APT	IA	KC-135 Test Apron and Taxiway	3,000	3,000
Army	19	Carbondale	IL	Armed Forces Reserve Center	11,800	11,800

Title XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Comm Number	Location	State	Protect Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Air Force	90	Capital APT AGS	IL	F-16 CIRF Sound Suppressor Foundation	1,600	1,600
Air Force	90	Capital APT AGS	IL	Upgrade F-16 Engine CIRF	6,200	6,200
Army	20	Greenwood (Indianapolis)	IN	Armed Forces Reserve Center	39,000	39,000
Air Force	112	McConnell AFB	KS	Munitions Delivery Road	1,450	1,450
Air Force	112	McConnell AFB	KS	STAMP Relocation	4,900	4,900
Air Force	112	McConnell AFB	KS	STRAPP Relocation	1,800	1,800
Army	143	Fort Knox	KY	Human Resources Command Complex, Incr 3	0	55,400
Army	9	Fort Knox	KY	Army Reserve Center, Phase 2	28,000	28,000
Army	23	Shreveport	LA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	16,500	16,500
Air Force	119	New Orleans ARS	LA	Establish F-15 CIRF	5,100	5,100
Air Force	119	New Orleans ARS	LA	F-15 CIRF Sound Suppressor Foundation	1,500	1,500
Air Force	94	Barnes MPT AGS	MA	EOD Facility	1,750	1,750
Army	169	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	Medical Research Lab, Chem Bio Defense	27,000	27,000
Army	174	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	Non-Medical Chem Bio Fac	27,000	27,000
Army	136	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	Headquarters Bldg, Army Test and Eval Cmd	43,000	43,000
Army	5	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	C4ISR, Phase 2, Incr 1	251,000	99,000
Army	5	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	C4ISR, Phase 1, Incr 3	0	142,000
Army	187	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	Army Research Lab Vehicle Technology	35,000	35,000
Army	169	Bethesda	MD	Community Support Facilities	11,200	11,200
Army	130	Fort Meade	MD	MILDEP Adjudication Activities	51,000	51,000
Army	141	Fort Meade	MD	Defense Media Activity, Incr 1	61,000	44,000
Air Force	129	Andrews AFB	MD	BRAC Construct Administrative Facility	53,000	53,000
Air Force	129	Andrews AFB	MD	BRAC Construct POV Lane, Pearl Harbor Gate	1,350	1,350
DISA	140	Fort Meade	MD	Construct DISA Building	130,128	130,128
TMA	169	Bethesda (WRNMMC)	MD	Medical Center Addition - Increment 2	200,500	201,350
Navy	65	Inspector-Instructor Bath	ME	Facility Renovation Project	540	540
Navy	65	Portsmouth	ME	Special Purpose BN Ops Facility	2,900	2,900
Army	176	Detroit Arsenal	MI	Administrative Office Buildings, Incr 1	99,000	56,000
Army	176	Detroit Arsenal	MI	Weapons Maintenance and Operations Fac	6,400	6,400

Title XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Comm Number	Location	State	Protect Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Air Force	95	Selfridge ANGB	MI	Add To Alert Complex	870	870
Army	127	Leonard Wood	MO	Prime Power School Complex	29,000	29,000
Air Force	94	Lambert - St. Louis IAP AGS	MO	Relocate 157 AOG	4,000	4,000
TMA	173G	Keesler AFB	MS	Community Hospital	67,700	67,700
Army	3	Fort Bragg	NC	Headquarters Bldg, FORSCOM/USARC, Incr 2	0	150,000
Army	30	Beatrice Readiness Center	NE	Armed Forces Reserve Center	13,290	13,290
Army	31	Pease AFRC	NH	Armed Forces Reserve Center	34,000	34,000
Army	53	Lakehurst AFRC	NJ	Equipment Concentration Site	27,000	27,000
Army	186	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	Packaging, Handling, Shipping & Trans Ctr	26,000	26,000
Army	186	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	Fuze Eng Cmplx/Explosive Magazines	25,000	25,000
Army	186	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	Guns & Weapons Systems Lab (Turret)	12,000	12,000
Army	186	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	Guns & Weapons Systems Tech Data	13,000	13,000
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	Aviation Supply Dept & AIMD Ops Facility	37,010	37,010
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	Munitions Maintenance Facility	1,800	1,800
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	NAVY VR Fleet Logistics Ops Facility (INCR II of II)	0	28,882
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	Aviation Support Facility Hangar Renovation	12,000	12,000
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	C-130 Flight Simulator Facility	4,260	4,260
Navy	68	McGuire AFB (Cookstown)	NJ	Helicopters Hangars & MAG HQ (INCR II of II)	0	41,941
Air Force	89,100	Nellis AFB	NV	Construct Airfield Pavements	7,800	7,800
Army	34	AFRC Farmingdale	NY	Armed Forces Reserve Center, Incr 2	0	27,000
Army	5	West Point	NY	US Military Academy Prep School, Incr 1	198,000	100,000
Army	37	Columbus	OH	Armed Forces Reserve Center	65,218	65,218
Army	37	Mansfield	OH	Armed Forces Reserve Center	30,714	30,714
Air Force	187	Wright-Patterson AFB	OH	Add to and Alter Sensors Laboratory (AFRL/SN)	40,000	40,000
Air Force	170	Wright-Patterson AFB	OH	Pipeline Dormitory	12,600	12,600
Air Force	170	Wright-Patterson AFB	OH	USAFSAM (Increment 2)	0	30,000
Army	73	Broken Arrow	OK	Armed Forces Reserve Center	12,100	12,100
Army	38	Broken Arrow	OK	Armed Forces Reserve Center	54,900	54,900
Army	38	Muskogee	OK	Armed Forces Reserve Center	23,000	23,000

Title XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Comm Number	Location	State	Protect Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Army	10	Fort Sill	OK	ADA Brigade Complex, Incr 2	0	47,000
Army	39	Camp Wythcombe	OR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	45,500	45,500
Army	40	AFRC Lewisburg	PA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	24,000	24,000
Army	40	AFRC Williamsport	PA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	18,500	18,500
Army	40	AFRC Willow Grove	PA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	30,000	30,000
Navy	137B	Philadelphia	PA	Renovate Building 9	20,570	20,570
Navy	57	Tobyhanna Army Depot	PA	Radar Maintenance Facility	2,450	2,450
Navy	73	NMCRC Pittsburgh	PA	NMCRC Moundsville to NMCRC Pittsburgh, PA	4,920	4,920
Army	41	AFRC Fort Allen	PR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	19,500	19,500
Army	41	AFRC Fort Buchanan	PR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	28,000	28,000
Army	41	Ceiba	PR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	36,000	36,000
Army	41	Mayaguez	PR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	37,000	37,000
Navy	181	NS Newport	RI	Maritime Subsurface Sensor Operations Facility	15,320	15,320
Army	3	Shaw AFB	SC	Headquarters Building, Third US Army	102,000	102,000
Air Force	3A	Shaw AFB	SC	Dormitory Renovation for HQ 3rd Army	2,350	2,350
Army	43	Kingsport	TN	Armed Forces Reserve Center	19,300	19,300
Air Force	92	McGhee Tyson APT AGS	TN	Expand Parking Apron & Hydrant Sys	5,200	5,200
Army	44	AFRC Amarillo	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	24,000	24,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Division Headquarters Building	25,000	25,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Combat Aviation Brigade Complex, Incr 3	0	103,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Brigade Combat Team Complex #3, Incr 2	0	145,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility 1	79,000	79,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Community Infrastructure	32,000	32,000
Army	44	AFRC Dyess AFB	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	40,000	40,000
Army	44	AFRC Lewisville	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	22,000	22,000
Army	44	AFRC Round Rock	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	41,000	41,000
Army	44	AFRC San Marcos	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	29,000	29,000
Army	44	AFRC Tyler	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	29,000	29,000
Air Force	113	NAS-JRB Fort Worth	TX	BRAC AFR Add Avionics Shop	1,050	1,050

Title XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Comm Number	Location	State	Protect Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Air Force	113	NAS-JRB Fort Worth	TX	BRAC AFR ECM Shop	1,150	1,150
Air Force	111	Ellington Field	TX	Relocate 272 EIS HQ	2,650	2,650
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	Medical Field Training Complex	18,000	18,000
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	METC Medical Instructional Facility (Increment 2)	0	96,400
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	METC Student Dorm #1 (Increment 2)	0	41,200
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	METC Student Dorm #2 (Increment 2)	0	33,700
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	METC Student Dorm #3 (Increment 1)	48,000	48,000
Air Force	170	Fort Sam Houston	TX	Tri-Service Research Facility	79,500	79,500
Air Force	170	Randolph AFB	TX	AF Audit Agency Relocation	1,336	1,336
TMA	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	San Antonio Military Medical Center (North) Incr 2	162,700	294,074
TMA	172	Lackland AFB	TX	WHMC Rennovation of Ambulatory Care Center	51,000	51,000
Air Force	113	Hill AFB	UT	Renovate LANTIRN CIRF Bldgs 584 & 578	2,500	2,500
Army	129	Arlington Hall	VA	Armed Forces Reserve Center, Add/Alt	80,100	80,100
Army	5	Fort Belvoir	VA	Network Operations Center	8,300	8,300
Army	132	Fort Belvoir	VA	Infrastructure Support, Incr 2	0	23,000
Army	168	Fort Belvoir	VA	Infrastructure Support, Incr 2	0	48,000
Army	169	Fort Belvoir	VA	Infrastructure Support, Incr 2	0	20,000
Army	168	Fort Belvoir	VA	Defense Access Roads, EPG	36,000	36,000
Army	8	Fort Eustis	VA	Headquarters Building, TRADOC	113,000	113,000
Army	122	Fort Lee	VA	USAF Transportation Management School	16,500	16,500
Army	121	Fort Lee	VA	Warrior Training Facilities	12,000	12,000
Army	121	Fort Lee	VA	Combat Service Support School, Ph 1, Incr 3	0	6,348
Army	133	Fort Lee	VA	Administrative Building (DCMA)	23,000	23,000
Army	121	Fort Lee	VA	Combat Service Support School, Ph 2, Incr 2	0	143,000
Army	123	Fort Lee	VA	JCOE for Culinary Training	17,000	17,000
NGA	168	Fort Belvoir	VA	NGA Headquarters Facility	324,900	743,868
TMA	169	Fort Belvoir	VA	Hospital Replacement - Increment 3	249,000	197,750
WHS	133	Fort Belvoir	VA	Office Complex	0	274,330
Navy	131	MCB Quantico	VA	Collocate MILDEP Invest Agencies (INCR II of II)	0	213,109

Title XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Comm Number	Location	State	Protect Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Navy	138	Chesapeake	VA	Joint Regional Correctional Facility (INCR I of II)	33,000	33,000
Navy	138	MCB Quantico	VA	Pre-trial Detainee Facility	5,570	5,570
Navy	8	NS Norfolk	VA	Renovate V47 for Combat Craft Facility	7,140	7,140
DIA	167	Rivanna Station (Charlottesville)	VA	Joint Use Intelligence Analysis Facility - Phase 2	3,000	21,000
Army	45	AFRC White River Junction	VT	Armed Forces Reserve Center	28,000	28,000
Army	46	AFRC Everett	WA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	28,000	28,000
Air Force	116	Fairchild AFB	WA	Relocate Combat Communications	12,800	12,800
Army	48	Madison	WI	Armed Forces Reserve Center	25,375	25,375
Army	73	Madison	WI	Armed Forces Reserve Center	6,600	6,600
Air Force	97	Gen Mitchell IAP AGS	WI	Add Hydrant Refueling Outlet	1,150	1,150
Air Force	-	Various	World Wide	Planning and Design	4,173	4,173
Army	-	Various	Worldwide	Planning and Design	12,000	12,000
Army	-	Various	Worldwide	Planning and Design (GDPR)	3,700	3,700
				Total Military Construction and P&D	**5,141,743**	**7,224,795**

Title XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Comm Number	Location	State	Protect Title	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Army	-	Various	Various	Environmental	54,831	54,831
Navy	-	Various	Various	Environmental	8,627	8,627
Air Force	-	Various	Various	Environmental	11,486	11,486
Def Wide	-	Various	Various	Environmental	0	0
				Total Environmental	**74,944**	**74,944**
Army	-	Various	Various	Operation and Maintenance	481,561	481,561
Navy	-	Various	Various	Operation and Maintenance	254,336	254,336
Air Force	-	Various	Various	Operation and Maintenance	253,272	253,272
Def Wide	-	Various	Various	Operation and Maintenance	340,152	340,152
				Total Operation and Maintenance	**1,329,321**	**1,329,321**
Army	-	Various	Various	MilPers PCS	0	0
Navy	-	Various	Various	MilPers PCS	9,785	9,785
Air Force	-	Various	Various	MilPers PCS	6,786	6,786
Def Wide	-	Various	Various	MilPers PCS	0	0
				Total MilPers PCS	**16,571**	**16,571**
Army	-	Various	Various	Other	157,991	157,991
Navy	-	Various	Various	Other	12,099	12,099
Air Force	-	Various	Various	Other	63,226	63,226
Def Wide	-	Various	Various	Other	186,439	186,439
				Total Other	**419,755**	**419,755**
				TOTAL FY 2009 FUNDING FOR BRAC 2005	**6,982,334**	**9,065,386**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Base Closure and Realignment 2005 Program Underfunding

The committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense has not used the appropriate cost indices to correctly account for construction cost escalation and has underfunded the Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) 2005 account. In a report to Congress dated February 28, 2008, the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics reported that the budget request for fiscal year 2008 did not include the full scope of projects and indicated that the fiscal year 2008 BRAC construction program "is generally underfunded for the current construction market" and "will pose a clear challenge to executing FY 2008 projects." The report also indicated that the combined impacts of the Guidance Unit Cost and the Area Cost Factor would result in an 11 percent increase, or $736.0 million to the execution of the BRAC program. The committee recommends that the Department use the reprogramming authority to correctly fund the required scope of construction and not reduce the scope of the projects to match available funding.

The committee is also concerned about statements from the Department of Defense's witnesses before the Subcommittee on Readiness that indicated the BRAC 2005 program is fully funded. Contradicting these statements is a report to Congress dated March 14, 2008, in which the Secretary of the Army reported numerous BRAC 2005 projects that have been deferred until after the statutory completion date.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report, by March 1, 2009, with the following information:

(1) Progress of properly funding the BRAC 2005 construction projects, commensurate with civilian construction cost indices;

(2) Assessment of the BRAC 2005 construction program if the appropriate Area Cost Factors and Guidance Use Costs were incorporated in the budget request for fiscal year 2010; and

(3) Assessment of BRAC 2005 construction projects that have been deferred until after the statutory completion date.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990

This section would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decision of the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 Base Closure and Realignment.

Section 2702—Authorized Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005

This section would authorize military construction projects for fiscal year 2009 for ongoing activities that are required to imple-

ment the decisions of the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment. The table included in this title of this report lists the specific amount authorized at each location.

Section 2703—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction projects for fiscal year 2009 that are required to implement the decisions of the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) round. This provision would also provide an overall limit of the amount authorized for BRAC military construction projects. The state list contained in this report provides a list of specific projects authorized at each location.

SUBTITLE B—AMENDMENTS TO BASE CLOSURE AND RELATED LAWS

Section 2711—Repeal of the Commission Approach to the Development of Recommendations in Any Future Round of Base Closures and Realignments

This section would repeal the process for arriving at Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) decisions.

The committee remains supportive of tools that allow the Department of Defense to productively right size defense infrastructure with the current defense mission. Traditionally, the BRAC process was used as the process to institute this change. However, the 2005 BRAC process was modified from a method of managing excess infrastructure into a process that instituted internal organizational change at a time when the Department was undergoing severe strain and prosecuting conflicts on multiple fronts. Ultimately, the Department only marginally reduced defense infrastructure and a very activist BRAC Commission modified 35 percent of the Department's recommendation.

In instituting the recommendations, significant changes have occurred since the BRAC Commission concluded their review. For example, the Comptroller General recently reported that the BRAC 2005 costs have increased by 48 percent and the projected savings have been reduced by 5 percent. This cost growth is reflective of an inadequate comparative tool that was used to evaluate various scenarios. Furthermore, some state and local communities have been unable to cope with the level of change recommended by the BRAC process and are expressing concerns about their ability to provide commensurate support in transportation and public school sectors.

The committee believes that the Department needs to change the methods and application of the base closure process before requesting another base closure round.

Section 2712—Modification of Annual Base Closure and Realignment Reporting Requirements

This section would amend the annual reporting requirements associated with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–510).

Section 2713—Technical Corrections Regarding Authorized Cost and Scope of Work Variations for Military Construction and Military Family Housing Projects Related to Base Closures and Realignments

This section would provide a technical correction to the Base Closure and Realignment construction notification clause and require the Department of Defense to report costs and scope variances that exceed 20 percent or $2,000,000, whichever is lesser.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2721—Conditions on Closure of Walter Reed Army Medical Hospital and Relocation of Operations to National Naval Medical Center and Fort Belvoir

This section would direct the Department of Defense to cease construction beyond work necessary to complete the foundation of the replacement facilities until the Secretary of Defense certifies the following items have been completed: 90 percent of the construction design; an independent cost estimate to complete the realignment of the Walter Reed Army Medical Center; and a milestone schedule to complete the proposed realignment.

The committee remains committed to implementing the Department's goal of transforming the National Capitol Region Health Care System into a world class medical center at the hub of our nation's premiere regional health care system serving our military and our nation. As such, it is critical to ensure that this vision is integrated into the ongoing design and construction required of the realignment of the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. Therefore, the committee believes that a higher level of design is required before vertical construction commences, better cost controls are implemented, and a comprehensive schedule is complete to ensure a seamless transition from existing capabilities into a world class medical system.

Section 2722—Report on Use of BRAC Properties as Sites for Refineries or Nuclear Power Plants

This section would require a study evaluating the feasibility of using military installations selected for closure under the base closure and realignment process as locations for the construction of petroleum or natural gas refineries or nuclear power plants.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Critical Infrastructure Program

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense established the Defense Critical Infrastructure Program (DCIP) pursuant to Department of Defense Directive (DODD) 3020.40 to identify and assure the availability of mission-critical infrastructure.

The committee notes with concern a recent study that found that critical national missions are "at an unacceptably high risk of ex-

tended outage from failure of the [power] grid and other critical national infrastructure." Although public works infrastructure, including power supply, is being analyzed as a part of DCIP, the committee is concerned that little progress has been made.

In addition, the committee is concerned that the Department has not properly programmed, in the Future Years Defense Program, security upgrades at access points and entry gates to military installations. These requirements were principally generated in response to Joint Staff Integrated Vulnerability Assessments and impact the level of security for military assets and personnel. The committee is also concerned about potential limitations in contingency operations related to Tier One assets as identified by DODD 3020.40.

Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to include installation security- and threat reduction-related military construction in the near term program and budgeting decisions, particularly as it relates to gates and access points. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to complete an assessment of Tier One assets and the corrective action required to provide assured power and secure and maintain redundancy of critical assets. This report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to continue its review of the critical infrastructure program and assess the Department's compliance with DODD 3020.40 and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2009.

Facilities Sustainment

The committee is convinced that the Department of Defense's decision to pursue standardized models for facilities sustainment and recapitalization will provide consistent service throughout the Department. The committee is also encouraged that the Department plans to expand this effort to include installation support services and supports standardization of service metrics. However, the committee is concerned about several issues highlighted by a recent Government Accountability Office report entitled "Continued Management Attention is Needed to Support Installation Facilities and Operations" (GAO–08–502). In this report, the Government Accountability Office concluded that the facilities sustainment model provides a consistent and reasonable framework for preparing estimates of the Department's annual facility sustainment funding requirements. However, the Government Accountability Office also concluded that accuracy and supportability issues with the model's inputs have affected the reliability of the model's estimates.

The committee believes that the inputs to the model are critical elements to support a reliable, standardized process and urges the Department to take prompt action to correct identified deficiencies. The committee also believes that the Department needs to complete a comprehensive review of the inputs to the model, such as the verification of each real property inventory record at least once every five years as currently dictated in the Department's directives, and better assess the specialized maintenance needs for its historic facilities and monuments.

The committee is also concerned that the allocation of facility sustainment funds within the Department may not be consistent

with requirements as determined by the sustainment model; an appropriate mechanism for identifying and funding deferred facility sustainment needs may not exist; the Departments lacks of a comprehensive approach to real property determinations of historic and monumental buildings, specifically including service academies and post secondary education facilities such as the Navy Post Graduate School; and the delivery of installation support services may not be consistent across the joint bases developed by the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment round. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to assess the following: the models' implementation at the installation level; the Department's sustainment funding allocation process ensures installations receive funds to adequately support its facilities; and the status of the Department's efforts to ensure delivery of adequate support services at joint bases. The Comptroller General shall report the results of its review to the congressional defense committees by March 30, 2009.

Formerly Used Defense Sites Review

The committee remains concerned that Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) receive lower priority for environmental remediation funding than active and Base Closure and Realignment installations and is concerned about the long-term consequences of these investment decisions. In the Defense Environmental Programs Report to Congress for fiscal year 2007, the Department identified over $16.0 billion of required remediation to support these FUDS activities. At many sites, the characterization of the environmental remediation required at the FUDS sites has yet to be fully completed. For example, the former Almaden Air Force Station, Santa Clara County, California, has yet to be fully characterized, and the extent of contamination on this property that was conveyed over 25 years ago is unknown. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to take steps to ensure the full characterization of all the FUDS locations, like the former Almaden Air Force Station.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to review the FUDS program and submit to the congressional defense committees a report, by March 1, 2009, assessing the following:

(1) Steps that the Department is taking to mitigate overall contamination at FUDS locations;

(2) Army Corps of Engineers' management of emerging contaminants at FUDS locations;

(3) Army Corps of Engineers' program management ability and organizational construct to manage the FUDS program including sponsorship for budget preparation requirements; and

(4) Relationship of environmental regulators and the Army Corps of Engineers.

Guam Integrated Water Management System

The committee recognizes the need for efficient management, utilization, and conservation of water resources for the civilian and military communities on Guam. For several years, the committee has encouraged the secretaries of the military departments to privatize utility systems where feasible. The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to work collaboratively with the Government of Guam for a comprehensive and integrated water supply and waste-

water system on Guam. To achieve this goal, the committee urges the exploration of a partnership to manage the distribution and supply of potable water on a more efficient basis on Guam.

Joint Land Use Study at Shaw Air Force Base

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is conducting a Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) funded by the Office of the Secretary of Defense to assess, among other things, current and future encroachment threats to U.S. military installations and operating spaces. The committee expects that, in conducting the JLUS, the Department will fully consider the implications of the services' evolving roles, missions, and material requirements as well as its respective and collective impacts upon each of the installations and operating spaces under review. The committee also expects that the Department will fully consider the realized effects and future implications of implementing the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of 2005 while conducting the JLUS proceedings. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to conduct and conclude its JLUS proceedings at Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, as expeditiously as possible, and it encourages the Secretary of Defense to conclude the JLUS before December 31, 2008.

Military Spouse and Families Memorial

The committee is aware of the widespread bipartisan support in the 110th Congress for the yet to be passed H.R. 3026, the Military Spouses Memorial Act of 2007, and recognizes that a memorial honoring our nation's military spouses and families is both fitting and proper. The committee is also aware that the bill does not presently conform to the provisions of the Commemorative Works Act of 1986 (Public Law 102–216), leading to a recent decision by the National Capitol Planning Commission to deny the siting of such a memorial in the District of Columbia. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report, by January 1, 2009, assessing defense installations in the National Capital Area, including Navy Annex and Fort Myer, which may be available to site this important memorial.

Recycled Materials for Road Construction and other Uses

The committee supports the determined efforts of the construction industry to recycle road materials and incorporate household recycled wastes into asphalt aggregate and base course applications. However, the committee is concerned about the uneven use of the construction industry's technique across the United States. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report, by March 1, 2009, with: an industry assessment by state and territory of using recycled materials for road construction; proposed modifications to the existing paving construction specifications that incorporate expanded recycling options; and overall opportunities to expand demand-side recycling options.

Safe Housing for Military Families

The committee was briefed on the Home Safety Month program developed by the Home Safety Council and understands that this program could be effective in preventing home-related injuries. The committee recommends that a program similar to the Home Safety Month program be adopted by the Military Family Housing Public Private partners in their management of over 150,000 family housing units.

Training Range Expansion

The committee understands that modern weapons systems being fielded by each of the military services require even larger, more extensive range facilities than the military departments now have at their disposal. The use of current range facilities is increasingly limited by growing considerations of urban encroachment, endangered species mitigation, and air and maritime traffic congestion. The Army alone said it needs an additional 5,000,000 acres of training space within the United States, a goal the committee believes is not attainable. However, the committee believes the secretaries of the military departments should continue to aggressively pursue opportunities to acquire additional training land, while working closely with local communities. In general, the committee strongly discourages the use of condemnation or eminent domain, and believes this tool should be used as sparingly as possible. The committee applauds the Department's efforts to manage existing ranges in a sustainable manner, but is dismayed to note the significant encroachment reported, particularly at large land maneuver ranges. The committee is concerned about the future availability of ranges sufficiently large and unencumbered enough for realistic training, and encourages the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to continue to manage existing ranges carefully and to seek creative ways to acquire new training ranges in cooperation with state and local officials.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801—Incorporation of Principles of Sustainable Design in Documents Submitted as Part of Proposed Military Construction Projects

This section would require the Department of Defense to incorporate sustainable design concepts and life cycle analysis into a review of options that would be submitted with the annual budget documents.

The committee continues to support construction and contracting innovations that the construction industry is pursuing, and believes accelerated contracting techniques should be pursued to the maximum extent possible. These techniques include construction management at-risk, limitations to the performance and payment bonds at large construction projects, and the continued development of alternative construction methods like modular construction. The Department should also incorporate construction mate-

rials that may require additional funds during construction, but are more cost effective over the life cycle of a facility. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to continue to pursue life cycle, cost effective materials and procedures and include a review of these alternatives when finalizing life cycle decisions for construction.

Section 2802—Extension of Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects Outside the United States

This section would extend the current use of operations and maintenance funds toward military construction requirements, outside the United States, for one year.

Section 2803—Revision of Maximum Lease Amount Applicable to Certain Domestic Army Family Housing Leases to Reflect Previously Made Annual Adjustments in Amount

This section would amend the maximum lease amount available to Army Family House Leases from $18,620 per unit to $35,000 per unit.

Section 2804—Use of Military Family Housing Constructed Under Build and Lease Authority to House Members without Dependents

This section would amend the military family housing build and lease authority and allow service members without dependants to be assigned to those quarters. Furthermore, this authority would also allow the Department of Defense to convert the family housing units, previously provided by the build to lease authority, to military unaccompanied housing. Finally, the secretary concerned would be required to provide notice to the congressional defense committees prior to using the conversion authority.

Section 2805—Lease of Military Family Housing to the Secretary of Defense for Use as Residence

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to lease military family housing in the National Capital Region. The rental rate would be determined by the higher of the following two alternatives:

(1) Fair market value offset by the security and infrastructure savings associated with housing the Secretary of Defense on a military installation; or

(2) 105 percent of the monthly rate for basic allowance for housing of the pay grade of an O–10, with dependents.

Section 2806—Repeal of Reporting Requirement in Connection with Installation Vulnerability Assessments

This section would repeal the current reporting requirements associated with installation vulnerability assessments.

Section 2807—Modification of Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing

This section would modify the existing privatization authorities and provide better real estate visibility and management of conveyance executed with this authority. Specifically, it would: require

the Department of Defense to partner with the family housing developer; require 100 percent performance and payment bonds; require competition for conveyance actions; repeal the authority to assign service members to privatized family housing; and require additional reporting associated with general and flag officer quarters.

Section 2808—Report on Capturing Housing Privatization Best Practices

This section would amend section 2884(b) of title 10, United States Code, and require an additional reporting element to annual reporting requirements. Specifically, the Secretary of Defense would submit to the congressional defense committees a report on best business practices for the execution of housing privatization initiatives.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Clarification of Exceptions to Congressional Reporting Requirements for Certain Real Property Transactions

This section would clarify reporting requirements associated with civil works and other real estate transactions.

Section 2812—Authority to Lease Non-Excess Property of Military Departments and Defense Agencies

This section would modify the Department of Defense's leasing authority and restrict certain uses of that authority. Specifically, the Department would be limited to leases less than 50 years, would be limited in the types of lease back agreements that could be entered, and would be limited on the use of proceeds derived from leases. Also, the secretaries concerned would be required to determine that property is not excess and would be required to provide expanded notifications to the congressional defense committees during the course of the lease review process. Finally, the secretary would be required to submit a report 30 days before the secretary enters into a lease that describes the agreement reached with the local municipality on taxation issues and further describes the proposed lessee payment.

Section 2813—Modification of Utility System Conveyance Authority

This section would modify the existing utility privatization authorities and provide the secretary concerned the discretion to convey additional, discrete utility elements without competition to an existing utility privatization interest, if certain criteria are met.

Section 2814—Permanent Authority to Purchase Municipal Services for Military Installations in the United States

This section would authorize the Department of Defense to acquire certain municipal services to support installation requirements.

Section 2815—Defense Access Roads

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a needs assessment to assess the magnitude of the transportation improvement required when the Secretary of Defense has concluded that a Department of Defense action has caused a significant transportation impact.

Section 2816—Protecting Private Property Rights during Department of Defense Land Acquisitions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to make every reasonable effort to acquire real property expeditiously by negotiation. The Secretary of Defense shall not be precluded from acquiring real property from willing sellers.

SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATED TO GUAM REALIGNMENT

Section 2821—Guam Defense Policy Review Initiative Account

This section would establish the Guam Defense Policy Review Account for purposes of centralizing account management for issues related to the realignment of military installations on Guam and the relocation of military personnel on Guam. Furthermore, not later that February 15 of every year, the Department shall submit a report to Congress that describes the military construction projects related to the realignment of military installations and the relocation of military personnel on Guam.

Section 2822—Sense of Congress regarding Use of Special Purpose Entities for Military Housing Related to Guam Realignment

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Special Purpose Entities proposed to support military family members in Guam should closely follow the model and standards associated with the privatized family housing initiative authorized by subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code. Furthermore, it would express the sense of Congress that utility funding associated with the Special Purpose Entity should be consolidated with the civilian infrastructure to maximize effectiveness of the overall system.

Section 2823—Sense of Congress Regarding Federal Assistance to Guam

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Interagency Group on Insular Affairs, should enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Government of Guam to identify civilian infrastructure associated with the capabilities expansion on Guam.

Section 2824—Comptroller General Report Regarding Interagency Requirements Related to Guam Realignment

This section would require the Comptroller General to submit a report on the status of interagency coordination related to the realignment of military forces on Guam.

Section 2825—Energy and Environmental Design Initiatives in Guam Military Construction and Installations

This section would require that facilities constructed to support the military expansion at Guam have energy efficiencies and energy conservation measures incorporated into the overall design process. Specifically, this section would require that military construction projects on Guam incorporate Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design to achieve not less than the U.S. Green Building Council silver standard for new construction.

Section 2826—Department of Defense Inspector General Report Regarding Guam Realignment

This section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to submit a report to Congress within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the efforts of the Inspector General to address potential waste and fraud associated with the realignment of military forces on Guam.

Section 2827—Eligibility of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for Military Base Reuse Studies and Community Planning Assistance

This section would authorize the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to be eligible to receive funds for military base reuse studies and community planning assistance.

Section 2828—Prevailing Wage Applicable to Guam

This section would require military construction contracts to comply with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, and would require a construction wage determination to be applied in all military construction contracts in Guam.

SUBTITLE D—ENERGY SECURITY

Section 2841—Certification of Enhanced Use Leases for Energy-Related Projects

This section would require that, if a proposed enhanced use lease involves a project related to energy production, and the term of the lease exceeds 20 years, the secretary of a military department may not enter into the lease until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the lease is consistent with the Department of Defense energy performance goals and plan required by section 2911 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 2842—Annual Report on Department of Defense Installations Energy Management

This section would amend section 2925(a) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to report on efforts taken to meet new energy goals set forth in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140) and on efforts to meet certification requirements for sustainable green-building standards for construction and major renovations.

SUBTITLE E—LAND CONVEYANCES

Section 2851—Land Conveyance, Former Naval Air Station, Alameda, California

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to convey the Former Naval Air Station, California, to the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority, except those lands designated as public benefit conveyances and certain other surplus lands.

Section 2852—Land Conveyance, Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point, Norwalk, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey 10 acres at the Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point to the City of Norwalk, California, for recreational purposes.

Section 2853—Land Conveyance, Former Naval Station, Treasure Island, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey the former Naval Station Treasure Island, California, to the Treasure Island redevelopment authority. Consideration for this transfer would be provided by the redevelopment authority's assuming at lease one of the following: the remediation of known environmental contamination, or by the Secretary of the Navy receiving a share of the revenues.

Section 2854—Condition on Lease Involving Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy and Ford Island Properties/Hunt Development to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Hawaii Community Development Authority to ensure that the development plan for the real property conforms to the final Kalaeloa Master Plan.

Section 2855—Land Conveyance, Sergeant First Class M.L. Downs Army Reserve Center, Springfield, Ohio

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey the Sergeant First Class M.L. Downs Army Reserve Center, Springfield, Ohio to the City of Springfield, Ohio for use for municipal government services.

Section 2856—Land Conveyance, John Sevier Range, Knox County, Tennessee

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey 124 acres known as the John Sevier Range in Knox County, Tennessee, to the State of Tennessee for use as a public firing range and associated recreational activities.

Section 2857—Land Conveyance, Bureau of Land Management Land, Camp Williams, Utah

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey 431 acres to the State of Utah for military use by the Utah National Guard at Camp Williams, Utah.

Section 2858—Land Conveyance, Army Property, Camp Williams, Utah

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey 608 acres and 308 acres, respectively, acres to the State of Utah for military use by the Utah National Guard at Camp Williams, Utah.

Section 2859—Extension of Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail through Fort Belvoir, Virginia

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into a revocable at will easement with the Secretary of the Interior to provide land along the perimeter of Fort Belvoir, Virginia, to be used to extend the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2871—Revised Deadline for Transfer of Arlington Naval Annex to Arlington National Cemetery

This section would delay the proposed transfer of the Arlington Naval Annex to the Arlington National Cemetery by one year. This delay would allow the Department of Defense the opportunity to better manage tenants affected by Base Closure and Realignment, provide savings, and ensure the timely site development for future use by the Arlington National Cemetery.

Section 2872—Decontamination and Use of Former Bombardment Area on Island of Culebra

This section would amend the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–166) and remove restrictions to environmental remediation on the Island of Culebra that were incorporated to protect the former bombardment area on the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico, from further development.

Section 2873—Acceptance and Use of Gifts for Construction of Additional Building at National Museum of the United States Air Force, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to accept a gift from the Air Force Museum Foundation that would allow construction of the fourth building for the National Museum of the United States Air Force at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Section 2874—Establishment of Memorial to American Rangers at Fort Belvoir, Virginia

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to permit the American Ranger Memorial Association, Inc., to establish and maintain a memorial, at a suitable location at Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

Section 2875—Lease Involving Pier on Ford Island, Pearl Harbor Naval Base, Hawaii

This section would direct the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a two year lease with the USS Missouri Memorial Association to use the pier Foxtrot Five on Ford Island, Hawaii.

Section 2876—Naming of Health Facility, Fort Rucker, Alabama

This section would require the health facility located at 301 Andrews Avenue at Fort Rucker, Alabama, to be known as the "Lyster Army/VA Health Clinic."

TITLE XXIX—ADDITIONAL WAR-RELATED AND EMERGENCY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

SUMMARY

Title XXIX of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) authorized $2,158,741,000 in emergency authorization of appropriations. Since enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the Department transmitted a budget modification. The committee recommends an additional authorization of appropriation of $1,182,489,000 to support war-related and emergency military construction requirements.

Title XXIX -- WAR-RELATED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Dollars in Thousands)

State/Country	Account	Installation	Project Title	FY 2008 Request	House Change	House Authorized
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	CAMP PENDLETON	PUBLIC PRIVATE VENTURE PHASE 6B	10,692	0	10,692
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	TWENTYNINE PALMS	PUBLIC PRIVATE VENTURE PHASE 2A	1,074	0	1,074
ALASKA	ARMY	FORT WAINWRIGHT	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	17,000	0	17,000
CALIFORNIA	AIR FORCE	BEALE AFB	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	17,600	0	17,600
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	CAMP PENDLETON	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	9,270	0	9,270
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	CHINA LAKE	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	7,210	0	7,210
CALIFORNIA	ARMY	FORT IRWIN	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	11,800	0	11,800
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	POINT MUGU	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	7,250	0	7,250
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	SAN DIEGO	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	17,930	0	17,930
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	SAN DIEGO MCRD	RECRUIT BARRACKS		43,200	43,200
CALIFORNIA	NAVY	TWENTYNINE PALMS	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	11,250	0	11,250
COLORADO	ARMY	FORT CARSON	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	8,400	0	8,400
FLORIDA	AIR FORCE	EGLIN AFB	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	11,000	0	11,000
FLORIDA	NAVY	EGLIN AFB	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSE ADDITIONS	780	0	780
GEORGIA	ARMY	FORT BENNING	CLASSROOMS AND BATTALION DINING FAC		30,500	30,500
GEORGIA	TMA	FORT BENNING	HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT		350,000	350,000
GEORGIA	ARMY	FORT GORDON	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	7,800	0	7,800
GEORGIA	ARMY	FORT GORDON	AIT COMPLEX 1, PH 1		32,000	32,000
HAWAII	ARMY	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	12,500	0	12,500
KANSAS	TMA	FORT RILEY	HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT		404,000	404,000
KENTUCKY	ARMY	FORT CAMPBELL	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	9,900	0	9,900
KENTUCKY	ARMY	FORT KNOX	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	7,400	0	7,400
MISSISSIPPI	NAVY	GULFPORT	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	6,570	0	6,570
MISSOURI	ARMY	FORT LEONARD WOOD	STARBASE COMPLEX 6, PH 1		50,000	50,000
NEW JERSEY	AIR FORCE	MCGUIRE AFB	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSE	6,200	0	6,200
NEW MEXICO	AIR FORCE	CANNON AFB	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	8,000	0	8,000
NORTH CAROLINA	NAVY	CAMP LEJEUNE	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	11,980	0	11,980
NORTH CAROLINA	NAVY	CAMP LEJEUNE	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	16,000	0	16,000
NORTH CAROLINA	TMA	CAMP LEJUENE	HOSPITAL ADDITION/ALTERATION		122,000	122,000
NORTH CAROLINA	ARMY	FORT BRAGG	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	8,500	0	8,500
OKLAHOMA	ARMY	FORT SILL	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	9,000	0	9,000

Title XXIX -- WAR-RELATED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Dollars in Thousands)

State/Country	Account	Installation	Project Title	FY 2008 Request	House Change	House Authorized
SOUTH CAROLINA	ARMY	FORT JACKSON	STUDENT BARRACKS		27,000	27,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	NAVY	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	RECRUIT BARRACKS		19,900	19,900
TEXAS	ARMY	FORT BLISS	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,700	0	5,700
TEXAS	ARMY	FORT BLISS	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,900	0	5,900
TEXAS	ARMY	FORT BLISS	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,700	0	5,700
TEXAS	ARMY	FORT HOOD	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	7,200	0	7,200
TEXAS	ARMY	FORT SAM HOUSTON	AIT BARRACKS		47,000	47,000
TEXAS	ARMY	FORT SAM HOUSTON	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	7,000	0	7,000
VIRGINIA	ARMY	FORT EUSTIS	AIT COMPLEX 1, PH 1		50,000	50,000
VIRGINIA	ARMY	FORT LEE	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	7,400	0	7,400
VIRGINIA	NAVY	YORKTOWN	JIEDDO BATTLE COURSES	8,070	0	8,070
AFGHANISTAN	ARMY	BAGRAM AIR BASE	BAGRAM THEATRE INTERNMENT FACILITY	60,000	-60,000	0
AFGHANISTAN	ARMY	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	CIED ROAD - RTE CONNECTICUT	54,000	0	54,000
DJIBOUTI	NAVY	CAMP LEMONIER	FUEL FARM	4,000	0	4,000
DJIBOUTI	NAVY	CAMP LEMONIER	FULL LENGTH TAXIWAY	15,490	0	15,490
DJIBOUTI	NAVY	CAMP LEMONIER	WESTERN TAXIWAY	2,900	0	2,900
IRAQ	ARMY	BAGHDAD	WATER SUPPLY, TREAT & STOR, PH III	13,000	0	13,000
IRAQ	ARMY	BAGHDAD	MNF NEW EMBASSY COMPOUND	10,500	-10,500	0
IRAQ	ARMY	CAMP ADDER	CORPS SUPPORT CENTER PHASE 3	13,200	-13,200	0
OMAN	AIR FORCE	MASIRAH AIR BASE	EXPEDITIONARY BEDDOWN SITE	6,300	0	6,300
QATAR	AIR FORCE	AL UDEID	CLOSE AIR SUPPORT PARKING APRON	60,400	0	60,400
QATAR	AIR FORCE	AL UDEID	FACILITY REPLACMENTS	40,000	0	40,000
WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	AIR FORCE	UNSPECIF WORLDWIDE	PLANNING & DESIGN		1,427	1,427
WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	ARMY	UNSPECIF WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN		6,000	6,000
WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	NAVY	UNSPECIF WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN		4,052	4,052
WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	TMA	UNSPECIF WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (MTF)		80,000	80,000

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2901—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize war-related military construction projects for the Army. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installations basis.

Section 2902—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize war-related military construction projects for the Navy. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installations basis.

Section 2903—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize war-related military construction projects for the Air Force. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installations basis.

Section 2904—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize war-related military construction projects for the defense agencies. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installations basis.

Section 2905—Termination of Authority to Carry out Fiscal Year 2008 Army Projects for which Funds Were not Appropriated

This section would repeal the project authorizations for military construction projects authorized in fiscal year 2008 for which no funds were appropriated.

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

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $16.0 billion for atomic energy defense activities. Of this amount, $9.1 billion is for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration and $6.9 billion is for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $16.2 billion, an increase of $232.7 million to the budget request.

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation			
Appropriation Summary:			
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	7,622	----	7,622
Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
National Nuclear Security Administration:			
Weapons activities	6,618,079	-8,440	6,609,639
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,247,048	208,100	1,455,148
Naval reactors	828,054	----	828,054
Office of the administrator	404,081	5,000	409,081
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	9,097,262	204,660	9,301,922
Environmental and Other Defense Activities:			
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,297,256	20,000	5,317,256
Other Defense Activities	1,313,461	8,000	1,321,461
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	247,371	----	247,371
Total, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	6,858,088	28,000	6,886,088
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	15,955,350	232,660	16,188,010
Total, Discretionary Funding	15,962,972	232,660	16,195,632

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability			
Operations and analysis			
Infrastructure security & energy restoration	7,622		7,622
Weapons Activities			
Directed stockpile work			
Life extension programs			
B61 Life extension program	2,189		2,189
W76 Life extension program	209,196		209,196
Total, Life extension programs	**211,385**	**----**	**211,385**
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	80,434		80,434
W62 Stockpile systems	1,645		1,645
W76 Stockpile systems	68,418		68,418
W78 Stockpile systems	43,349		43,349
W80 Stockpile systems	32,034		32,034
B83 Stockpile systems	25,759		25,759

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
W87 Stockpile systems	37,189		37,189
W88 Stockpile systems	49,854		49,854
Total, Stockpile systems	**338,682**	**----**	**338,682**
Reliable replacement warhead	10,000	-10,000	0
Weapons dismantlement and disposition			
Operations and maintenance	116,822	-7,500	109,322
Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility OPC		[-7,500]	
Construction:			
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, SRS	66,890		66,890
Total, Weapons dismantlement and disposition	**183,712**	**-7,500**	**176,212**
Stockpile services			
Production support	302,126		302,126
Research and development support	36,231	-3,540	32,691
R&D certification and safety	193,375	5,000	198,375
Facility free hydro-dynamic test capabilities		[5,000]	
Management, technology, and production	201,375		201,375

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Pit manufacturing	145,269	-35,000	110,269
Pit manufacturing capability	53,560	-15,000	38,560
Total, Stockpile services	**931,936**	**-48,540**	**883,396**
Total, Directed stockpile work	**1,675,715**	**-66,040**	**1,609,675**
Campaigns:			
Science campaign			
Advanced certification	20,000	10,000	30,000
Primary assessment technologies	74,413		74,413
Dynamic plutonium experiments	23,734		23,734
Dynamic materials properties	85,805		85,805
Advanced radiography	29,418		29,418
Secondary assessment technologies	79,292		79,292
Test readiness	10,408		10,408
Total, Science campaign	**323,070**	**10,000**	**333,070**
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	35,641	5,000	40,641
Weapons Systems Engineering Assessment Technology	17,105		17,105

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Nuclear survivability	21,753		21,753
Enhanced surveillance	68,243	3,000	71,243
Total, Engineering campaign	**142,742**	**8,000**	**150,742**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign			
Ignition	103,644		103,644
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	68,248		68,248
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	8,920		8,920
Joint Program in High Energy Density Laboratory Plasmas	3,147		3,147
Facility operations and target production	180,384	14,600	194,984
Fully fund NIC baseline plan		[4,600]	
NIC risk mitigation		[10,000]	
NIF assembly and installation	56,899		56,899
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**421,242**	**14,600**	**435,842**
Advanced simulation and computing campaign			
Operations and maintenance	561,742		561,742

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Readiness Campaign			
Stockpile readiness	28,731		28,731
High explosives and weapon operations	8,927		8,927
Nonnuclear readiness	40,165		40,165
Tritium readiness	82,265	-10,000	72,265
Advanced design and production technologies	22,949		22,949
Total, Readiness campaign	**183,037**	**-10,000**	**173,037**
Total, Campaigns	**1,631,833**	**22,600**	**1,654,433**
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)			
Operations of facilities			
Kansas City Plant	122,389		122,389
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	85,160	10,000	95,160
De-Inventory SNM from LLNL		[10,000]	
Los Alamos National Laboratory	298,112		298,112
Nevada Test Site	92,203		92,203
Pantex	104,361	10,000	114,361
Sandia National Laboratory	127,827		127,827
Savannah River Site	108,114		108,114

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Y-12 National security complex	216,904	7,000	223,904
Maintenance of facilities		[5,000]	
Storage/HEUMF		[2,000]	
Institutional site support	57,837		57,837
Total, Operations of facilities	**1,212,907**	**27,000**	**1,239,907**
Program readiness	73,841		73,841
Material recycle and recovery	72,509		72,509
Containers	23,398		23,398
Storage	29,846		29,846
Subtotal, Operations and maintenance	**1,412,501**	**27,000**	**1,439,501**
Construction:			
09-D-404, Test capabilities revitalization II, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM	3,200		3,200

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
08-D-801 High pressure fire loop (HPFL) Pantex, TX	2,000		2,000
08-D-802 High explosive pressing facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	28,233		28,233
08-D-804 TA-55 Reinvestment project Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)	7,900		7,900
08-D-806 Ion beam laboratory refurbishment SNL, Albuquerque, NM	10,014		10,014
07-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	7,446		7,446
07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	19,660		19,660
06-D-140 Project engineering design (PED) various locations	104,661		104,661

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
06-D-402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV	9,340		9,340
05-D-402 Beryllium capability (BEC) project Y-12 National Security Complex, Oakridge, TN	5,015		5,015
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	100,200		100,200
04-D-128 TA-18 Criticality experiments facility (CEF), Los Alamos National Laboratory Nevada Test Site, NV	10,353		10,353
Total, Construction	**308,022**	**----**	**308,022**
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,720,523**	**27,000**	**1,747,523**
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	131,651		131,651

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Program direction	89,421		89,421
Total, Secure transportation asset	**221,072**	**----**	**221,072**
Nuclear weapons incident response	221,936	5,000	226,936
National technical nuclear forensics		[5,000]	
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program			
Operations and maintenance	99,550		99,550
Construction:			
08-D-601 Mercury highway			
Nevada Test Site, NV	11,700		11,700
08-D-602 Portable water system upgrades			
Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	27,666		27,666
07-D-253 TA 1 heating systems modernization			
(HSM) Sandia National Laboratory	15,755		15,755

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
06-D-601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	4,000		4,000
06-D-603 Steam plant life extension project (SLEP), Y-12, National Security Complex, Oakridge, TN	10,878		10,878
Total, Construction	69,999	----	69,999
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	**169,549**	**----**	**169,549**
Environmental projects and operations			
Long term stewardship	40,587		40,587
Transformation disposition	77,391		77,391
Safeguards and Security			
Defense nuclear security			
Operations and maintenance	690,217	3,000	693,217
Physical Security Systems - Y-12		[3,000]	
Construction:			

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
08-D-701 Nuclear materials S&S upgrade project Los Alamos National Laboratory	46,000		46,000
05-D-170 Project engineering and design, various locations	1,111		1,111
Total, Construction	47,111	----	47,111
Total, Defense nuclear security	**737,328**	**3,000**	**740,328**
Cyber security	122,511		122,511
Total, Safeguards and Security	**859,839**	**3,000**	**862,839**
Subtotal, Weapons Activities	**6,618,445**	**-8,440**	**6,610,005**
Adjustments			
Use of prior year balances	-366		-366
Total, Adjustments	**-366**	**----**	**-366**
Total, Weapons Activities	**6,618,079**	**-8,440**	**6,609,639**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operations and maintenance	261,944		261,944

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Construction:			
07-SC-05 Physical Science Facility Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Richland, WA	13,147		13,147
Total, Construction	13,147	----	13,147
Total, Nonproliferation & verification R&D	**275,091**	**---**	**275,091**
Nonproliferation and international security	140,467	-11,900	128,567
Global Nuclear Energy Partnership		[-6,900]	
Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention		[-5,000]	
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	429,694	50,000	479,694
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	141,299		141,299
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition	40,774		40,774
Russian surplus materials disposition	1,000		1,000
Total, Fissile materials disposition	41,774		41,774

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Global threat reduction initiative	219,641	170,000	389,641
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,247,966**	**208,100**	**1,456,066**
Use of prior year balances (NN)	-918		-918
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,247,048**	**208,100**	**1,455,148**
Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance	771,600		771,600
Construction:			
09-D-190, PED, Infrastructure upgrades, KAPL	1,000		1,000
09-D-902, NRF Office Building #2 ECC Upgrade, Idaho	8,300		8,300
08-D-190 Project engineering and design Expended Core Facility M-290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID	300		300

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
07-D-190 Materials research technology complex (MRTC)	12,400		12,400
Total, Construction	22,000	----	22,000
Total, Naval reactors development	**793,600**	**----**	**793,600**
Program direction	34,454		34,454
Total, Naval Reactors	**828,054**	**----**	**828,054**
Office of the Administrator			
Office of the administrator	404,081	5,000	409,081
Total, Office of the Administrator	**404,081**	**5,000**	**409,081**
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			
Closure sites administration	13,209		13,209
Fernald	2,100		2,100
Miamisburg	30,574	10,000	40,574
Mound Site Cleanup		[10,000]	
Total, Closure sites	**45,883**	**10,000**	**55,883**

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Hanford site:			
Program increase for high risk cleanup activities		10,000	10,000
2012 completion projects			
Nuclear facility D&D river corridor closure project	165,248		165,248
NM stabilization and disposition PFP	113,483		113,483
SNF stabilization and disposition	122,171		122,171
Total, 2012 completion projects	**400,902**	**----**	**400,902**
2035 completion projects			
Nuclear facility D&D - remainder of Hanford	85,653		85,653
Richland community and regulatory support	19,620		19,620
Soil and water remediation - groundwater vadose zone	169,682		169,682
Solid waste stabilization and disposition 200 area	175,930		175,930
Total, Hanford site	**851,787**	**10,000**	**861,787**
Idaho National Laboratory:			
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	2,030		2,030
SNF stabilization and disposition - 2012	20,334		20,334

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	178,767		178,767
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	46,025		46,025
Construction:			
06-D-401 Sodium bearing waste treatment project, Idaho	86,700		86,700
Soil and water remediation - 2012	70,268		70,268
Nuclear facility D & D	24,133		24,133
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,867		3,867
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**432,124**	**----**	**432,124**
NNSA sites			
NNSA Service Center/SPRU	16,943		16,943
Nevada	65,674		65,674
Los Alamos National Laboratory	162,467		162,467
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**245,084**	**----**	**245,084**
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
Building 3019	58,000		58,000
Nuclear facility D & D ORNL	58,160		58,160
Nuclear facility D & D Y-12	32,392		32,392

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Nuclear facility D & D - East Tennesse Technology Park	105		105
OR reservation community and regulatory support	6,100		6,100
Soil and water remediation - offsites	4,730		4,730
Solid waste stabilization and disposition - 2012	78,183		78,183
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**237,670**	**----**	**237,670**
Office of River Protection:			
Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
Construction:			
01-D-416 Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
01-D-16A Low activity waste facility	160,000		160,000
01-D-16B Analytical laboratory	65,000		65,000
01-D-16C Balance of facilities	75,000		75,000
01-D-16D High level waste facility	125,000		125,000
01-D-16E Pretreatment facility	265,000		265,000
Total, Construction	690,000	----	690,000
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	**690,000**	**----**	**690,000**

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Tank farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	288,443		288,443
Total, Tank farm activities	**288,443**	**----**	**288,443**
Total, Office of River protection	**978,443**	**----**	**978,443**
Savannah River sites:			
2012 completion projects			
04-D-414 Container surveillance capability in 235F Project engineering and design	2,032		2,032
Total, 2012 completion projects	**2,032**	**----**	**2,032**
2035 completion projects			
SR community and regulatory support	12,500		12,500
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	339,311		339,311
Spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition	24,108		24,108
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	53,559		53,559
Soil and water remediation	67,121		67,121

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Nuclear facility D & D	2,052		2,052
Total, 2035 completion projects	**498,651**	**----**	**498,651**
Tank farm activities			
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	578,218		578,218
Construction:			
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	127,524		127,524
Total, Construction	127,524	----	127,524
Total, Tank farm activities	**705,742**	**----**	**705,742**
Total, Savannah River sites	**1,206,425**	**----**	**1,206,425**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Waste isolation pilot plant	126,425		126,425
Central characterization project	29,069		29,069
Transportation	28,170		28,170
Community and regulatory support	27,860		27,860
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	**211,524**	**----**	**211,524**
Program direction	308,765		308,765

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Program support	33,930		33,930
Safeguards and Security:			
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	5,124		5,124
Oak Ridge Reservation	27,020		27,020
West Valley	1,400		1,400
Paducah	8,196		8,196
Richland/Hanford Site	75,265		75,265
Savannah River Site	134,336		134,336
Total, Safeguards and Security	**251,341**	**----**	**251,341**
Technology development	32,389		32,389
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	463,000		463,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	**5,298,365**	**20,000**	**5,318,365**
Use of prior year balances	-1,109		-1,109
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,297,256**	**20,000**	**5,317,256**

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Other Defense Activities			
Health, Safety and Security			
Health, safety, and security	347,271	8,000	355,271
Program direction	99,597		99,597
Total, Health, Safety and Security	**446,868**	**8,000**	**454,868**
Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	174,397		174,397
Program direction	11,584		11,584
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**185,981**	**----**	**185,981**
Nuclear Energy			
Infrastructure			
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	78,811		78,811
Total, Infrastructure	**78,811**	**----**	**78,811**
Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility			
Operations and maintenance	19,200		19,200

Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	FY2009 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Construction and other project costs:			
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	467,808		467,808
Total, Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility	**487,008**	**----**	**487,008**
Total, Nuclear Energy	**565,819**	**----**	**565,819**
Defense related administrative support	108,190		108,190
Office of hearings and appeals	6,603		6,603
Subtotal, Other Defense Activities	**1,313,461**	**8,000**	**1,321,461**
Total, Other Defense Activities	**1,313,461**	**8,000**	**1,321,461**
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	**247,371**		**247,371**
Total, Department of Energy	**15,962,972**	**232,660**	**16,195,632**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Overview

The budget request contained $9.1 billion for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends $9.3 billion, an increase of $204.7 million to the budget request.

Weapons Activities

Assessment of life extension programs

In February 2008, the committee wrote to the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and requested that he direct the JASON scientific advisory panel to undertake a technical review of warhead life extension programs (LEP) analogous to their 2007 review of the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program. On March 17, 2008, the Administrator responded that NNSA would direct the JASON panel to conduct such a study, for which planning would commence later this year.

The committee welcomes this analysis, and believes a fuller understanding of the risks, uncertainties, and challenges associated with the warhead life extension programs will enable a more robust comparison between the current program of record and any proposed modifications or alternatives, including the RRW proposal.

The committee believes the JASON review should encompass a broad range of options, including some not included in previous LEPs. The committee therefore encourages the Administrator of the NNSA to prepare an assessment of the expected technical and financial costs and benefits of expanding the scope of life extension programs, to include reuse of legacy primary and secondary components. The committee believes such an assessment should inform and be part of the JASON review.

Reliable Replacement Warhead

The budget request contained $10.0 million within Directed Stockpile Work for the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program.

The committee notes that the budget does not provide sufficient funds to complete the Phase 2a design and cost study for RRW. Instead, the request provides modest funding to "address questions raised by the JASON review of RRW feasibility study activities." The committee notes that funds are also requested elsewhere in the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) budget, within Advanced Certification and Enhanced Surety, to support further examination of certification issues raised by the RRW proposal.

The committee sees value in research focused on the certification and stewardship issues raised not only by the RRW proposal, but also by the annual assessment process and certification issues raised by planned warhead life extension programs. Such research is critical to sustaining and modernizing the Stockpile Stewardship Program (SSP), whether or not the RRW program proceeds.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $10.0 million, for the Reliable Replacement Warhead within Directed Stockpile Work. Instead, the committee recommends an additional $10.0 million within Advanced Certification for research to address questions raised by the JASON review of RRW, and to support evaluation of other high priority SSP challenges, including certification of weapons using existing pits or primaries, weapons subject to life extension programs, and weapons modified to include advanced surety and safety features.

Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility

The budget request contained $32.5 million for the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility (PDCF)—Other Project Costs within Weapons Dismantlement and Disposition, an increase of $24.9 million above the fiscal year 2008 appropriated level.

The committee supports construction of the PDCF, but finds the justification for the proposed increase insufficient.

The committee recommends $25.0 million, a decrease of $7.5 million, for the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility—Other Project Costs.

Stockpile Services

Research and Development Support

The budget request contained $36.2 million for Research and Development Support within Stockpile Services.

The committee is supportive of these activities, but finds insufficient grounds for the proposed increase over the fiscal year 2008 appropriated level.

The committee recommends $32.7 million, a decrease of $3.5 million from the request.

Research and Development Certification and Safety

The budget request contained $193.4 million for Research and Development Certification and Safety within Stockpile Services.

The committee supports the National Nuclear Security Administration's efforts to transform the existing nuclear weapons complex into a more modern and responsive infrastructure. The committee notes that, in addition to infrastructure modernization, the scientific tools that sustain the Stockpile Stewardship Program also must be modernized over time. The committee understands, for example, that there is the potential to develop hydro-dynamic test capabilities, which currently require large, expensive facilities, at a scale that would not require new facilities. Instead, such "facility free" hydro-dynamic test capabilities would be small enough to be portable.

The committee recommends $198.4 million in Research and Development Certification and Safety, an increase of $5.0 million specifically for research into the potential for "facility free" hydro-dynamic test capabilities.

Pit Manufacturing and Pit Manufacturing Capability

The budget request contained $145.3 million for Pit Manufacturing and $53.6 million for the Pit Manufacturing Capability, both within Stockpile Services. Each sub-program is defined as aiming

to "establish the capability to manufacture pits other than the W88 pit," and to "improve manufacturing processes used to manufacture all pit types." The committee notes redundancy in the two efforts, and urges the National Nuclear Security Administration to examine the potential for combining these into one activity.

The committee recommends $110.3 million for Pit Manufacturing, a reduction of $35.0 million from the request, and $38.6 million in Pit Manufacturing Capability, a reduction of $15.0 million from the request.

Advanced Certification

The budget request contained $20.0 million for Advanced Certification, a program begun in fiscal year 2008 to fund activities specifically targeting the challenges associated with the assessment and certification of the nation's aging nuclear weapons.

The committee supports such research, and regards it as crucial to the sustainment and modernization of the Stockpile Stewardship Program. In particular, the committee regards the Advanced Certification activity as integral to advancing new approaches to Stockpile Stewardship, including pit or primary reuse options in the life extension programs.

The committee recommends $30.0 million for Advanced Certification, an increase of $10.0 million above the request. The committee recommends the additional funds for research to address questions raised by the JASON review of RRW, and to support evaluation of other high priority SSP challenges, including certification of weapons using existing pits or primaries, weapons subject to life extension programs, and weapons modified to include advanced surety and safety features.

Engineering Campaign

Enhanced Surety

The budget request contained $35.6 million for Enhanced Surety within the Engineering Campaign. According to the request, the Enhanced Surety sub-program is designed to "develop options for weapon system designers during stockpile alterations, modifications, and transformations." The effort further addresses "other refurbishments and stockpile improvement projects needed to meet future Department of Defense requirements."

The committee supports such activities, but understands that the request is insufficient to support analysis of certain options for augmenting the surety of existing legacy stockpile systems, including the surety of the B61 warhead.

The committee recommends $40.6 million for Enhanced Surety, an increase of $5.0 million above the request, for research into emerging options for increasing the surety of existing weapons systems, including the B61 warhead.

Enhanced Surveillance

The budget request contained $68.2 million for Enhanced Surveillance within the Engineering Campaign. This sub-program is designed to develop models and other technologies necessary for early identification and assessment of stockpile aging issues.

The committee supports this activity, but understands that the request does not fully support research into emerging technologies for embedded surveillance. The committee notes the promise in such technologies.

The committee recommends $71.2 million for Enhanced Surveillance, an increase of $3.0 million over the request, for research into embedded surveillance.

Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign

The budget request contained $421.2 million for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign, including $180.4 million for facility operations and target production.

The committee supports the National Ignition Campaign (NIC), and believes the successful execution of this campaign is critical to the success of the Stockpile Stewardship Program. The committee understands the fiscal year 2009 request does not fully fund the National Ignition Campaign Baseline Execution Plan, and further understands that additional risk reduction resources are needed to meet NIC milestones.

The committee recommends $195.0 million, an increase of $14.6 million, for facility operations and target production, of which $4.6 million is for fully funding the National Ignition Campaign Baseline Execution Plan, and $10.0 million is for supporting enhanced target production and risk reduction activities.

Readiness Campaign—Tritium Readiness

The budget request contained $82.3 million for Tritium Readiness sub-program within the Readiness Campaign.

The committee supports Tritium Readiness activities, but understands that the sub-program maintains uncosted, uncommitted balances of more than $25.0 million above the Department of Energy established threshold. The committee is concerned that such funds reflect an imbalance between Tritium Readiness resources and the sub-program scope of work.

The committee recommends $72.3 million, a decrease of $10.0 million, for Tritium Readiness in the Readiness Campaign.

Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities

Operations of Facilities—Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

The budget request contained $85.2 million for operations at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) within Readiness and Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities.

The committee notes the request is $4.2 million below the fiscal year 2008 level. The committee also understands the request is insufficient to fully support removal of Category 1 and Category 2 special nuclear material from LLNL. The committee notes such removal is an important element of the Complex Transformation effort.

The committee recommends $95.2 million for LLNL Operations of Facilities, an increase of $10.0 million above the request, to support reduction and removal of special nuclear materials from LLNL.

Operations of Facilities—Pantex Plant

The budget request contained $104.4 million for operations at the Pantex Plant within Readiness and Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities.

The committee is concerned that the request is $8.5 million below the fiscal year 2008 level at a time when the volume of work at Pantex is not expected to diminish. The committee also understands the request is insufficient to support planned fiscal year 2009 operations at the Pantex Plant.

The committee recommends $114.4 million for Pantex Plant Operations of Facilities, an increase of $10.0 million above the request.

Operations of Facilities—Y–12

The budget request contained $216.9 million for operations at the Y–12 National Security Complex within Readiness and Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities.

The committee notes that while maintenance needs at the Y–12 complex are growing, the request is more than $7.0 million below the fiscal year 2008 funded level. The committee also understands that with additional resources, Y–12 could accelerate the transfer of material from existing facilities into the new Highly Enriched Uranium Materials Facility (HEUMF), thereby reducing the security costs of securing those materials prior to their transfer to the HEUMF.

The committee recommends $223.9 million, an increase of $7.0 million above the request. Of the increase, the committee recommends $5.0 million to support maintenance of facilities at the Y–12 National Security Complex, and $2.0 million to support the relocation of containers and material during the transition into the HEUMF at the Y–12 National Security Complex.

National Nuclear Security Administration nuclear weapons transport

The committee believes the increased use of air transportation of nuclear weapons by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) merits consideration. The Office of Secure Transportation (OST) within the NNSA currently transports nuclear weapons between certain NNSA and Department of Defense facilities for activities such as maintenance, surveillance, disassembly, and the exchange of limited life components.

The committee, therefore, directs the Administrator of the NNSA and the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Nuclear Weapons Council, to conduct a feasibility study of transporting nuclear weapons, components, and materials by aircraft. This study should evaluate options for increasing the use of air transportation between sites and facilities, while taking into account all safety and security concerns. It should assess the need for air assets as a part of OST and the role, schedule, and priority of these missions supportable by air transportation assets from the NNSA and the Air Force consistent with other requirements. The study should compare the safety and security costs, risks, and benefits associated with both air and ground transportation of nuclear weapons, components, and materials to and from all NNSA, Air Force, and Navy facilities.

The committee recognizes that much of the information necessary for inclusion in such a report will be classified. Therefore, the committee directs that a classified report with an unclassified executive summary be submitted to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2008.

National Nuclear Technical Forensics

The budget request contained $221.9 million for Nuclear Weapons Incident Response, including $12.9 million for National Technical Nuclear Forensics (NTNF).

The committee notes that the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and the American Physical Society (APS) recently released a report, "Nuclear Forensics: Role, State of the Art, and Program Needs." The committee notes that the AAAS–APS report recommended accelerated training for personnel trained in disciplines relating to nuclear forensics, including graduate scholarship and fellowship programs to produce three to four new Ph.D.s per year in relevant disciplines. The AAAS–APS report also recommended upgrading equipment currently available to the Department of Energy national laboratories which support the NTNF.

The committee recommends $226.9 million for Nuclear Weapons Incident Response, including $17.9 million in NTNF, an increase of $5.0 million, to support fellowships for disciplines critical to support the mission of the National Technical Nuclear Forensics effort and to upgrade and modernize laboratory equipment.

Defense Nuclear Security—Operations and Maintenance—Physical Security systems—Y–12

The budget request contained $690.2 million for Operations and Maintenance, including $77.2 million for Physical Security Systems, within Defense Nuclear Security.

The committee recommends $693.2 million, including $80.2 million for Physical Security Systems, an increase of $3.0 million, to implement physical security upgrades and enable compliance with the Design Basis Threat at the Y–12 National Security Complex.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

The budget request contained $1.2 billion for Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs.

The committee fully supports the goals of NNSA's nonproliferation programs and continues to believe that such programs are critical to U.S. national security and must be a top national security priority. In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, the committee expressed concern that a lack of effective policy guidance and leadership, as well as programmatic and funding constraints, have limited the progress of NNSA and other nonproliferation programs in recent years. The committee further noted that although NNSA nonproliferation programs have made significant progress over the last 15 years, much remains to be done, and emphasized that there must be a strong national commitment to reinvigorate these programs.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) addressed these concerns by increasing fund-

ing for NNSA nonproliferation programs by $235.0 million above the budget request for fiscal year 2008. Public Law 110–181 also: required a report by the President on nuclear terrorism prevention; required reports by the Secretary of Energy on strengthening and expanding the NNSA International Radiological Threat Reduction and NNSA International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation programs; and included other provisions to ensure that wherever possible, NNSA nonproliferation programs address threats involving nuclear and radiological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

The committee also notes that the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53), passed in the 110th Congress by both the House and Senate as H.R. 1 and commonly known as "the 9/11 bill," included a number of provisions and authorized funding to accelerate, strengthen, and expand NNSA nonproliferation programs. Provisions include the establishment of both a presidential coordinator and a congressional-executive commission on the prevention of weapons of mass destruction proliferation and terrorism.

The committee believes that there are additional opportunities for NNSA nonproliferation programs to address the wide variety of global threats arising from the proliferation of nuclear and radiological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise. The committee believes NNSA nonproliferation programs would continue to benefit from increased funding to address such threats.

The committee recognizes and appreciates recent actions by NNSA to eliminate impediments to timely obligating and executing authorized and appropriated funds for NNSA nonproliferation programs. Such actions have enabled NNSA to achieve a level of uncommitted uncosted balances for most NNSA nonproliferation programs that is below the acceptable levels established by NNSA in close coordination with the Government Accountability Office. The committee urges NNSA to continue its efforts to eliminate any remaining impediments to timely obligating and executing funds for NNSA nonproliferation programs. The committee further expects that any additional funds that it recommends for NNSA nonproliferation programs under this Act will be obligated and executed in a timely manner. The committee further urges NNSA nonproliferation programs to maintain a particular focus on securing nuclear and radiological weapons and weapons-related materials and technologies at the source wherever possible.

The committee recommends $1.5 billion, an increase of $208.1 million. This includes an increase of $215.0 million for NNSA nonproliferation programs and a decrease of $6.9 million for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. In addition, elsewhere in this title, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for the Office of the Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program direction.

Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development

The budget request contained $275.1 million for Nonproliferation Research and Development (R&D). The committee fully supports the goals of the R&D program, and notes that the program is the sole remaining U.S. Government capability for long-term nuclear

nonproliferation research and development. The committee emphasizes the importance of expanding U.S. scientific skills and resources and improving U.S. Government capabilities relating to both short- and long-term innovative nonproliferation research and development that will maintain U.S. technological advantage in this area.

The committee recommends $275.1 million, the amount of the budget request.

Radiation detection technology

The committee encourages the National Nuclear Security Administration to continue to work closely with the Department of Homeland Security's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office on the research and development of radiation detection technology to ensure there is no duplication of research efforts, but rather a collaborative complementary approach to research in areas of common interest.

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Capabilities Replacement Laboratory

The committee continues to support the role of the National Nuclear Security Administration in the construction of the Capabilities Replacement Laboratory at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, which would house critical capabilities for national security missions.

Nonproliferation and International Security

The budget request contained $140.5 million for Nonproliferation and International Security (NIS). The committee fully supports the goals of the NIS program, although notes its concern below about the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP).

The committee recommends $128.6 million for NIS reflecting a decrease of $6.9 million from GNEP, and a transfer of $5.0 million from Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention to high-priority activities within International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation.

Global Nuclear Energy Partnership

The budget request contained $6.9 million for Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) activities from within Nonproliferation and International Security (NIS).

The committee notes that since fiscal year 2006, the Department of Energy has funded a portion of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership from within various National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program lines. NNSA has characterized GNEP, which promotes the use of nuclear energy throughout the world, as an important nonproliferation initiative.

The committee finds NNSA's proposed nonproliferation arguments for GNEP unpersuasive and is not convinced that GNEP will achieve its stated nonproliferation objectives. Rather, the committee is concerned about proliferation risks associated with GNEP. For these reasons, the committee does not support any funding for GNEP activities from within any NNSA Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program line.

The committee recommends none of the funding in the budget request for GNEP from within NIS, a decrease of $6.9 million.

Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention

The budget request contained $23.8 million for Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (GIPP) from within Nonproliferation and International Security.

The committee has been conducting vigorous oversight on the GIPP program and the program's funding of Russian institutes, which are involved with separate work on nuclear projects in the Islamic Republic of Iran. The committee appreciates the information provided by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) on the GIPP program to date and recognizes the important nonproliferation objectives of the program.

The committee encourages NNSA to continue strengthening the management and implementation of the GIPP program as necessary to ensure that the program achieves its intended nonproliferation objectives and in no way undermines U.S. national security interests. The committee expects that NNSA will continue to keep it fully informed of significant developments involving the program.

The committee also directs the Secretary of Energy to submit to the congressional defense committees, within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a report on the funding for GIPP projects. The report should include: (1) the amount of authorized and appropriated funds to be obligated or expended for each GIPP project for fiscal year 2009; and (2) the purposes for which these amounts will be obligated or expended.

The committee recommends $18.8 million, reflecting a transfer of $5.0 million to high-priority activities within International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation.

International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation

The budget request contained $429.7 million for International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation (MPC&A). The committee fully supports the goals of the MPC&A program.

The committee recommends $479.7 million, an increase of $50.0 million, as follows: $28.0 million for security upgrades to Russian nuclear sites, pursuant to the U.S.-Russia Bratislava Nuclear Security Initiative; and $22.0 million to secure nuclear weapons and weapons-usable material located outside the United States, and to install radiation detection equipment at border crossings and a key port of transit to deter, detect, and interdict illicit transfers of materials that could be used in weapons of mass destruction or a radiological dispersion device, known as a "dirty bomb."

Second Line of Defense

The committee continues to encourage the National Nuclear Security Administration to closely coordinate its Second Line of Defense efforts to deter, detect, and interdict illicit transfers of nuclear and radioactive materials at border crossings and ports with the efforts of any other relevant U.S. agency or department, including the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense.

Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production

The budget request contained $141.3 million for Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production (EWGPP). The committee fully supports the goals of the EWGPP program.

The committee recommends $141.3 million for EWGPP, the amount of the budget request.

Fissile Materials Disposition

United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition

The budget request contained $40.8 million for the United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program.

The committee fully supports the goals of the United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program. The committee notes that historically, funding for the United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program included funding for the disposition of U.S. surplus weapons-grade plutonium and construction of the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility for use in disposition of surplus weapons-grade plutonium. The committee views these activities as important to U.S. nonproliferation objectives and national security goals.

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161), transferred funding for the MOX project to the Department of Energy Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology (NE), and transferred funding for the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility and Waste Solidification Building projects to the National Security Administration (NNSA) Weapons Activities program.

The committee does not believe the transfer of funding for disposition of U.S. surplus weapons-grade plutonium, including the transfer of funding for the MOX project to NE, was necessary. The committee understands, however, that the Department of Energy has constructed an arrangement between the National Security Administration (NNSA) Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (NN) and NE through which NE is able to fund the MOX project and NN is able to manage and execute the MOX project. The committee notes that the Department of Energy General Counsel has judged this arrangement to be consistent with the requirements of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–65). The committee views this arrangement as an appropriate means of balancing the requirements of Public Law 110–161 and Public Law 106–65.

The committee supports execution of program activities and functions relating to disposition of U.S. surplus weapons-grade plutonium and the MOX project, including management and direction of the MOX project, from within NN, given the important nonproliferation objectives and benefits associated with these activities.

For fiscal year 2009, the Department of Energy has requested funding for the MOX project from within Other Defense Activities—Nuclear Energy, and requested funding for the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility and Waste Solidification Building projects from within NNSA Weapons Activities—Weapons Dismantlement and Disposition. The committee therefore authorizes funding for the MOX project under section 3103 of this Act, and authorizes funding for the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility

and Waste Solidification Building projects under section 3101 of this Act.

The committee recommends $40.8 million for U.S. Fissile Materials Disposition, the amount of the budget request.

Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition

The budget request contained $1.0 million for the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program.

The committee fully supports the goals of the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program, which include disposition of the Russian Federation's surplus weapons-grade plutonium. The committee further emphasizes the importance of nonproliferation programs with Russia, including the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program, to U.S nonproliferation objectives and national security goals.

The committee urges the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to resolve any outstanding issues with Russia relating to the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program and to move the program forward in a manner that is consistent with the program's nonproliferation objectives. The committee emphasizes its strong concern with the use of fast reactors under the program and expects NNSA to pursue a disposition path for Russia's surplus weapons-grade plutonium which ensures that any reactors used under the program do not produce plutonium and include necessary monitoring and inspection controls.

The committee also notes that the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161), rescinded prior fiscal years funds for the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program. The committee expects NNSA to keep the committee fully informed of significant program developments and any funding needs to continue program activities during fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends $1.0 million, the amount of the budget request.

Global Threat Reduction Initiative

The budget request contained $219.6 million for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI). The committee fully supports the goals of the GTRI program.

The committee recommends $389.6 million, an increase of $170.0 million, as follows: (1) $50.0 million to accelerate conversion of domestic and international research reactors from the use of weapons-usable highly-enriched uranium to low-enriched uranium; (2) $50.0 million to expand and accelerate efforts to secure U.S. research and test reactors and sites with high-priority radiological sources; (3) $8.0 million to accelerate the removal of excess and unwanted radiological sources within U.S. borders; (4) $10.0 million to accelerate the removal of vulnerable radiological sources located outside the United States; (5) $12.0 million to secure vulnerable sites with high-priority radiological sources located outside the United States; and (6) $40.0 million to remove and dispose of vulnerable weapons-usable highly-enriched uranium located outside the United States.

Office of the United States Coordinator for the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism

The committee notes that the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53), passed in the 110th Congress by both the House of Representatives and the Senate as H.R. 1 and commonly known as "the 9/11 bill," established the Office of the United States Coordinator for the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, within the Executive Office of the President, and required a presidentially-appointed U.S. Coordinator to: (1) serve as the advisor to the President on all matters relating to the prevention of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) proliferation and terrorism; (2) formulate a U.S. strategy for preventing WMD proliferation and terrorism; (3) lead interagency coordination of U.S. efforts to implement the strategy and policies; (4) conduct oversight and evaluation of accelerated and strengthened implementation of initiatives and programs to prevent WMD proliferation and terrorism by government agencies; (5) oversee the development of a comprehensive and coordinated budget for programs and initiatives to prevent WMD proliferation and terrorism; and (6) report annually on strategy and policies.

The committee further notes that Public Law 110–53 expressed the sense of Congress that the President should engage the President of the Russian Federation in a discussion on the goals of establishing the Office of the U.S. Coordinator, and the importance of strong cooperation between the U.S. Coordinator and a senior Russian official to coordinate planning and implementation of activities to prevent WMD proliferation and terrorism.

The committee is seriously concerned that the President has not yet appointed the U.S. Coordinator or engaged the President of Russia in the discussion called for in Public Law 110–53. The committee expects the President to appoint the U.S. Coordinator at the earliest possible time, and urges the President to engage with the President of Russia in the discussion called for in Public Law 110–53.

Office of the Administrator

The budget request contained $404.1 million for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Office of the Administrator. The committee is concerned by continued reports of limited staff capacity and resources for implementation of critical NNSA nonproliferation programs.

The committee recommends $409.1 million, an increase of $5.0 million. The committee intends this increase for NNSA Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program direction to expand and strengthen staff capacity, capabilities, and resources relating to NNSA nonproliferation programs.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained $6.9 billion for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $6.9 billion, an increase of $28.0 million.

Defense Environmental Cleanup

Defense Environmental Cleanup program funding

The budget request contained $5.3 billion for Defense Environmental Cleanup, a decrease of $52.1 million from the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2008.

The committee is encouraged by recent efforts made by the Environmental Management (EM) program to improve corporate management practices, including independent validation of lifecycle costs and schedules for the EM program's remaining scope of work. However, as a result of this re-baselining, EM now estimates the total life cycle costs of remaining cleanup to be between $265.1 and $305.0 billion, a 35 to 55 percent increase over previous life cycle cost estimates. Furthermore, while total life cycle cleanup cost estimates are increasing, overall funding for the EM program has been decreasing.

The committee is concerned that the EM program is in need of additional resources at a number of different sites and urges the Department of Energy to put additional resources into this activity in future years' budget requests. The committee recommends an additional $10.0 million within Defense Environmental Cleanup for high risk cleanup activities at the Hanford Site.

Federal facility agreement and consent order milestones

The committee understands that the Department of Energy (the Department) enters into legally enforceable agreements on environmental cleanup milestones with local and state authorities. The committee is concerned that the Department may fail to meet up to 31 of these federal facility agreements or consent order milestones in fiscal year 2009. These regulatory milestones apply to activities at Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, the Oak Ridge Reservation in Tennessee, the Hanford Site in Washington, and the Savannah River Site in South Carolina.

The committee is aware that two-thirds of the 31 afore-mentioned milestones are at risk due to funding constraints. The committee considers recent funding reductions for Defense Environmental Cleanup to be out of step with the Department's remaining cleanup scope of work. The committee supports the Department's intent to execute its work scope by placing the highest priority on projects that address the greatest risks to human health and the environment. But the committee also expects the Department to continue to strive to meet all milestones.

Consolidation and disposition of surplus special nuclear materials

The committee understands that the Department of Energy (the Department) expects to complete plans in fiscal year 2008 for the consolidation and disposition of approximately 166 metric tons (MT) of surplus, non-programmatic, special nuclear materials. This quantity includes approximately 58 MT of plutonium and approximately 108 MT of highly enriched uranium. These materials are stored at multiple locations including the Savannah River Site (SRS), Hanford Site, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the Pantex Plant, and the Y–12 National Security Complex.

The committee supports consolidation and disposition of these surplus materials to the maximum extent practicable in order to reduce the possibility that they could fall into the wrong hands, and to reflect the United States' commitment to the reduction of proliferation risks. The committee notes that consolidation and disposition should also reduce security costs associated with safeguarding these materials.

Pursuant to the requirements of section 3155 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107), in September 2007, the Department set forth a baseline disposition plan for 13 MT of surplus "non-pit" plutonium. The Secretary of Energy presented this plan as part of a three-pronged approach for disposition of surplus plutonium:

(1) A Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility, Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility, and Waste Solidification Building planned for SRS to dispose of at least 34 MT of weapon-grade plutonium (the MOX program);

(2) A plutonium vitrification capability to dispose of up to 13 MT of non-weapon-grade plutonium, also planned for SRS; and

(3) Use of the existing H-Canyon/HB-Line at SRS to process approximately two MT of plutonium bearing materials.

Notwithstanding this planned approach, the committee notes the Department is exploring the feasibility of processing all surplus weapons-usable plutonium through the MOX facility and H-Canyon, without constructing a plutonium vitrification facility. The committee is aware that the technical feasibility depends in part on determining whether un-irradiated fuel assemblies originally intended for the Fast Flux Test Facility at the Hanford Site can be processed through H-Canyon/HB-Line.

The committee expects the Secretary of Energy to notify the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and the House Committee on Appropriations of the Department's updated disposition strategy for surplus non-weapon-grade plutonium prior to shipping the un-irradiated fuel assemblies currently stored at Hanford and destined for the proposed plutonium vitrification facility to the Savannah River Site.

Coordination of disposition efforts

The committee understands that several offices within the Department of Energy participate in the consolidation and disposition of special nuclear materials (SNM), including the National Nuclear Security Administration, the Offices of Environmental Management, Nuclear Energy, and Science, and the General Counsel. Because of this dispersed authority, the committee regards the Nuclear Material Disposition Consolidation Coordinating Committee (NMDCCC) as a valuable tool for the Department of Energy. The committee encourages the Secretary of Energy to ensure that the NMDCCC, or a similar coordinating office, remains in place.

Mound Site cleanup

The budget request contained $45.9 million for closure sites, including $30.6 million for the Miamisburg, Ohio Closure Project cleanup.

The committee recommends $55.9 million for closure sites, an increase of $10.0 million, for additional cleanup of the Mound Site in Miamisburg, Ohio.

Low-activity waste treatment and disposition at Hanford

The budget request contained $288.4 million for radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition for the Office of River Protection, including $1.0 million for a Demonstration Bulk Vitrification System (DBVS).

Approximately 53 million gallons of radioactive waste are stored underground at the Department of Energy Hanford site, including both high-level waste (HLW) and low-activity waste (LAW). The Waste Treatment Plant (WTP), currently under construction, is designed to process 100 percent of the HLW but only approximately 50 percent of the LAW at the Hanford site. Therefore, the Department of Energy has been evaluating a supplemental bulk vitrification technology, the DBVS, to treat the remaining fraction of low-activity waste. According to the budget request, DBVS was expected to reach Critical Decision–2 (CD–2), approval of the performance baseline, in January 2008. However, at the time of this report, the CD–2 determination has not been made.

The Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management testified to the committee on March 12, 2008, that the Department of Energy has retained independent experts to assess the range of options for supplemental LAW treatment, including bulk vitrification and others. Further, the Assistant Secretary testified that this analysis is expected to be completed in June 2008.

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to provide a plan for treating and disposing of all low-activity waste at Hanford to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and the House Committee on Appropriations by January 1, 2009.

The committee recommends $288.4 million for radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition, the amount of the budget request.

Other Defense Activities

Nuclear energy—Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility

The budget request contained $487.0 million for the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility, including $19.2 million in operations and maintenance and $467.8 million in construction and other project costs, within Other Defense Activities—Nuclear Energy.

Pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161), funding for the MOX project was transferred to the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology (NE). As discussed elsewhere in this report, the committee views the MOX project as a nonproliferation and national security activity, and does not believe the transfer of funding for the MOX project to NE was necessary. The committee understands, however, that the Department of Energy has constructed an arrangement between the National Nuclear Security Administration Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (NN) and NE through which the MOX

project can be funded through NE but managed and executed by NN.

The committee recommends $487.0 million for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, the amount of the request.

Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

The budget request contained $247.4 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, all to be directed towards the Yucca Mountain project. The committee continues to support the need for a permanent deep geologic repository for high-level radioactive waste.

The committee recommends $247.4 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, the amount of the budget request.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2009, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and the Office of the Administrator.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup

This section would authorize funds for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2009.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize funds for other defense activities for fiscal year 2009, including funds for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility at the Savannah River Site, South Carolina.

Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

This section would authorize funds for defense nuclear waste disposal for fiscal year 2009.

Section 3105—Energy Security and Assurance

This section would authorize funds for energy security and assurance programs for fiscal year 2009.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 3111—Utilization of International Contributions to Russian Plutonium Disposition Program

This section would provide the Secretary of Energy with authority to accept international contributions for the effective and transparent disposition of the Russian Federation's surplus weapons-grade plutonium under the Russian Plutonium Disposition program. This section would require the Secretary of Energy, within 30 days after the receipt of an international contribution under this section, to provide the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on

Foreign Affairs with notice of such contribution. This section would also require the Secretary of Energy, by October 31 of each year, beginning in the fiscal year in which the first contributions under this section are retained, to submit to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs a report on the receipt and use of any international contributions under this section during the preceding fiscal year. The authority under this section would expire on December 31, 2013.

Section 3112—Extension of Deadline for Comptroller General Report on Department of Energy Protective Force Management

This section would extend the deadline established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) for the Comptroller General to conduct an assessment of the Department of Energy's management of protective forces at departmental sites with category one special nuclear material. This section would establish a new deadline of March 1, 2009.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $25.5 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends $25.5 million, the amount of the request.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize funds for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2009.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $19.1 million for fiscal year 2009 for operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Reserves.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2009

This section would authorize a total of $387.8 million for the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2009. Of the funds authorized, $171.8 million would be available for operations and training activities, $193.5 million would be available for the Maritime Security Program of which

$19.5 million would be available for maintenance reimbursement for the Maritime Security Fleet, $18.0 million for the program to dispose of obsolete vessels, $25.0 million for assistance to small shipyards, and $30.0 million for the loan guarantee program authorized by chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code, commonly referred to as the Title XI Loan Program.

Section 3502—Limitation on Export of Vessels Owned by the Government of the United States for the Purpose of Dismantling, Recycling, or Scrapping

This section would require that any vessel owned or controlled by the United States Maritime Administration, United States Navy, or any other government agency shall not be approved for export to a foreign country for purposes of dismantling, recycling, or scrapping. The Administrator of the Maritime Administration may waive this requirement only with certification that there is no available capacity for disposal in the United States, a compelling need exists for the vessel to be dismantled or scrapped, and that the foreign shipyard conducting the dismantling or scrapping would adhere to the safety, labor, and health requirements equivalent to the laws of the United States.

Section 3503—Student Incentive Payment Agreements

This section would authorize the Secretary to increase student incentive payments at the State Maritime Academies from $4,000 per year to $8,000 per year.

Section 3504—Riding Gang Member Requirements

This section would amend section 1018 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) to require that all persons onboard vessels involved in the carriage of cargo for the Department of Defense, with the exception of supercargo personnel, possess a merchant mariners' document or a transportation worker security card issued pursuant to the requirements of chapter 73 of title 46, United States Code. In addition, this section would stipulate that supercargo personnel onboard the vessels at the direction of the Secretary may satisfy the requirement for a merchant mariners' document or a transportation worker security card by passing a background security check conducted by the Secretary and that these supercargo personnel are not considered riding gang members pursuant to section 8106 of title 46, United States Code.

Section 3505—Maintenance and Repair Reimbursement Program for the Maritime Security Fleet

This section would amend section 3517 of the Maritime Security Act of 2003 (46 U.S.C. 53101 note) requiring that the Secretary of Transportation implement the Maintenance and Repair Reimbursement Pilot Program with one or more contractors currently participating in the Maritime Security Program under chapter 531 of title 46, United States Code.

Section 3506—Temporary Program Authorizing Contracts with Adjunct Professors at the United States Merchant Marine Academy

This section would authorize the Administer of the Maritime Administration to continue current contracts with Adjunct Professors and enter into contracts as necessary for Adjunct Professors until December 30, 2009. All such contracts entered into under this authority would terminate six months after that date. This temporary authority is required to allow time for the Merchant Marine Academy to develop and implement a personnel and budget plan to eliminate the use of Adjunct Professors hired under personal services contracts by the Academy.

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, February 5, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2009.

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.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2009.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. DELL'ORTO,
Acting General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, March 18, 2008.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SKELTON: The enclosed letter, putting forward a legislative proposal for Presidential authority to waive Section 1083 of the 2008 National Defense Authorization Act and signed by the Secretaries of State, Defense, Commerce and Energy, was transmitted by the Department of State to the House and Senate leaders this morning

We hope this information is useful to you and other Members of Congress and we look forward to working with you on this important initiative. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY T. BERGNER,
Assistant Secretary.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2009.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. DELL'ORTO,
Acting General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, April 18, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2009.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. DELL'ORTO,
Acting General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, April 25, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposals that would implement initiatives concerning military spousal benefits presented by the President in his State of the Union Address.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. DELL'ORTO,
Acting General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, April 25, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2009.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. DELL'ORTO,
Acting General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith for the consideration of Congress and referral to the appropriate committees a proposed bill,

"To authorize certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes."

The proposal seeks to enhance the operations of the United States Maritime Administration through amendments and improvements to certain maritime programs.

The proposal would provide the Secretary of Transportation (Secretary) authority to donate non-retention vessels to foreign Governments for use as training vessels and would clarify the disposal of non-retention government vessels.

The proposal would allow the Maritime Administration to retain proceeds from sale and scrapping of non-retention vessels into the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund with a waterfall of how such funds can be expended. The proposal would also allow the Maritime Administration to deposit insurance proceeds and recoveries resulting from accident litigation and arbitration awards from third parties into the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund instead of such funds being deposited into the Treasury, allowing the Agency to be "made whole" for damage to its vessels.

The proposal would amend Title XIII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to exempt Academy graduates who serve on active duty for five years from certain performance service obligations under the commitment agreement requirements. The proposal would allow the United States Merchant Marine Academy (Academy) and State maritime academies to collect the cost of tuition and student incentive payments (SIP) from certain graduates defaulting on their service obligations. The proposal would also allow the Academy to contract with individuals as personal service contractors to serve as adjunct professors.

The proposal would allow the Secretary to waive the requirements that an individual pass the Coast Guard licensing examination as a condition of graduation from a State maritime academy. The waiver would allow accommodation for individuals with disabilities. The proposal would also increase SIP from $4,000 to $8,000 per academic year and service obligation requirements for students receiving SIP from six (6) years to eight (8) years relating to time in reserves and Coast Guard licensing.

The proposal would also authorize the Secretary to provide for the construction and reconstruction of suitable training vessels with modern equipment and instruments to replace vessels furnished to State maritime academies. The proposal would likewise provide the Secretary with the authority to administer an intermodal and marine facilities program comprising of port infrastructure development or expansion. The program would be subject to the availability of appropriations. It would also extend authority for the Marine War Risk program from December 31, 2010 until December 31, 2015.

Lastly, the proposal would provide tax relief for only U.S. citizen merchant mariners serving on Liquefied Natural Gas vessels operated under the registry of a foreign country.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to Congress, and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

MARY E. PETERS,
Secretary of Transportation.

2 Enclosures.

Identical letter to the President of the Senate.

Draft bill and section-by-section analysis.

COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 14, 2008 the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 5658, as amended, by a vote of 61–0.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2008.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to review the text of H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, for provisions which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources. Among these provisions are those dealing with compensation and benefits for the NOAA Corps, off-installation mitigation authority in natural resources management, Guam realignment issues, and extension of the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail through Fort Belvoir, Virginia, among others.

Because of the continued cooperation and consideration that you have afforded me and my staff in developing these provisions, I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 5658 based on their inclusion in the bill. Of course, this waiver is not intended to prejudice any future jurisdictional claims over these provisions or similar language. I also reserve the right to seek to have conferees named from the Committee on Natural Resources on these provisions, and request your support if such a request is made.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 5658 and the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

With warm regards, I am

Sincerely,

NICK J. RAHALL, II,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. NICK J. RAHALL, II,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2008.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs agrees not to request a sequential referral. By waiving consideration of H.R. 5658, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over any subject matter contained in the bill which falls within its jurisdiction. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs reserves its right to seek conferees on any provisions within its jurisdiction which are considered in a House-Senate conference, and requests your support if such a request is made.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 5658 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the

measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

BOB FILNER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. BOB FILNER,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. 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 schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Veterans Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2008.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding regarding consideration of H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. As you know, this legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Given the importance of moving this bill forward promptly, I do not intend to request the sequential referral of H.R. 5658 to the Committee on Education and Labor. I do so, however, only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice this Committee's jurisdictional interests and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation. In addition, should this bill or similar legislation be considered in a conference with the Senate, I would expect members of the Committee on Education and Labor to be appointed to the conference committee.

Finally, I ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters in your committee's report on H.R. 5658 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor. If you

have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call me. I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. I agree that the Committee on Education and Labor has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Education and Labor is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2008.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to you regarding H.R. 5658, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009". This legislation authorizes military activities of the Department of Defense and other programs.

H.R. 5658 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, I agree to waive consideration of this bill with the mutual understanding that my decision to forego a sequential referral of the bill does not waive, reduce, or otherwise affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure over H.R. 5658.

Further, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation on provisions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the appointment of conferees on H.R. 5658 or similar legislation.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in the Committee Report on H.R. 5658 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House Floor.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important national defense legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, M.C.
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR, M.C.,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. 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 schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of Committee on Homeland Security in matters being considered in H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 5658 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over 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 Committee on Homeland Security, and that a copy of this letter and 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 Homeland Security also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. I agree that the Committee on Homeland Security has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in matters being considered in H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 5658 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over 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 Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and that a copy of this letter and 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 Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence 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 consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

SILVESTRE REYES,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. SILVESTRE REYES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. 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 schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2008.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing about H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, which the Committee on Armed Services plans to markup on May 14, 2008.

I appreciate your effort to consult with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform regarding those provisions of H.R. 5658 that fall within the Oversight Committee's jurisdiction. These provisions involve the federal civil service and federal acquisition policies.

In the interest of expediting consideration of H.R. 5658, the Oversight Committee will not request a sequential referral of this bill. I would, however, request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Oversight Committee should H.R. 5658 or a similar Senate bill be considered in conference with the Senate. Moreover, this letter should not be construed as a waiver of the Oversight Committee's legislative jurisdiction over subjects addressed in H.R. 5658 that fall within the jurisdiction of the Oversight Committee.

Finally, I request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee on Armed Services Committee Report on H.R. 5658 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Again, I appreciate your willingness to consult the Committee on these matters.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. I agree that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing you concerning the bill, H.R. 5658, the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. There are certain provisions in the legislation as reported by the Committee on Armed Services which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am prepared to waive the right of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I will seek to have Members of the Committee designated as members of any future conference regarding H.R. 5658, and I request that you urge the Speaker to appoint Members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider any such provisions.

I appreciate your cooperation on these matters, and I would ask that you place this letter into the Committee Report on H.R. 5658.

Sincerely,

HOWARD BERMAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. HOWARD BERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write with regard to H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. The bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I support passage of the bill, and I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring it up on the House floor in an expeditious manner.

The Committee will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. This decision is based on my understanding that you have agreed that the inaction of the Committee with respect to the bill does not in any way serve as a jurisdictional precedent as to our two committees. Further, as to any House-Senate conference on the bill, the Committee on Energy and Commerce reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees for consideration of portions of the bill (or similar legislation) that are within the Committee's jurisdiction.

The provisions of the reported bill that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce include the following:

Sec. 313. Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for Certain Costs in Connection with Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington.

Sec. 601. Fiscal Year 2009 Increase in Military Basic Pay.

Sec. 608. Guaranteed pay increase for members of the Armed Forces of one-half of one percentage point higher than Employment Cost Index.

Sec. 619. Use of New Skill Incentive Pay and Proficiency Bonus Authorities to Encourage Training in Critical Foreign Languages and Foreign Cultural Studies.

Sec. 1033. Extension of Commission to Assess the Threat of the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack.

I request that you send a letter to me confirming our agreements as to jurisdiction, and that our exchange of letters be included in your Committee's report on the bill and inserted in the Congressional Record as part of the consideration of the bill.

I look forward to working with you on this important legislation. If you wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2008.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
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 2009 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

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

Congressional Budget Office Mandatory Cost Estimate

MAY 16, 2008.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed table showing a preliminary estimate of the direct spending effects of H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on May 14, 2008. CBO's complete cost estimate for H.R. 5658, including the discretionary costs of the bill, will be provided shortly.

Based on the legislative language for H.R. 5658 that was provided to CBO on May 15, 2008, CBO estimates that enacting this bill would increase direct spending by $2 million in 2009, and decrease such spending by $13 million over the 2009–2013 period and by $75 million over the 2009–2018 period. The largest budgetary effects would result from changes in the TRICARE pharmacy benefit and retirement programs, and the sale of assets from the National Defense Stockpile. Enactment of the bill would not affect revenues. For the purposes of this estimate, we assume that H.R. 5658 will be enacted near the beginning of fiscal year 2009.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Schmit, who can be reached at 226–2840.

Sincerely,

PETER R. ORSZAG,
Director.

Enclosure.

Preliminary Estimate of Changes in Direct Spending for H.R. 5658, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, as Ordered Reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on May 14, 2008

(Millions of dollars, by fiscal year)

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total 2009-2013	Total 2009-2018
Section 501 Retirement of Warrant Officers												
Estimated Budget Authority	1	1	*	*	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	8
Estimated Outlays	1	1	*	*	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	8
Section 503 Minimum Service for Retirement as an Officer												
Estimated Budget Authority	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	*	*	*	0	2
Estimated Outlays	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	*	*	*	0	2
Section 511 Delayed Retirement for Military Technicians												
Estimated Budget Authority	-5	-7	-7	-6	-6	-6	-5	-5	-5	-4	-31	-56
Estimated Outlays	-5	-7	-7	-6	-6	-6	-5	-5	-5	-4	-31	-56
Section 514 Retirement Age of Certain Reserve Officers												
Estimated Budget Authority	-1	-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-7	-12
Estimated Outlays	-1	-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-7	-12
Section 545 Education Benefits for Reserve Component Members												
Estimated Budget Authority	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-5	-10
Estimated Outlays	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-5	-10
Section 592 Correction of Military Records												
Estimated Budget Authority	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Estimated Outlays	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Section 641 Retired Pay for Reserve Members Wounded in Action												
Estimated Budget Authority	*	1	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	5	8	27
Estimated Outlays	*	1	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	5	8	27
Section 643 Survivor Allowance												
Estimated Budget Authority	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	2	0	0	19	31
Estimated Outlays	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	2	0	0	19	31
Section 702 Prohibition on Increase of Pharmacy Copayments												
Estimated Budget Authority	75	230	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	345	345
Estimated Outlays	75	230	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	345	345
Section 1004(a)-(d) Shift of Payments from the Military Retirement Fund												
Estimated Budget Authority	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	0	0	0	-45	45	0	0	0	0	-45	0
Section 1004(e) Transfer from the National Defense Stockpile Fund												
Estimated Budget Authority	-40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-40	-40
Estimated Outlays	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Section 1011 Sale of Floating Drydock												
Estimated Budget Authority	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-1
Estimated Outlays	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-1
Section 1412 - Stockpile Sales												
Estimated Budget Authority	-70	-70	-60	-50	-50	-50	-50	-10	0	0	-300	-410
Estimated Outlays	-70	-70	-60	-50	-50	-50	-50	-10	0	0	-300	-410
TOTAL												
Estimated Budget Authority	-38	155	-24	-52	-49	-48	-47	-10	-2	0	-8	-115
Estimated Outlays	2	155	-24	-52	-94	-3	-47	-10	-2	0	-13	-75

Notes:

Estimates are based on a preliminary reading of bill language provided to CBO on May 15, 2008.

Enactment of H.R. 5658 would not affect revenues.

Provisions that would affect direct spending by less than $500,000 are not included in this estimate.

* = less than $500,000.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee generally concurs with the mandatory estimate as contained in the report of the Congressional Budget Office.

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee is required to include a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, which are in the bill or the report. The following table provides the list of such provisions which are included in the bill and the report:

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
I	APA		006	HH60Ms for Army Reserve MEDEVAC Requirements	$59,400.0	Ortiz	Army Reserves	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Alexander	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Bilirakis	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Brady (PA)	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000 0	Chabot	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	DeLauro	Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation	Stratford, CT
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Ehlers	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	English	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Gillibrand	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Gingrey	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Granger	Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation	Stratford, CT
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Kuhl	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Marshall	Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation	Stratford, CT
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	McCarthy (NY)	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Ortiz	United Technologies Corporation - Sikorsky Aircraft	Corpus Christi, TX
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Richardson	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Rogers (AL)	Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation	Stratford, CT
I	APA		020	UH-60 A to L Upgrades	$5,000.0	Rohrabacher	Army National Guard	
I	APA		020	UH-60 Weapons Armament Mission B-Kit	$2,000.0	Hall (TX)	Contract Fabrication & Design	Princeton, TX
I	APA		029	Compact Aircraft Support Carts	$2,500.0	Davis (CA)	Epsilon Systems Solutions, Inc.	San Diego, CA
I	APA		029	Compact Aircraft Support Carts	$2,500.0	Scott (VA)	Army National Guard	
I	WTCV		045	Stryker Situation Awareness Soldier Protection Package	$5,900.0	Smith (WA)	5th Stryker Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Infantry Division	Fort Lewis, WA
I	WTCV		046	Transmission Dynamometer	$2,000.0	Boyda	Kansas Army National Guard	Fort Riley, KS
I	PAA		017	Excalibur Procurement	$15,000.0	Boren	Raytheon Missile Systems/ McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	Tucson,AZ McAlester, OK
I	PAA		017	Excalibur Procurement	$15,000.0	Cole	Raytheon Company	McAlester, OK
I	PAA		017	Excalibur Procurement	$15,000.0	Giffords	Raytheon Company	Tuscon, AZ
I	PAA		038	Ammunition Peculiar Equipment Outloading Module (MP3)	$4,000.0	Boren	McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	McAlester, OK
I	OPA		013	Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles (FMTV, HIMARS)	$5,000.0	Mitchell	Firetrace Aerospace	Scottsdale, AZ

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
I	OPA		027	Defense Advanced GPS Receiver	$5,000.0	Braley	Rockwell Collins	Cedar Rapids, IA
I	OPA		027	Defense Advanced GPS Receiver	$5,000.0	Loebsack	Rockwell Collins	Cedar Rapids, IA
I	OPA		083	Retrofit 30th HBCT radios with Embedded SAASM GPS card	$1,000.0	McIntyre	North Carolina National Guard	Raleigh, NC
I	OPA		111	Interoperable Radios for Texas National Guard Disaster Response	$1,000.0	Conaway	Texas Army National Guard	Austin, TX
I	OPA		111	Joint Incident Scene Communication Capability	$3,000.0	Conaway	Texas Army National Guard	Austin, TX
I	OPA		118	SAASM PPS GPS Upgrade	$2,000.0	Souder	ITT	Fort Wayne, IN
I	OPA		137	Multi-Temperature Refrigerated Container System (MTRCS)	$2,200.0	Davis (KY)	DRS	Florence, KY
I	OPA		169	Call For Fire Trainer II / Joint Fires and Effects Trainer System	$4,000.0	Cole	Stanley Associates	Lawton, OK
I	OPA		169	Combat Skills Marksmanship Trainer (CSMT)	$3,000.0	Gingrey	Meggitt Training Systems	Suwanee, GA
I	OPA		169	Combat Skills Simulation Systems, Ohio Army National Guard	$4,650.0	Space	Ohio Army National Guard	Columbus, OH
I	OPA		169	Fort Bragg Range 74 Combined Arms Collective Training	$4,000.0	Hayes	General Dynamics Information Technology	Waynesville, NC
I	OPA		169	Fort Bragg Range 74 Combined Arms Collective Training	$4,000.0	McIntyre	General Dynamics Information Technology	Waynesville, NC
I	OPA		169	Immersive Group Simulation Virtual Training System (IGS-VTS) for the Hawaii Army National Guard	$4,500.0	Abercrombie	Atlantis Cyberspace, Inc.	Honolulu, HI
I	OPA		169	Instrumentation for Urban Assault Course - Tennessee National Guard	$1,750.0	Tanner	Tennessee National Guard	Nashville, TN
I	OPA		169	Texas Army National Guard Future Solider Trainer Program	$3,000.0	Lampson	Texas Army National Guard	Austin, TX
I	OPA		169	Virtual Convoy Operations Trainer for Kentucky National Guard	$1,500.0	Davis (KY)	Kentucky Army National Guard	Frankfort, KY
I	OPA		169	Virtual Interactive Combat Environment (VICE) - New Jersey National Guard	$2,000.0	Saxton	Dynamic Animation Systems	Fairfax, VA
I	OPA		170	Deployable/Mobile/Digital Target System-Armor-Infantry Set	$450.0	Tanner	Tennessee National Guard	Nashville, TN
I	OPA		170	M1 Abrams Mobile Conduct of Fire Trainers Upgrades - Tennessee National Guard.	$3,000.0	Tanner	Tenness National Guard	Nashville, TN

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
I	OPA		176	Battlefield Anti-Intrusion System (BAIS)	$6,000.0	Andrews	L-3 Communications	Camden, NJ
I	OPA		176	Battlefield Anti-Intrusion System (BAIS)	$6,000.0	LoBiondo	L-3 Communications	Camden, NJ
I	OPA		176	Battlefield Anti-Intrusion System (BAIS)	$6,000.0	Saxton	L-3 Communications	Camden, NJ
I	SCN		004	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement/Advance Construction	$722,000.0	Courtney	General Dynamics - Electric Boat	Groton, CT
I	SCN		004	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement/Advance Construction	$722,000.0	Ellsworth	Babcock & Wilcox Company	Mt. Vernon, IN
I	SCN		004	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement/Advance Construction	$722,000.0	Forbes	The Navy	Various
I	SCN		004	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement/Advance Construction	$722,000.0	Hunter	Navy	Connecticut and Virginia
I	SCN		004	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement/Advance Construction	$722,000.0	Langevin	General Dynamics - Electric Boat	Groton, CT
I	SCN		004	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement/Advance Construction	$722,000.0	Pascrell	General Dynamics - Electric Boat	Groton, CT
I	SCN		004	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement/Advance Construction	$722,000.0	Rothman	General Dynamics - Electric Boat	Groton, CT
I	SCN		014	LPD-17	$1,800,000.0	Butterfield	Northrop Grumman	Arlington, VA
I	SCN		014	LPD-17	$1,800,000.0	Drake	Northrop Grumman Corporation Ship Systems Avondale Operations	New Orleans, LA
I	SCN		014	LPD-17	$1,800,000.0	Forbes	N/A	Various locations
I	SCN		014	LPD-17	$1,800,000.0	Jefferson	Northrop Grumman Corporation	Arlington, VA
I	SCN		014	LPD-17	$1,800,000.0	Scott (VA)	Northrop Grumman	Newport News, VA
I	SCN		014	LPD-17	$1,800,000.0	Taylor	Northrop Grumman	Avondale, LA
I	APN		004	BRU-55 Smart Rack	$4,500.0	Murphy (PA)	ITT Mtech	Warminster, PA
I	APN		051	Crane NSWC IDECM Depot Capability	$6,000.0	Ellsworth	ITT Corporation	Crane, IN
I	OPN		019	Canned Lube Pumps (CLP) LSD-41/49 Class Amphibious Ships	$4,000.0	Hayes	IMO Pump	Monroe, NC
I	OPN		019	CVN Propeller Replacement Program	$5,000.0	Taylor	Rolls-Royce Naval Marine, Inc	Pascagoula, MS
I	OPN		019	Jet Fuel (JP-5) Electric Valve Operators	$3,000.0	Bishop (NY)	Curtiss-Wright Flow Control Corp	East Farmingdale, NY
I	OPN		019	Jet Fuel (JP-5) Electric Valve Operators	$3,000.0	King (NY)	Curtiss-Wright Flow Control Corp	East Farmingdale, NY
I	OPN		019	Jet Fuel (JP-5) Electric Valve Operators	$3,000.0	McCarthy (NY)	Curtiss-Wright Flow Control Corp	East Farmingdale, NY

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
I	OPN		024	ANG-Combat Communications on the Move	$3,500.0	Hunter	147 Combat Communications Squadron	San Diego, CA
I	OPN		030	LSD 41/49 Class - Boat Davit System Modification	$1,670.0	Sestak	Rockwell Automation	Norristown, PA
I	OPN		030	LSD 41/49 Class – Boat Davit System Modification	$1,670.0	Marshall	Rockwell Automation	Dublin, GA
I	OPN		030	LSD 41/49 Class – Boat Davit System Modification	$1,670.0	Scott (VA)	Rockwell Automation	Richmond, VA
I	OPN		033	AN/SPQ-9B Surface Ship Radar	$5,400.0	Ackerman	NGC Electronic Systems	Melville, NY
I	OPN		033	AN/SPQ-9B Surface Ship Radar	$5,400.0	Bishop (NY)	Sperry Marine Ship Defense Systems	Melville, NY
I	OPN		033	AN/SPQ-9B Surface Ship Radar	$5,400.0	McCarthy (NY)	NGC Electronic Systems	Melville, NY
I	OPN		040	Gateway System	$3,000.0	Mica	Ocean Design, Inc.	Daytona Beach, FL
I	OPN		097	Multi Climate Protection System (MCPS)	$8,000.0	Hodes	Polartec, LLC	Hudson, NH
I	OPN		097	Multi Climate Protection System (MCPS)	$8,000.0	Rogers (MI)	Peckham Industries	Lansing, MI
I	OPN		097	Multi Climate Protection System (MCPS)	$8,000.0	Shea-Porter	Polartec, LLC	Hudson, NH
I	OPN		097	Multi Climate Protection System (MCPS)	$8,000.0	Tsongas	Polartec, LLC	Lawrence, MA
I	OPN		097	Multi Climate Protection System (MCPS)	$8,000.0	Walberg	Peckham Industries	Lansing, MI
I	OPN		134	High Performance Computing Capability	$2,000.0	Hunter	IBM & Delphi Research	San Diego, CA
I	PMC		042	USMC Tactical Fuel Systems (Nitrile Rubber Collapsible Storage Units)	$1,500.0	Taylor	Avon Engineered Fabrications, Inc.	Picayune, MS
I	PMC		050	Combat Casualty Care Equipment Upgrade Program	$4,000.0	Barrett	North American Rescue Products, Inc.	Greenville, SC
I	PMC		050	Combat Casualty Care Equipment Upgrade Program	$4,000.0	Spratt	North American Rescue Products, Inc.	Greenville, SC
I	APAF		017	C-40 Aircraft	$88,000.0	Costello	Scott Air Force Base	Belleville, IL
I	APAF		017	C-40 Aircraft	$88,000.0	Shimkus	Scott Air Force Base	Belleville, IL
I	APAF		048	Podded Reconnaissance System, Scathe View, C-130H	$5,000.0	Berkley	Nevada Military Department	Carson City, NV
I	APAF		048	Podded Reconnaissance System, Scathe View, C-130H	$5,000.0	Granger	ATK Integrated Systems	Fort Worth, TX
I	APAF		048	Podded Reconnaissance System, Scathe View, C-130H	$5,000.0	Porter	ATK Integrated Systems	Fort Worth, TX
I	APAF		059	RC-26B ANG Modernization	$3,000.0	Granger	ATK Integrated Systems	Fort Worth, TX

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
I	APAF		059	RC-26B ANG Modernization	$3,000.0	Lampson	The National Guard Bureau	
I	APAF		059	RC-26B ANG Modernization	$3,000.0	Rogers (AL)	Alabama Air National Guard	Montgomery, AL
I	OPAF		016	Force Protection Surveillance System	$4,000.0	Sanchez, Loretta	Rockwell Collins	Anaheim Hills, CA
I	OPAF		024	IMPACT (Information Modernization for Processing with Advanced Coating Technologies)	$2,000.0	Marshall	Warner Robins AFB	Warner Robins, GA
I	OPAF		024	Science, Engineering and Laboratory Data Integration (SELDI)	$2,000.0	Bishop (UT)	Ogden Air Logistics Center / ES3, Inc.	Hill AFB, UT
I	PDW		033	Combat Rations Surge Production Capacity Requirements	$5,000.0	Ellsworth	Amerqual	Evansville, IN
I	PDW		062	Remote Activated Munitions (RAMS)	$6,000.0	Hayes	Raytheon Technical Services Company	Indianapolis, IN
I	PDW		065	Mk 47 Advanced Lightweight Grenade Launcher	$6,000.0	Allen	General Dynamics Armament and Technical Products	Saco, ME
I	PDW		069	Special Operations Craft - Riverine	$3,600.0	Taylor	United States Marine, Inc.	Gulfport, MS
I	PDW		082	Special Operations Visual Augmentation Systems Hand Held Imager/Long Range	$15,400.0	Tsongas	FLIR Systems, Inc.	North Billenca, MA
I	PDW		083	Multi-Band Multi-Mission Radio	$9,500 0	Castor	Raytheon Company	Largo, FL
I	PDW		083	Multi-Band Multi-Mission Radio	$9,500.0	Souder	Raytheon	Fort Wayne, IN
I	PDW		95	SM-3 Deployment	$55,000.0	Ross	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Pine Bluff, AR
I	PWD		001	Domestic Production of Polycrystalline Laser Gain Materials	$3,000.0	Dingell	Nanocerox, Incorporated	Ann Arbor, MI
I	PAAF		6	Joint Direct Attack Munition	$40,000.0	Hunter	The Boeing Company	St. Louis, MO
II	RDA	0203726A	154	Fire Support Technology Improvement Program	$1,500.0	Shuster	Szanca Solutions, Inc.	Bedford, PA
II	RDA	0203735A	155	Condition Based Maintenance for Military Vehicles	$1,000.0	Rogers (AL)	Auburn University	Auburn, AL
II	RDA	0203735A	155	Ground Combat Systems Electronic Enhancements	$4,800.0	McKeon	Curtiss Wright	Santa Clarita, CA
II	RDA	0203802A	163	Close Combat Missile Modernization (Javelin)	$10,000.0	Everett	Lockheed Martin	Huntsville/Redstone Arsenal/Troy, AL
II	RDA	0208053A	166	JTAGS Preplanned Product Improvement	$6,000.0	Franks	Northrup Gruman	Colorado Springs, CO
II	RDA	0305208A	177	Asymmetric Threat Response and Analysis Program (ATRAP)	$5,000.0	Giffords	University of Arizona	Tucson, AZ

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDA	0305208A	177	Blast Damage Assessment Risk Analysis and Mitigation Application - Enhancements (BRAMA-E)	$4,000.0	Young (AK)	ISR Battle Command Battle Lab	Ft. Huachuca, AZ
II	RDA	0305208A	177	Constant Look Operational Support Environment (CLOSE)	$4,000.0	Young (AK)	ISR Battle Command Battle Lab	Ft. Huachuca, AZ
II	RDA	0305208A	177	Heuristic Internet Protocol Packet Inspection Engine (HIPPIE)	$3,500.0	Akin	TechGuard Securities	Chesterfield, MO
II	RDA	0601102A	2	Functionally Integrated Reactive Surface Technologies (FIRST)	$2,500.0	Gillibrand	Starfire Systems	Malta, NY
II	RDA	0601102A	2	Nanocrystal Source Display	$1,500.0	Markey	QD Vision	Watertown, MA
II	RDA	0601102A	2	Nanostructured Materials For Photovoltaic Applications	$2,000.0	McHugh	Clarkson University	Potsdam, NY
II	RDA	0601102A	2	Solid State Shelter Lighting System	$480.0	Hill	Techshot, Inc.	Greenville, IN
II	RDA	0601103A	3	Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM) at Coppin University	$1,000.0	Cummings	Coppin State University	Baltimore, MD
II	RDA	0602105A	5	Aircraft Skin Repair by Cold Spray	$3,000.0	Bartlett	Engineering Systems Solutions (ESS)	Frederick, MD
II	RDA	0602105A	5	Aircraft Skin Repair by Cold Spray	$3,000.0	Cummings	Engineering Systems Solutions (ESS)	Frederick, MD
II	RDA	0602105A	5	Ultrasonic Consolidation for Armor Applications	$1,700.0	Dingell	Solidica, Inc.	Ann Arbor, MI
II	RDA	0602105A	13	Dual Stage Variable Energy Absorber	$3,000.0	Murphy (PA)	ARRCA, Incorporated	Penns Park, PA
II	RDA	0602120A	6	Command and Control, Communications and Computers (C4) module	$1,500.0	Young (AK)	Gerald Meyers, Alkan Shelter, LLC	Fairbanks, AK
II	RDA	0602120A	6	Cyber Forensics and Tracking Capability Tool	$1,000.0	Davis (KY)	STARCON	Catlettsburg, KY
II	RDA	0602120A	6	Dismounted Soldier Millimeter Wave BTID RF Tag	$2,000.0	Saxton	Sierra Monolithics	Redondo Beach, CA
II	RDA	0602120A	6	Electromagnetic Geolocation	$2,830.0	Davis (CA)	QUASAR Federal Systems	San Diego, CA
II	RDA	0602120A	6	Electromagnetic Geolocation	$2,830.0	Smith (WA)	QUASAR Federal Systems	San Diego, CA
II	RDA	0602120A	6	Semi-Autonomous or Unattended Psychological Operations and Reconnaissance Tool (SUPORT)	$3,000.0	Spratt	Defense Technologies, Inc.	Gastonia, NC
II	RDA	0602211A	8	Intensive Quenching for Advanced Weapon Systems	$1,200.0	Sutton	IQ Technologies, Inc.	Akron, OH

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDA	0602270A	9	Knowledge Integration & Management Center of Excellence	$3,000.0	Cummings	Morgan State University	Baltimore, MD
II	RDA	0602270A	9	Silver Fox and Manta UAS	$4,000.0	Giffords	Advanced Ceramics Research	Tucson, AZ
II	RDA	0602303A	10	Micro Safe and Arm Device for DoD Rocket Systems	$2,500.0	McKeon	Pacific Scientific	Valencia, CA
II	RDA	0602601A	13	DoD Hydrogen PEM Fuel Cell Medium/Heavy Duty Vehicle Demonstration Program	$8,000.0	Larson	UTC Power	South Windsor, CT
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Fire Resistant Fuels	$4,800.0	Rodriguez	Southwest Reasearch Institute	San Antonio, TX
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Improved EFP and IED protection, testing, modeling and proving using LAS glass ceramics	$6,000.0	Tauscher	Livermore National Laboratory	Livermore, CA
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Nano-Based, Rust-Corrosion-UV Protection Systems for Storage of Military Hardware	$300.0	Davis (KY)	Ashland Inc.	Covington, KY
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Nanofluids for Advanced Military Mobility	$2,200.0	Davis (KY)	Ashland Inc.	Covington, KY
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Rapid Up-Armor Synthesis and Crashworthiness Design for Improved Soldier Survivability	$2,000.0	Donnelly	The University of Notre Dame	Notre Dame, IN
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Tactical Metal Fabrication (TacFab)	$6,300.0	Markey	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Waltham, Woburn, Beverly, Billerica, Lowell, MA
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Tactical Metal Fabrication (TacFab)	$6,300.0	Tierney	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Waltham, Woburn, Beverly, Billerica, Lowell, MA
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Tactical Metal Fabrication (TacFab)	$6,300.0	Tsongas	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Billerica, MA
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Tactical Metal Fabrication (TacFab)	$6,300.0	Turner	BuyCastings.com	Dayton, ON
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Torque-Vectoring Rollover Prevention Technology	$1,400.0	McHugh	Magna Powertrain	East Syracuse, NY
II	RDA	0602618A	14	Beneficial Infrastructure for Rotorcraft Risk Reduction Demonstrations (BIRRRD)	$1,500.0	Sestak	Dragonfly Pictures, Inc	Essington, PA
II	RDA	0602618A	14	Globally Accessible Manufacturing and Maintenance Activity (GAMMA)	$3,500.0	Knollenberg	POM Group Inc.	Auburn Hills, MI
II	RDA	0602624A	17	Specialized Compact Automated Mechanical Clearance Platform	$3,000.0	Murphy (PA)	Humanistic Robotics, Inc.	Philadelphia, PA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDA	0602709A	19	Miniaturized Sensors for Small and Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (MINISENS)	$3,000.0	Reyes	Aerospace Missions Corporation	El Paso, TX
II	RDA	0602709A	19	Multi-Threat Detection Initiative (MTDI)	$3,000.0	Abercrombie	Alakai Consulting and Engineering, Inc.	Honolulu, HI
II	RDA	0602709A	19	Power Efficient Microdisplay Development for US Army Night Vision	$4,650.0	Hall (NY)	eMagin Corporation	Hopewell Junction, NY
II	RDA	0602712A	20	Hawaii Undersea Chemical Military Munitions Assessment Plan	$5,000.0	Abercrombie	University of Hawaii	Honolulu, HI
II	RDA	0602716A	21	LWI Training-based Collaborative Research	$25,000.0	Skelton	Leonard Wood Institute	Fort Leonard Wood, MO
II	RDA	0602720A	22	Integrated Environmental Control System / Cryogenic Agent Removal System (CARS)	$5,000.0	Alexander	Mezzo Technologies	Baton Rouge, LA
II	RDA	0602720A	22	Integrated Environmental Control System / Cryogenic Agent Removal System (CARS)	$5,000.0	Bartlett	Fairchild Controls	Frederick, MD
II	RDA	0602720A	22	Range Scrap Disposal, Hawthorne Army Depot	$1,250.0	Brady (PA)	Hawthorne Army Depot	Hawthorne, NV
II	RDA	0602720A	22	Range Scrap Disposal, Hawthorne Army Depot	$1,250.0	Sestak	Hawthorne Army Depot	Hawthorne, NV
II	RDA	0602786A	27	Advanced Thermal Processing of Packaged Combat Rations	$2,100 0	Gingrey	Printpack, Inc.	Atlanta, GA
II	RDA	0602786A	27	Wearable Personal Area Network Technology	$3,000.0	Spratt	Advanced Mission Systems, Inc.	Fort Mill, SC
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Advanced Bio-engineering for Enhancement of Soldier Survivability	$3,000.0	Gingrey	Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, GA
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Advanced Bio-engineering for Enhancement of Soldier Survivability	$3,000.0	Johnson (GA)	Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, GA
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Advanced Bio-engineering for Enhancement of Soldier Survivability	$3,000.0	Marshall	Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, GA
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Advanced Functional Nanomaterials for Biological Processes	$2,500.0	Snyder	University of Arkansas Little Rock	Little Rock, AR
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Depression and Mood Disorders Treatment/Research	$1,000.0	King (NY)	University of Notre Dame	South Bend, IN
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Measuring and Protecting Against Traumatic Brain Injury from IEDs	$3,000.0	McNerney	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	Livermore, CA
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Measuring and Protecting Against Traumatic Brain Injury from IEDs	$3,000.0	Tauscher	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	Livermore, CA
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Military Photomedicine Program	$6,000.0	Sanchez, Loretta	Air Force Office of Scientific Research	Arlington, VA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Minimizing Health Effects of Air Toxics on Military Personnel	$1,200.0	Yarmuth	University of Lousiville Research Foundation	Louisville, KY
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Neuropsychiatric and Post Traumatic Stress Treatment Initiative	$1,200.0	Alexander	Biomedical Research Foundation of Northwest Louisiana	Shreveport, LA
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Neuropsychiatric and Post Traumatic Stress Treatment Initiative	$1,200.0	McCrery	Biomedical Research Foundation of Northwest Louisiana	Shreveport, LA
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Orthopedic Implant Design and Manufacturing for Traumatic Injunes	$2,000.0	Donnelly	The University of Notre Dame	Notre Dame, IN
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Orthopedic Implant Design and Manufacturing for Traumatic Injuries	$2,000.0	Souder	University of Notre Dame	Notre Dame, IN
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Plasma Technology Laboratory	$1,000.0	Ortiz	Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi, TX
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Attention Modification Program for Veterans	$1,500.0	Davis (CA)	San Diego State University Research Foundation	San Diego, CA
II	RDA	0602787A	28	The use of drugs to reduce hearing loss following acute acoustic trauma	$1,600.0	McHugh	State University of New York, Plattsburgh	Plattsburgh, NY
II	RDA	0603001A	29	Ballistic Precision Aerial Delivery System (BPADS)	$4,800.0	Larson	Pioneer Aerospace Corporation	South Windsor, CT
II	RDA	0603001A	29	Ballistic Precision Aerial Delivery System (BPADS)	$4,800.0	Taylor	Pioneer Aerospace Corporation	Columbia, MS
II	RDA	0603001A	29	Novel Flame Retardant Nylon Fabrics	$2,000.0	Spratt	Milliken & Company	Spartanburg, SC
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Advanced Technology Research Center for Traumatic Injury to the Visual System and Brain	$5,000.0	Brady (PA)	Wills Eye Health System	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Center of Cardiac Surgery Robotic Computerized Telemanipulation as Part of a Comprehensive Approach	$2,000.0	Brady (PA)	Thomas Jefferson University Hospital	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Chronic Tinnitus Treatment Program	$3,700.0	Dent	Neuromonics, Inc.	Bethlehem, PA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Clinical Technology Integration for Military Health	$6,800.0	Markey	DocBox, Inc.	Waltham, MA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Composite Tissue Allotransplantation Research and Clinical Program	$5,000.0	Yarmuth	National Foundation to Support Cell Transplant Research	Louisville, KY
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Controlled Release of Anti-Inflammatory and Tissue Repair	$6,000.0	Blunt	Crosslink	Springfield, MO
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Corneal Wound Repair	$6,000.0	Blunt	St. John's Medical Research	Springfield, MO

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Emergency Department Preparedness Project	$2,000.0	King (NY)	New York University Medical Center	New York City, NY
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Infectious and Inflammatory Disease Center (IIDC)	$2,000.0	Bilbray	Burnham Institute for Medical Research	La Jolla, CA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Infectious and Inflammatory Disease Center (IIDC)	$2,000.0	Davis (CA)	Burnham Institute for Medical Research	San Diego, CA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Institute of Surgical and Interventional Simulation	$3,000.0	Smith (WA)	University of Washington	Seattle, WA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Joint Medical Logistics AIT Modernization Initiative: Navy Hospital Ships	$6,000.0	Larsen	Intermec Technologies Corporation	WA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Joint Medical Logistics AIT Modernization Initiative: Navy Hospital Ships	$6,000.0	Loebsack	Intermec	Cedar Rapids, IA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Locomotor Translational Research and Clinical Treatment for Traumatic Brain Injury	$4,200.0	Yarmuth	Jewish Hospital and St. Mary's Foundation	Louisville, KY
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Madigan Army Medical Center Digital Pen	$250.0	Smith (WA)	Madigan Army Medical Center	Fort Lewis, WA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Magnetic Brain Stimulation for Traumatic Brain Injury Rehabilitation	$1,000.0	Cummings	University of Maryland - Baltimore	Baltimore, MD
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Mild Traumatic Brain Injury Assessment and Triage Using Smart Sensor Technology	$3,200.0	Knollenberg	William Beaumont Hospital	Royal Oak, MI
II	RDA	0603002A	30	National Trauma Institute	$3,000.0	Gonzalez	The University of Texas Health Science Center San Antonio	San Antonio, TX
II	RDA	0603002A	30	National Trauma Institute	$3,000.0	Smith (TX)	The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio	San Antonio, TX
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Personal Status Monitor (Nightengale)	$2,500.0	McHugh	WelchAllyn	Skaneateles Falls, NY
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Pilot Program for PTSD Telemedicine Support for Military and Dependents (TSMD)	$2,200.0	Butterfield	East Carolina University, Brody School of Medicine	Greenville, NC
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Shock Trauma Center Operating Room Equipment	$2,100.0	Ruppersberger	Shock Trauma Center, University of Maryland Medical Center	Baltimore, MD
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Smisson Cartledge Infuser	$2,000.0	Gingrey	Smisson Cartledge Biomedical	Macon, GA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Telepharmacy Remote Medicine Device Unit (TRMDU)	$3,000.0	Brady (PA)	INRange Systems, Inc	Altoona, PA
II	RDA	0603002A	30	TeraStack Pilot for Army Telemedicine	$2,500.0	Hall (TX)	Hie Electronics	McKinney, TX
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Ultra High-Speed MEMS Electromagnetic Cell Sorter (UHSMECS)	$5,500.0	Capps	Innovative Micro Technology	Santa Barbara, CA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Ultra-High Resolution Display for Army Medicine (UHRDARM)	$5,200.0	Hall (NY)	eMagin Corporation	Hopewell Junction, NY
II	RDA	0603002A	30	USF College of Public Health / Haley VA Rehabilitation and Assistive Technology Project	$5,000.0	Castor	University of South Florida, College of Public Health	Tampa, FL
II	RDA	0603003A	31	Advanced Performance for Military Helicopters	$3,100.0	Tauscher	Curtiss-Wright Metal Improvement Company	Livermore, CA
II	RDA	0603003A	31	Drive System Composite Structural Component Risk Reduction Program	$5,000.0	Brady (PA)	V System Composites, Inc	Chester, PA
II	RDA	0603003A	31	Mission Execution Technology Implementation	$10,000.0	Akin	Westar Aerospace & Defense Group, Inc.	St. Charles, MO
II	RDA	0603003A	31	Mission Execution Technology Implementation	$10,000.0	Hulshof	Aeromechanics Division	Redstone Arsenal, AL
II	RDA	0603003A	31	Non-Hazardous Infrared Anti-Reflective Coatings for Army Aircraft Sensors	$2,000.0	Hayes	United Protective Technologies (UPT)	Charlotte, NC
II	RDA	0603003A	31	UAV-Resupply BURRO	$4,800.0	Larson	Kaman Aerospace Corporation	Bloomfield, CT
II	RDA	0603003A	31	Universal Control--Full Authority Digital Engine Control (FADEC)	$5,000 0	Larson	Goodrich Engine Control Systems	West Hartford, CT
II	RDA	0603004A	32	Chemical Mechanical Self Destruct Fuze	$2,000.0	Hall (TX)	Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant (LSAAP), Day & Zimmermann	Texarkana, TX
II	RDA	0603004A	32	Lens-Less Micro Seeker System for Small Steerable Projectiles	$5,000.0	Dreier	Tanner Research, Inc.	Monrovia, CA
II	RDA	0603004A	32	Precision Molding Manufacturing Technology for InfraRed Aspheric Optics	$2,900.0	Andrews	Edmund Optics	Barrington, NY
II	RDA	0603004A	32	Precision Molding Manufacturing Technology for InfraRed Aspheric Optics	$2,900.0	Dent	Edmund Optics, Inc.	Barrington, NY
II	RDA	0603004A	32	Precision Molding Manufacturing Technology for InfraRed Aspheric Optics	$2,900.0	Saxton	Edmund Optics, Inc	Barrington, NY
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Advanced Composites for Light Weight, Low Cost Transportation Systems using 3+ Extruder	$5,000.0	Stupak	Century/3 Plus, LLC	Traverse City, MI
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Advanced Drivetrains for Enhanced Mobility and Safety	$2,500.0	Upton	Eaton Corporation	Marshall, MI
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Advanced Drivetrains for Enhanced Mobility and Safety	$2,500.0	Walberg	Eaton Automotive -Torque Control Products Division	Marshall, MI

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Advanced Lithium Iron Phosphate Battery System for Army Combat Hybrid HMMWV and Other Army Vehicle P	$4,000.0	Dingell	T/J Technologies Advanced Research &Government Solutions	Ann Arbor, MI
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Antiballistic Windshield Armor	$5,000.0	Donnelly	Division of A123Systems, Inc. Defense, CS	Mishawaka, IN
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Commercially Viable Si/C Power Semiconductors Using Superlattice Technology	$3,200.0	Gillibrand	C9 Corporation	Wilton, NY
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Dynamometer Facility Upgrade Program	$4,250.0	Dingell	AVL North America, Inc.	Ann Arbor, MI
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Dynamometer Facility Upgrade Program	$4,250.0	Levin	AVL North America, Inc.	Plymouth, MI
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Fire Shield	$6,000.0	Dreier	Chang Industry	La Verne, CA
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Hybrid Electric (heavy truck) Vehicle	$5,000.0	Bartlett	Volvo Powertrain of North America	Hagerstown, MD
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Long Range Power Source for Unmanned Ground Vehicles	$4,000.0	Dingell	Adaptive Materials, Inc.	Ann Arbor, MI
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Conditioned Based Maintenance· Fleet Mission Readiness	$4,000.0	Rogers (AL)	Honeywell International	Washington, DC
II	RDA	0603005A	33	User Evaluation of LASSO Vehicles	$2,000.0	Marshall	GEORGIA A.T.M. INC.	Glenwood, GA
II	RDA	0603008A	36	Applied Communications and Information Networking (ACIN)	$7,000.0	Andrews	U.S. Army CERDEC	Camden, NJ
II	RDA	0603008A	36	Applied Communications and Information Networking (ACIN)	$7,000.0	LoBiondo	U.S. Army CERDEC	Camden, NJ
II	RDA	0603008A	36	Maritime C4ISR System	$1,000.0	Shuster	Mission Critical Solutions, LLC	Alum Bank, PA
II	RDA	0603015A	38	Center for Experiential Technologies for Urban Warfare and Disaster Response	$4,200.0	McIntyre	UNC-Chapel Hill	Chapel Hill, NC
II	RDA	0603015A	38	Joint Fires & Effects Training System (JFETS)	$6,500.0	Cole	Institute for Creative Technologies	Marina Del Ray, CA
II	RDA	0603103A	41	Unserviceable Ammunition Demilitarization	$2,000.0	Bishop (UT)	Tooele Army Depot, Battelle Memorial Institute	Tooele, UT
II	RDA	0603125A	43	Field Test of Solar Cells at FOBs	$2,000.0	Hunter	Skybuilt	Arlington, VA
II	RDA	0603270A	45	UWB-RWM for IED Countermeasures (Ultra-Wideband Reactive Waveform Modulator)	$1,500.0	Akin	X-COM Systems, LLC	Warrensburg, MO
II	RDA	0603305A	55	Compact Pulsed Power for Defense Applications	$4,000.0	Conaway	Texas Tech University	Lubbock, TX
II	RDA	0603305A	55	Compact Pulsed Power for Defense Applications	$4,000.0	Neugebauer	Texas Tech University	Lubbock, TX

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDA	0603305A	55	Composite Structure Design	$2,500.0	Johnson (GA)	Army Space and Missile Defense Command	Anniston, AL
II	RDA	0603305A	55	Deployable Space and Electronic Warfare Analysis Tool	$4,000.0	Lamborn	Analytical Graphics, Inc.	Colorado Springs, CO
II	RDA	0603327A	57	Center for Defense Systems Research	$1,000.0	Reyes	University of Texas at El Paso	El Paso, TX
II	RDA	0603607A	49	Integrated Fire Control System for Small Arms	$1,500.0	Bartlett	ACAGI, Inc.	Frederick, MD
II	RDA	0603653A	62	Stryker Common Active Protection System Radar	$4,500.0	Hall (TX)	Raytheon Network Centric Systems	McKinney, TX
II	RDA	0603653A	62	Stryker Common Active Protection System Radar	$4,500.0	Reyes	Raytheon Network Centric Systems	McKinney, TX
II	RDA	0603710A	50	Brownout Situational Awareness Sensor	$4,500.0	Hunter	TREX Enterprises Corporation	San Diego, CA
II	RDA	0603710A	50	Hyper-IFP (Hyperspectral Sensor for Improved Force Protection)	$5,400.0	Akin	Clean Earth Technologies, LLC	St. Louis, MO
II	RDA	0603710A	50	Personal Miniature Thermal Viewer	$4,200.0	Michaud	Elscott Manufacturing	Ellsworth, ME
II	RDA	0603710A	50	Personal Miniature Thermal Viewer	$4,200.0	Sanchez, Loretta	Irvine Sensors Corporation	Costa Mesa, CA
II	RDA	0603710A	50	Research to Enhance Visual Clarity of Night Vision and Low-Light Video	$2,000.0	Gillibrand	On2 Technologies, Inc.	Clifton Park, NY
II	RDA	0603734A	52	Distributed Power from Wastewater	$2,800.0	Space	Ohio University	Athens, OH
II	RDA	0603734A	52	Enhanced Holographic Imager	$2,800.0	Conaway	Zebra Imaging	Austin, TX
II	RDA	0603734A	52	Enhanced Holographic Imager	$2,800.0	Granger	Zebra Imaging, Inc.	Austin, TX
II	RDA	0603734A	52	S.A.V.E.: Synthetic Automotive Virtual Environments	$2,000.0	Hodes	Vehicle Control Training, LLC	Dalton, NH
II	RDA	0603772A	53	Foliage Penetrating, Reconnaissance, Surveillance, Tracking, and Engagement Radar (FORESTER)	$4,000.0	McHugh	Syracuse Research Corporation	North Syracuse, NY
II	RDA	0603772A	53	Foliage Penetrating, Reconnaissance, Surveillance, Tracking, and Engagement Radar (FORESTER)	$4,000.0	Walsh	Syracuse Research Corporation	Syracuse, NY
II	RDA	0603772A	53	Software Lifecycle Affordability Management Phase II (SLAM II)	$2,500.0	Saxton	PRICE Systems, LLC	Mount Laurel, NJ
II	RDA	0603779A	66	Demonstration Project at Travis AFB Environmental Mangament Information System	$500.0	Tauscher	Travis Air Force Base	Fairfield, CA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDA	0603779A	66	Green Range and Impact Zone	$2,500 0	Spratt	Concurrent Technologies Corporation	North Charleston, SC
II	RDA	0603779A	66	Internet-Based Environmental Compliance Management System	$2,500.0	Abercrombie	Enviance	Carlsbad, CA
II	RDA	0603779A	66	Renewable Energy Testing Center	$3,800.0	Matsui	Renewable Energy Institute International	Sacramento, CA
II	RDA	0603779A	66	Strengthening LEAD Environmental, Energy, and Transporation Management	$500.0	Shuster	Mountain Research LLC	Altoona, PA
II	RDA	0603807A	72	Leishmania Skin Test	$1,500.0	Hunter	Allermed Laboratories, Inc	San Diego, CA
II	RDA	0604270A	78	Hostile Fire Indicator	$5,000.0	Shea-Porter	BAE Systems E&IS	Nashua, NH
II	RDA	0604601A	63	Capability expansion of near-net shaped direct-sinistered silicon carbide torso plates	$4,000.0	Snyder	Army PEO Soldier	
II	RDA	0604601A	63	Headborne Energy Analysis and Diagnostic System (HEADS)	$2,000.0	Mitchell	BAE Systems	Tucson, AZ
II	RDA	0604622A	85	Multi-purpose ISO Container Transporters	$3,000.0	Udall (NM)	MCT Industries, Inc.	Bernalillo, NM
II	RDA	0604807A	110	Rotary Valve Pressure Swing Absorption Oxygen Generator (RVPSAOG)	$3,000.0	Davis (CA)	SeQual Technologies, Inc	San Diego, CA
II	RDA	0604854A	120	U.S. Army M109A6 Paladin Virtual System Development and Modernization	$5,000.0	McNerney	CPU Technology, Inc	Pleasanton, CA
II	RDA	0604870A	66	Mobile Detection Assessment Response System	$5,500.0	Bartlett	Product Manager-Force Protection Systems	Fort Belvoir, VA
II	RDA	0605502A	132	Gunfire Detection System for Unmanned Aerial Vehicles	$9,000.0	Everett	Radiance Technologies / Army Aviation Warfighting Center	Fort Rucker, AL
II	RDA	0605502A	132	Study of Warfighting Initiative for Future Technologies and Tactics - Aviation (SWIFTT-A)	$3,000.0	Everett	SAIC Huntsville / Army Aviation Warfighting Center	Fort Rucker, AL
II	RDA	0605502A	133	Electro-Magnetic Flak Impulse System	$5,000.0	McCaul	Applied Physical Electronics, LP	Spicewood, TX
II	RDA	0605502A	133	Electro-Magnetic Flak Impulse System	$5,000.0	Smith (TX)	Applied Physical Electronics, LP	Spicewood, TX
II	RDA	0605602A	135	MOTS All Sky Imager (MASI)	$3,000.0	Reyes	Trex Enterprises	San Diego, CA
II	RDA	0708045A	179	Composite Rotorcraft Airframe Development	$2,000.0	Everett	US Army MANTECH/ GKN Aerospace	Tallassee, AL
II	RDA	0708045A	179	Composite Rotorcraft Airframe Development	$2,000.0	Rogers (AL)	GKN Aerospace	Tallassee, AL
II	RDA	0708045A	179	Helicopter Vulerability Reduction	$3,000.0	Shays	United Technologies Research Center	East Hartford, CT

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDA	0708045A	179	Helicopter Vulnerability Reduction	$3,000.0	Courtney	United Technologies Research Center	East Hartford, CT
II	RDA	0708045A	179	Vehicle Common Armor Manufacturing Process (VCAMP)	$4,000.0	Saxton	SMH International, LLC	Mount Laurel, NJ
II	RDN	0101221N	159	Advanced LINAC Facility	$4,400.0	Hill	Indiana University	Bloomington, IN
II	RDN	0204229N	167	ImageNav— Low-Cost Image-Based Navigation and Precision Targeting	$3,000.0	Markey	Scientific Systems Company, Inc	Woburn, MA
II	RDN	0205601N	173	Advanced Anti-Radiation Guided Missile (AARGM) Derivative	$3,000.0	Larsen	ATK Advanced Weapons	Woodland Hills, CA
II	RDN	0205632N	176	MK 48 Torpedo Post-Launch Communication System	$1,000.0	Arcuri	Naval Sea Systems Command	Washington Navy Yard, DC
II	RDN	0205633N	177	Reduction of Weapon System Downtime Rapid Repair Structural Adhesives	$2,000.0	Langevin	Epoxies, Etc., Inc.	Cranston, RI
II	RDN	0205633N	177	Sacrificial Film Laminates for Navy Helicopter Windscreens	$1,200.0	Spratt	United Protective Technologies	Charlotte, NC
II	RDN	0206623M	181	Development and test program for an EMI Hardened shelter for the Marine Corps.	$2,000.0	Young (AK)	Gerald Meyers, Alkan Shelters LLC	Fairbanks, AK
II	RDN	0206623M	181	Enhanced Military Vehicle Maintenance System Demonstration Project with ANAD and Auburn University	$4,000.0	Rogers (AL)	Anniston Army Depot	Anniston, AL
II	RDN	0206623M	181	Marine Corps Shotgun Modernization Program	$3,000.0	Hoyer	USMC	Quantico, VA
II	RDN	0303109N	190	Joint- Integrated Systems Technology for Advanced Digital Networking (JIST-NET)	$6,000.0	Hunter	San Diego DEFCOMM	El Cajon, CA
II	RDN	0601103N	1	University Reseach Initiative	$7,000.0	King (NY)	Webb Institute	Glen Cove, NY
II	RDN	0601153N	3	Energetics S&T Workforce	$3,000.0	Hoyer	Navy	Indian Head, MD
II	RDN	0602114N	4	High Energy Conventional Energetics (Phase 2)	$1,500.0	Hoyer	Navy	Indian Head, MD
II	RDN	0602114N	4	Marine Mammal Hearing and Echolocation Research	$2,400.0	Abercrombie	Marine Mammal Research Program, University of Hawaii	Kailua, HI
II	RDN	0602123N	5	Autonomous Superconducting Fault Current Limiting Systems	$2,000.0	Miller (MI)	Nove Technologies, Inc	Metamora, MI
II	RDN	0602123N	5	Composite Sea Lion Craft Project	$5,000.0	Taylor	Seemann Composites	Gulfport, MS
II	RDN	0602123N	5	Medium Voltage Distribution Employing High Fidelity Technology	$5,000.0	Sanchez, Loretta	Power Paragon	Anaheim, CA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDN	0602123N	5	Optical Recognition Protocol for Biologics Detection	$3,200.0	Abercrombie	Pukoa Scientific	Honolulu, HI
II	RDN	0602131M	6	Warfighter Rapid Awareness Processing Technology (WRAPT)	$4,000.0	Abercrombie	Archinoetics, LLC	Honolulu, HI
II	RDN	0602234N	7	Infrared Materials Laboratories	$3,000.0	Cole	Amethyst Research, Inc.	Ardmore, OK
II	RDN	0602235N	8	All Weather Sense and Avoid for UAVs	$2,500.0	Hoyer	Naval Air Station	Patuxent River, MD
II	RDN	0602235N	8	SOF Test Environment for Advanced Team Collaboration Missions	$2,000.0	Hoyer	Naval Air Station	Patuxent River, MD
II	RDN	0602236N	9	Remote Fuel Assessment System (RFAS)	$2,000.0	Bartlett	Zeltex Inc.	Hagerstown, MD
II	RDN	0602271N	10	Center for Hetero-Functional Materials	$1,000.0	Conaway	Angelo State University	San Angelo, TX
II	RDN	0602435N	11	Autonomous Undersea Vehicle Applications Center	$2,000.0	Shea-Porter	Autonomous Undersea Systems Institute	Lee, NH
II	RDN	0603114N	15	Airborne Free Space Optical Communications Interrogator	$6,000.0	Abercrombie	Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc. (dba NovaSol)	Honolulu, HI
II	RDN	0603114N	15	Countermine Lidar UAV-based System (CLUBS)	$2,200.0	Taylor	Optech International Inc.	Kiln, MS
II	RDN	0603114N	15	Electromagnetic Railgun Program	$5,000.0	Wittman	Navy	Dahlgren, VA
II	RDN	0603114N	15	High Speed Anti-Radiation Demonstrator	$2,500.0	McKeon	Aerojet	Sacramento and China Lake, CA
II	RDN	0603114N	15	Real-Time Hyperspectral Targeting Sensor	$3,000.0	Hunter	Surface Optics Corporation	San Diego, CA
II	RDN	0603123N	16	High Strength Flame Resistant LCP Reinforced Netting	$3,000 0	Larsen	Diamond Nets, Inc.	Everson, WA
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Integrated Ship and Motion Control Technology	$4,300.0	Courtney	Mystic Innovations Group, Inc	Mystic, CT
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Integrated Ship and Motion Control Technology	$4,300.0	Gillibrand	Advanced Energy Conversion, LLC	Malta, NY
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Mobile Manufacturing and Repair Cell/Engineering Education Outreach Program	$1,000.0	Knollenberg	Focus. HOPE	Detroit, MI
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Mobile Manufacturing and Repair Cell/Engineering Education Outreach Program	$1,000.0	Levin	Focus· HOPE	Detroit, MI
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Navy Multi-Fuel Combustor for Shipboard Fuel Cell Systems	$2,000.0	Lampson	Navy: Office of Naval Research	Missouri City, TX
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Power Node Switching & Control Center	$3,000.0	Murphy (PA)	SPD Electrical Systems	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Pure Hydrogen Supply from Logistic Fuels	$4,000.0	Murphy (PA)	Power and Energy, Inc.	Ivyland, PA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Sea Fighter	$10,000.0	Hunter	L-3 Communications	San Diego, CA
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Superconducting DC Homopolar Motor	$2,000.0	Tsongas	Superconducting Systems, Inc.	Billenca, MA
II	RDN	0603216N	27	In Buoy Processor for Trigger and Alert Sonobuoy System	$2,500.0	Abercrombie	Guide Star Engineering, LLC	Kapolei, HI
II	RDN	0603236N	18	Deployed ASW Sustainment Training; P-3 Air Crew Tactical Team Trainer (PACT3)	$4,000.0	Drake	Alion Science and Technology, BMH Operation	Norfolk, VA
II	RDN	0603236N	18	Environmentally Sealed, Ruggedized Avionics Displays	$6,800.0	Butterfield	Combat Displays, Inc.	New Bern, NC
II	RDN	0603236N	18	Environmentally Sealed, Ruggedized Avionics Displays	$6,800.0	Hayes	Combat Displays, Inc.	New Bern, NC
II	RDN	0603236N	18	Environmentally Sealed, Ruggedized Avionics Displays	$6,800.0	McIntyre	Combat Displays, Inc.	New Bern, NC
II	RDN	0603236N	18	System for Intelligent Task Assignment & Readiness (SITAR)	$3,000.0	Hunter	SYS Technologies	San Diego, CA
II	RDN	0603254N	29	Holographic Optical Filters for LIDAR	$1,200.0	Murphy (PA)	RL Associates, Inc.	Langhorne, PA
II	RDN	0603254N	29	Holographic Optical Filters for LIDAR	$1,200.0	Sestak	RL Associates, Inc.	Chester, PA
II	RDN	0603254N	29	Marine Mammal Awareness, Alert and Response Systems (MMAARS)	$6,000.0	Abercrombie	BAE Systems	Honolulu, HI
II	RDN	0603254N	29	Tactical E-Field Buoy Development	$7,000.0	Hunter	Information Systems Laboratories	San Diego, CA
II	RDN	0603512N	34	Improved Corrosion Protection for Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System for CVN-21	$3,000.0	LoBiondo	NAVAIR	Lakehurst, NJ
II	RDN	0603512N	34	Improved Corrosion Protection for Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System for CVN-21	$3,000.0	Sestak	McGee Industries	Aston, PA
II	RDN	0603512N	34	Improved Corrosion Protection for Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System for CVN-21	$3,000.0	Smith (NJ)	McGee Industries Inc	Aston, PA
II	RDN	0603513N	35	Data Acquisition Reporting and Trending System (DARTS)	$3,000.0	Brady (PA)	Progeny Systems Corporation	Manassas, VA
II	RDN	0603513N	35	Diagnostic/Prognostic Pump System	$2,000.0	Gingrey	Global Technology Connection, Inc.	Atlanta, GA
II	RDN	0603513N	35	Diagnostic/Prognostic Pump System	$2,000.0	Neal	Warren Pumps	Warren, MA
II	RDN	0603513N	35	Diagnostic/Prognostic Pump System	$2,000.0	Sestak	Fairmount Automation, Inc.	Newtown Square, PA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDN	0603513N	35	High Temperature Superconductor (HTS) Navy Propulsion Motor for DDG 1000, and CG(X)	$2,000.0	Tsongas	American Superconductor Corporation	Westborough, MA
II	RDN	0603513N	35	IR LED Free Space Optics Communications Advancement	$2,000.0	Hunter	Torrey Pines Logic	San Diego, CA
II	RDN	0603513N	35	Power Conversion Equipment for High Density Power Generation Packages	$1,500.0	Boren	Westwood Corporation	Tulsa, OK
II	RDN	0603513N	35	Power Conversion Equipment for High Density Power Generation Packages	$1,500.0	Sullivan	Westwood Corporation	Tulsa, OK
II	RDN	0603553N	40	Sonobuoy Flight Vehicle (SFV)	$2,600.0	Mica	Sparton	DeLeon Springs, FL
II	RDN	0603561N	42	Advanced Submarine System Development (ULMS)	$10,000.0	Forbes	Navy	Various
II	RDN	0603561N	42	HBCU Applied Research Incubator (HARI)	$3,500.0	Cummings	In-Depth Engineering	Jackson, MS
II	RDN	0603561N	42	Sea Based Strategic Deterrent (SBSD)/ Undersea Launched Missile Study (ULMS)	$10,000.0	Courtney	General Dynamics Electric Boat	Groton, CT
II	RDN	0603561N	42	Sea Based Strategic Deterrent (SBSD)/ Undersea Launched Missile Study (ULMS)	$10,000.0	Langevin	General Dynamics - Electric Boat	Groton, CT
II	RDN	0603561N	42	Sea Based Strategic Deterrent (SBSD)/ Undersea Launched Missile Study (ULMS)	$10,000.0	Scott (VA)	Northrop Grumman	Newport News, VA
II	RDN	0603561N	42	Sea Based Strategic Deterrent (SBSD)/ Undersea Launched Missile Study (ULMS)	$10,000.0	Wittman	Northrop Grumman	Newport News, VA
II	RDN	0603561N	42	SSGN/Virginia Payload Tube Development	$15,000.0	Courtney	General Dynamics Electric Boat	Groton, CT
II	RDN	0603561N	42	SSGN/Virginia Payload Tube Development	$15,000.0	Langevin	General Dynamics Electric Boat	Groton, CT
II	RDN	0603563N	44	Analytics for Shipboard Monitoring Systems (ASMS)	$1,000.0	Drake	Oceana Sensor Technologies, Inc.	Virginia Beach, VA
II	RDN	0603564N	45	Naval Ship Hydrodynamic Test Facilities, NSWC, Carderock	$10,000.0	Van Hollen	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock	Bethesda, MD
II	RDN	0603635M	54	Center for Geospatial Intelligence & Investigation (GII)	$1,000.0	Granger	Texas State University, San Marcos	San Marcos, TX
II	RDN	0603635M	54	Urban Operations Laboratory	$6,000.0	Boyda	Kansas State University & M2 Technologies	Manhattan, KS
II	RDN	0603640M	20	Ballistic Helmet Development	$1,500.0	King (NY)	American Defense Systems, Inc.	Hicksville, NY
II	RDN	0603640M	20	Ground Warfare Acoustical Combat System Sniper Defeat and Combat Situational Awareness	$8,500.0	Boren	GWACS Defense Inc.	Tulsa, OK

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDN	0603640M	20	Ground Warfare Acoustical Combat System Sniper Defeat and Combat Situational Awareness	$8,500.0	Sullivan	GWACS Defense Inc	Tulsa, OK
II	RDN	0603640M	20	New Class of Backpacks for Marine Electricity Independence	$500.0	Sestak	Lightning Packs, LLC	Wayne, PA
II	RDN	0603725N	60	Hydrokinetic Power Generator	$2,000.0	Dingell	Vortex Hydro Energy, LLC	Ann Arbor, MI
II	RDN	0603725N	60	Regenerative Fuel Cell Back-up Power	$2,700.0	Larson	Infinity Fel Cells and Hydrogen, Inc.	Windsor, CT
II	RDN	0603725N	60	Swimmer Detection Sonar Network for the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard	$5,500.0	Hodes	Scientific Solutions, Inc.	Nashua, NH
II	RDN	0603725N	60	Swimmer Detection Sonar Network for the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard	$5,500.0	Shea-Porter	Scientific Solutions, Inc.	Nashua, NH
II	RDN	0603725N	60	Testing of Critical Components for Ocean Alternate Energy Options	$2,500.0	Abercrombie	Naval Facilities Engineering Services Center (NFESC)	Port Hueneme, CA
II	RDN	0603725N	60	Wave Energy PowerBuoy Generating System	$3,500.0	Abercrombie	Ocean Power Technologies	Honolulu, HI
II	RDN	0603747N	23	Navy – Use of UNOLS Fleet	$2,500.0	Davis (CA)	University of California, San Diego	San Diego, CA
II	RDN	0603795N	70	Affordable Weapon System	$15,000.0	Hunter	N/A	San Diego, CA, Los Angeles, CA, Tucson, AZ, St. Louis, MO
II	RDN	0603795N	70	Affordable Weapons System	$15,000.0	Gallegly	MBDA	Westlake Village, CA
II	RDN	0603889N	74	CRISSTL Ball	$1,500.0	Gillibrand	InterScience, Inc.	Troy, NY
II	RDN	0604215N	82	U.S. Navy METCAL RDT&E	$2,000.0	Calvert	NSWC, Corona	Corona, CA
II	RDN	0604230N	86	Wireless Imaging and Sensor Network	$5,000.0	Davis (CA)	G2 Software Systems, Inc/AVAAK, Inc	San Diego, CA
II	RDN	0604272N	76	Compact Ultra-fast Laser System Development	$4,500.0	Ellsworth	Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology and SAIC	Crane, IN
II	RDN	0604307N	98	DDG 51 Class Permanent Magnet Hybrid Electric Propulsion	$3,000.0	Bartlett	DRS Power Technology, Inc.	Fitchburg, MA
II	RDN	0604307N	98	DDG 51 Class Permanent Magnet Hybrid Electric Propulsion	$3,000.0	Murphy (CT)	DRS Power and Control Technologies	Danbury, CT
II	RDN	0604307N	98	DDG 51 Class Permanent Magnet Hybrid Electric Propulsion	$3,000.0	Tsongas	DRS Power Technology, Inc.	Fitchburg, MA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDN	0604501N	104	National Radio Frequency (RF) R&D and Technology Transfer Center	$5,000.0	Ellsworth	Technology Service Corporation	Crane, IN
II	RDN	0604501N	104	National Radio Frequency R&D and Technology Transfer Center	$5,000.0	Buyer	Technology Service Corporation	Bloomington, IN
II	RDN	0604558N	109	Large-Scale Demonstration Item for VA-Class Bow Dome	$2,000.0	Taylor	Seeman Composites, Inc	Gulfport, MS
II	RDN	0604567N	112	Automated Fiber Optic Manufacturing Initiative	$4,500.0	Drake	KITCO Fiber Optics	Virginia Beach, VA
II	RDN	0604567N	112	Automated Fiber Optic Manufacturing Initiative	$4,500.0	Scott (VA)	KITCO Fiber Optics	Virginia Beach, VA
II	RDN	0604759N	137	Air Combat Environment Test & Evaluation Facility (ACETEF) Upgrades	$3,000.0	Hoyer	NAS Patuxent River	Patuxent River, MD
II	RDN	0604759N	137	Improved Interoperability RDT&E to Support NAVAIR and GWOT Missions	$1,500.0	Hoyer	NAS Patuxent River	Patuxent River, MD
II	RDN	0604759N	137	SureTrak Re-Architecture & Sensor Augmentation for Force Protection at NAWCAD Patuxent River	$2,000.0	Cummings	Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division	Patuxent River, MD
II	RDN	0604759N	137	SureTrak Re-Architecture & Sensor Augmentation for Force Protection At NAWCAD Patuxent River	$2,000.0	Hoyer	NAS Patuxent River	Patuxent River, MD
II	RDN	0604771N	123	Reducing Operational Stress	$5,000.0	Davis (CA)	Science Applications International Corporation	San Diego, CA
II	RDN	0604771N	123	U.S. Navy Pandemic Influenza Vaccine Program	$2,000.0	McHugh	Trudeau Institute	Saranac Lake, NY
II	RDN	0605500N	133	Maritime Patrol Improvements	$448,300.0	Larsen	Navy	
II	RDAF	0207277F	131	Enhanced Guardian Angel Kit	$4,000.0	McIntyre	MSA Paraclete Armor and Equipment	St. Pauls, NC
II	RDAF	0207434F	86	Flexible Access Secure Transfer (FAST)	$4,000.0	Pascrell	BAE Systems	Wayne, NJ
II	RDAF	0207434F	86	Flexible Access Secure Transfer (FAST)	$4,000.0	Rothman	BAE Systems	Wayne, NJ
II	RDAF	0301310F	154	Open Source Research Centers	$3,000.0	Space	National Air and Space Intelligence Center	Wright Patterson AFB, OH
II	RDAF	0301310F	154	Open Source Research Centers	$3,000.0	Sutton	Radiance Technologies, Inc.	Fairborn, OH
II	RDAF	0301310F	154	Open Source Research Centers	$3,000.0	Turner	National Air and Space Intelligence Center	Dayton, OH

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDAF	0301555F	4	Remote Suspect Identification	$4,000.0	Alexander	Air Force Cyberspace Command (P)/Louisiana Tech University (Ruston, LA)	Bossier City, LA
II	RDAF	0301555F	4	Remote Suspect Identification	$4,000.0	McCrery	Air Force Cyberspace Command (P)/Louisiana Tech University (Ruston, LA)	Bossier City, LA
II	RDAF	0303140F	162	Cybercraft	$3,000.0	McCrery	Distributed Infinity Inc.	Lakespur, CO
II	RDAF	0303140F	162	Dark Screen	$2,000.0	Rodriguez	University of Texas, San Antonio	San Antonio, TX
II	RDAF	0305206F	191	Multiple UAS cooperative concentrated observation and engagement against a common ground objective	$10,000.0	Bartlett	Proxy Aviation Systems	Germantown, MD
II	RDAF	0305206F	191	Multiple UAS cooperative concentrated observation and engagement against a common ground objective	$10,000.0	Sestak	Proxy Aviation Systems	Germantown, MD
II	RDAF	0305207F	192	RIVET JOINT ISR Network Integration	$3,500.0	Hall (TX)	L-3	Greenville, TX
II	RDAF	0401115F	205	Electromagnetic In-Flight Propeller Balancing	$1,500.0	English	LORD Corporation	Erie, PA
II	RDAF	0401115F	205	Link 16 Program for AFSOC's MC-130Hs	$5,200.0	Loebsack	Rockwell Collins	Cedar Rapids, IA
II	RDAF	0408011F	215	Joint Precision AirDrop Systems – Mission Planner Rapid Fielding Initiative	$4,500.0	Taylor	Planning Systems Inc (PSI)	Long Beach, CA
II	RDAF	0408011F	215	Next Generation Tactical Environmental Clothing for AFSOC	$2,000.0	Rogers (AL)	THY Enterprises	Alexander City, AL
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	Aerodynamic Wind Tunnel Upgrade Initiative	$2,000.0	Giffords	University of Arizona	Tucson, AZ
II	RDAF	0602015F	7	Basic Science Research TBI	$3,100.0	Ruppersberger	Shock Trauma Center, University of Maryland Medical Center	Baltimore, MD
II	RDAF	0602015F	7	Mobile Diabetes Management	$2,000.0	Ruppersberger	Well Doc	Baltimore, MD
II	RDAF	0602102F	8	Advanced Carbon Fiber Research and Test Initiative	$3,000.0	Inglis	Cytec Industries Inc.	Piedmont, SC
II	RDAF	0602102F	8	Advanced Carbon Fiber Research and Test Initiative	$3,000.0	Spratt	Cytec Industries Inc.	Rock Hill, SC
II	RDAF	0602102F	8	Advanced Casting and Coating Technologies	$3,500.0	Sutton	PPG Industries	Barberton, OH
II	RDAF	0602102F	8	Ceramic Matrix Composite Turbine Blade Demonstration	$5,000.0	Shays	UTC Research Center	East Hartford, CT
II	RDAF	0602102F	8	FEL Capabilities for Aerospace Microfabrication	$1,400.0	Wittman	Air Force	Newport News, VA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDAF	0602102F	8	Next Generation Manufacturing Processes	$1,500 0	Smith (TX)	The University of Texas at Austin	Austin, TX
II	RDAF	0602102F	8	ONAMI Safer Nanomaterials and Nanomanufacturing	$1,000.0	DeFazio	University of Oregon	Eugene, OR
II	RDAF	0602102F	8	ONAMI Safer Nanomaterials and Nanomanufacturing	$1,000.0	Walden	Portland State University, University of Oregon, Oregon State University	Portland, Eugene, Corvallis, OR
II	RDAF	0602201F	9	Single-Mode Optical Connectors for Advanced Air Vehicles	$1,500.0	Dingell	Translume Inc.	Ann Arbor, MI
II	RDAF	0602202F	10	Bay Area Language Technology Innovation Center (BALTIC)	$4,500.0	Honda	SRI International	Menlo Park, CA
II	RDAF	0602202F	10	Bay Area Language Technology Innovation Center (BALTIC)	$4,500.0	Tauscher	International Computer Science Institute (ICSI) and SRI International	Berkeley, CA Menlo Park, CA
II	RDAF	0602203F	11	Advanced Vehicle Propulsion Center	$3,000.0	McKeon	Advatech Pacific	Palmdale, CA
II	RDAF	0602203F	11	High Temperature, High Energy-Density Capacitors by Stacked or Multilayer CVD Processes	$1,000.0	Dent	Morgan Advanced Ceramics, Inc. Diamonex Products Division	Allentown, PA
II	RDAF	0602203F	11	Hydrocarbon Boost Technology Demonstrator	$3,000.0	Doolittle	Aerojet-General Corporation	Sacramento, CA
II	RDAF	0602203F	11	Hydrocarbon Boost Technology Demonstrator	$3,000.0	McCarthy (CA)	Aerojet-General Corporation	Sacramento, CA
II	RDAF	0602203F	11	Hydrocarbon Boost Technology Demonstrator	$3,000.0	McKeon	Aerojet-General Corporation	Sacramento and Edwards AFB, CA
II	RDAF	0602203F	11	Integrated Electrical Starter/Generator (IES/G)	$3,500.0	Turner	GE Aviation, Electrical Power Systems	Vandalia, OH
II	RDAF	0602203F	11	National Test Facility for Aerospace Fuels and Propulsion	$1,700.0	Buyer	Purdue University	West Lafayette, IN
II	RDAF	0602203F	11	WASH Oxygen Sensor and Cell-Level Battery Controller	$5,200.0	Dreier	Advanced Projects Research, Incorporated	La Verne, CA
II	RDAF	0602204F	12	Information Quality Tools for Persistent Surveillance Data Sets	$2,000.0	Snyder	University of Arkansas Little Rock	Little Rock, AR
II	RDAF	0602204F	12	Net-Centric Sensor Grids	$3,000.0	Hill	Indiana University	Bloomington, IN
II	RDAF	0602601F	13	Radiation Hardened Non-Volatile Memory Technology	$3,000.0	Lamborn	Aeroflex	Colorado Springs, CO
II	RDAF	0603112F	18	Improved Inspection Reliability for Optimized Inspection	$2,000.0	Smith (TX)	Texas Research Institute	Austin, TX

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDAF	0603112F	18	Metals Affordability Initiative	$14,000.0	Cannon	Air Force Research Laboratory	Dayton, OH
II	RDAF	0603112F	18	Metals Affordability Initiative	$14,000.0	DeFazio		Albany, OR
II	RDAF	0603112F	18	Metals Affordability Initiative	$14,000.0	Hayes	Air Force Research Laboratory	Dayton, OH
II	RDAF	0603112F	18	Metals Affordability Initiative	$14,000.0	Kaptur	Air Force Research Laboratory	Dayton, OH
II	RDAF	0603112F	18	Metals Affordability Initiative	$14,000.0	Ryan	Air Force Research Laboratory	Dayton, OH
II	RDAF	0603112F	18	Metals Affordability Initiative	$14,000.0	Turner	Air Force Research Laboratory	Dayton, OH
II	RDAF	0603203F	19	Moving Target Strike	$6,000.0	Miller (FL)	General Atomics/Alpha Data Corporation	Fort Walton Beach, FL
II	RDAF	0603216F	21	Versatile Affordable Advanced Turbine Engines (VAATE) for Supersonic Cruise Missiles	$5,500.0	Bishop (UT)	Air Force Research Lab/Williams International, Inc.	Ogden, UT
II	RDAF	0603270F	23	COTS Analysis Tools for Navigational Warfare	$3,000.0	Sestak	Analytical Graphics, Inc.	Exton, PA
II	RDAF	0603401F	25	Hybrid Sounding Rocket Propulsion	$2,000.0	Hunter	SpaceDev Inc	Poway, CA
II	RDAF	0603401F	25	Small Low Cost Reconnaisance Spacecraft Components	$5,000.0	Bishop (UT)	Utah State University Space Dynamics Laboratory	Logan, UT
II	RDAF	0603401F	25	Technology Testing Platform	$2,000.0	Perlmutter	Design Net Engineering	Lakewood, CO
II	RDAF	0603444F	26	High Accuracy Network Determination System (HANDS)	$8,000.0	Abercrombie	Oceanit	Honolulu, HI
II	RDAF	0603680F	29	Prepreg Thickness Variability Reduction Program	$2,000.0	Hall (TX)	Cytec Engineering	Greenville, TX
II	RDAF	0603851F	46	ICBM Crypto Upgrade (ICU)	$5,000.0	Bishop (UT)	Air Force / Northrup Grumman	Ogden Air Logistics Center, Hill AFB, UT
II	RDAF	0604240F	61	B-2 Moving Target Kill (MTK)/SDB II	$10,300.0	Dicks	Northrop Grumman Corporation	Palmdale, CA
II	RDAF	0604240F	61	B-2 Moving Target Kill (MTK)/SDB II	$10,300.0	McKeon	Northrop Grumman Corporation	Palmdale, CA
II	RDAF	0604421F	66	Space Control Test Capabilities	$10,000.0	Everett	Davidson Technologies	Huntsville, AL
II	RDAF	0604421F	66	Space Control Test Capabilities	$10,000.0	Rogers (AL)	Computer Science Corporation	Redstone Arsenal, AL
II	RDAF	0604706F	75	ACES 5 Ejection Seat	$6,000.0	Lamborn	Air Force Human Systems Group	Brooks Air Force Base, TX
II	RDAF	0604740F	77	Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit (DMIT)	$7,000.0	LoBiondo	Gestalt	Camden, NJ
II	RDAF	0604740F	77	Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit (DMIT)	$7,000.0	Sestak	Accenture National Security Service	King of Prussia, PA
II	RDAF	0604740F	77	Distributed Mission Interoperablility Toolkit (DMIT)	$7,000.0	Andrews	Hanscom AFB	Camden, NJ

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDAF	0604759F	94	Eglin AFB Range Operations Control Center (ROCC) Initiative	$4,200.0	Miller (FL)	Cubic Defense Applications	Arlington, VA
II	RDAF	0604759F	94	FPS-16 Radar Mobilization Upgrade	$6,000.0	Miller (FL)	BAE Systems	Fort Walton Beach, FL
II	RDAF	0604796F	52	Advanced Propulsion Non-Tactical Vehicle (APNTV)	$2,200.0	Saxton	General Motors	Detroit, MI
II	RDAF	0604857F	55	Day/Night ISR Payload for Operationally Responsive Spacecraft	$10,000.0	Murphy (CT)	Goodrich Electro-Optical Systems	Danbury, CT
II	RDAF	0605978F	102	Low Profile Arresting Gear	$1,000.0	Sestak	Engineered Arresting Systems Corporation	Aston, PA
II	RDAF	0708011F	29	Wire Integrity Technology Program	$2,000.0	Marshall	Warner Robins AFB	Warner Robins, GA
II	RDAF	0708011F	218	Adavnced Integrated Structures for Affordable Transport Aircraft	$3,000.0	Sanchez, Loretta	V System Composites	Anaheim, CA
II	RDAF	0708611F	221	Clean Cities National Outreach Program for Advance Power Technology Office (APTO)	$1,900.0	Marshall	Warner Robins AFB	Warner Robins, GA
II	RDAF	0708611F	221	Eielson Air Force Base Alternative Energy Source Program	$4,000.0	Young (AK)	Biomass Energy Systems, Inc.	Princeton, NJ
II	RDAF	0708611F	221	Expeditionary 200 kW+ Alternative Power Generator - Phase 1	$3,000.0	Lamborn	Peterson Air Force Base	Colorado Springs, CO
II	RDDW	0301011G	167	IED Industrial Exploitation (IDEX) Program	$7,000.0	Larsen	Agilent Technologies	Everett, WA
II	RDDW	0301301L	169	Portable Device for Latent Fingerprint Identification	$1,800.0	Smith (WA)	Sagem Morpho	Tacoma, WA
II	RDDW	0304210BB	193	Expeditionary Persistent Power	$3,000.0	Shuster	Mission Critical Solutions, LLC	Alum Bank, PA
II	RDDW	0304210BB	193	Unmanned Aerial Systems Test Facility upgrade	$8,000.0	Cole	Oklahoma State University Multispectral Laboratory	Ponca City, OK
II	RDDW	0601101E	2	Combined Injury Consortium	$5,000.0	Snyder	University of Arkansas School of Medical Sciences	Little Rock, AR
II	RDDW	0601111D8Z	3	Integrated Cryo-cooled High Power Density Systems	$2,000.0	Boyd	Florida State University	Tallahassee, FL
II	RDDW	0602228D8Z	9	John H. Hopps Defense Research Scholars Program	$2,000.0	Marshall	Morehouse College	Atlanta, GA
II	RDDW	0602670D8Z	15	Center for Automated Language and Cultural Analysis for Global Security	$2,000.0	Cummings	University of Maryland College Park	College Park, MD
II	RDDW	0602670D8Z	15	Center for Automated Language and Cultural Analysis for Global Security	$2,000.0	Hoyer	University of Maryland College Park	College Park, MD

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDDW	0602670D8Z	15	Center for Automated Language and Cultural Analysis for Global Security	$2,000.0	Van Hollen	University of Maryland, College Park	College Park, MD
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	27	Advanced Sighting Systems for Machine Guns	$4,000.0	Sanchez, Loretta	SureFire LLC	Fountin Valley, CA
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	27	Affordable Robust Mid-Sized Unmanned Ground Vehicle (ARMS UGV)	$1,500.0	Tsongas	Black-I Robotics, Inc	Tyngsboro, MA
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	27	Airborne Counter-Terrorism/Counter-Narcotics Threat Protection System	$4,000.0	Thompson (CA)	L-3 Sonoma Electro Optics	Santa Rosa, CA
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	27	BOPPER (Bioterrorism Operations Policy and Public Emergency Response)	$4,000.0	Watt	Clean Earth Technologies	Winston-Salem, NC
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	27	EDIT Technology for Counter-Tunnel Operations and Cache Detections	$1,500.0	Udall (NM)	Stolar Research Corporation	Raton, NM
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	27	Full Scale Impact and Blast Loading Laboratory Testing Program	$4,000.0	Davis (CA)	University of California, San Diego	San Diego, CA
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	27	Port and Harbor Security Enhancement Using Autonomous Underwater Vehicle Combined Platforms	$3,700.0	Cummings	Battelle Memorial Institute	Baltimore, MD
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	27	Vehicle Design for Survivability Under Blast Loading	$3,000.0	Conaway	Applied Research Associates	San Antonio, TX
II	RDDW	0603160BR	28	Next Generation Intelligent Portable Radionuclide Detection and Identification Systems	$2,000.0	English	eV Products, a division of II-VI, Incorporated	Saxonburg, PA
II	RDDW	0603648D8Z	35	Distributed Network Switching	$2,900.0	Sanchez, Loretta	Raptor Networks Technology, Inc.	Santa Ana, CA
II	RDDW	0603711D8Z	40	Connectory Expansion for Rapid Identification of Technology Sources for DOD	$1,300 0	Hunter	East County Economic Development Council	El Cajon, CA
II	RDDW	0603712S	41	Emerging/Critical Interconnection Technology E/CIT Program	$2,000.0	Ellsworth	NSWC Crane, IPC, and SAIC	Crane, IN
II	RDDW	0603720S	44	3-D Electronics and Power	$3,000.0	Calvert	Center for Nanoscale Science and Engineering, University of California, Riverside	Riverside, CA
II	RDDW	0603720S	44	End to End Semi Fab Alpha Tool	$5,000.0	Sanchez, Loretta	Digibeam Corporation	Costa Mesa, CA
II	RDDW	0603720S	44	Feature Size Yield Enhancement at DMEA ARMS Foundry	$5,000.0	Matsui	Defense Microelectronics Activity	McClellan, CA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDDW	0603720S	44	Superlattice Nanotechnology	$3,000.0	Hayes	University of North Carolina	Charlotte, NC
II	RDDW	0603757D8Z	118	Indiana Complex Operations Partnership	$2,000.0	Hill	Indiana National Guard	Indianapolis, IN
II	RDDW	0603826D8Z	59	Rapid Economic & Defense Tech Identification	$2,000.0	Rodriguez	Cenovance, LLC	San Antonio, TX
II	RDDW	0603832D8Z	61	Modeling and Simulation Standards Development	$800.0	Forbes	Virginia Modeling, Analysis, and Simulation Center, Old Dominion University	Suffolk, VA
II	RDDW	0603881C	72	Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (David's Sling)	$10,000.0	Akin	LaBarge Corporation (subcontractor to Raytheon)	St. Louis, MO
II	RDDW	0603881C	72	Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (David's Sling)	$10,000.0	Blunt	LaBarge Corporation (subcontractor to Raytheon)	Joplin, MO
II	RDDW	0603881C	72	Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (David's Sling)	$10,000.0	Saxton	Rafael Advanced Defense Systems, Ltd	Bethesda, MD
II	RDDW	0603892C	81	Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense - Signal Processor	$20,000.0	Andrews	Lockheed Martin	Moorestown, NJ
II	RDDW	0603892C	81	Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense - Signal Processor	$20,000.0	Saxton	Lockheed Martin	Moorestown, NJ
II	RDDW	0604016D8Z	94	Managing and Extending DoD Asset Lifecycles (MEDAL)	$4,000 0	Abercrombie	Referntial Systems Incorporated	Honolulu, HI
II	RDDW	0604165D8Z	103	Advanced Hypersonic Weapon Technology Demonstration	$7,000.0	Everett	Westar Aerospace and Defense Group / Army Space and Missile Defense Command	Huntsville, AL
II	RDDW	0604940D8Z	121	Advanced SAM Hardware Simulator Development	$6,000.0	Gingrey	Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, GA
II	RDDW	0604940D8Z	121	Advanced SAM Hardware Simulator Development	$6,000.0	Johnson (GA)	Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, GA
II	RDDW	0604940D8Z	121	Advanced SAM Hardware Simulator Development	$6,000.0	Marshall	Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, GA
II	RDDW	0604940D8Z	121	Gulf Range Mobile Instrumentation Capability (GR-MIC)	$4,000.0	Miller (FL)	Prologic, Inc.	Manassas, VA
II	RDDW	0604940D8Z	121	Joint Gulf Range Complex Upgrade	$8,000.0	Miller (FL)	The Boeing Company	Fort Walton Beach, FL
II	RDDW	0605013BL	109	Health Informatics Initiative	$3,000.0	Castor	USF College of Public Health	Tampa, FL
II	RDDW	0605013BL	109	In Transit Visibility System	$1,000.0	Brady (PA)	ePortation	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDDW	0605799D8Z	142	Defense Command Integration Center	$3,400.0	Boyda	Kansas National Guard	Topeka, KS

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
II	RDDW	0605799D8Z	142	Defense Command Integration Center	$3,400.0	Moore (KS)	Kansas National Guard Bureau, Forbes Field ANG Base	Topeka, KS
II	RDDW	0605804D8Z	145	Renewable Fuel Systems (RFS) for Defense Applications	$4,000.0	Andrews	Stevens Institute of Technology	Hoboken, NJ
II	RDDW	0605804D8Z	145	Renewable Fuel Systems (RFS) for Defense Applications	$4,000.0	Sires	Stevens Institute of Technology	Hoboken, NJ
II	RDDW	1160401BB	23	Advanced Craft Technology Demonstrators to Quantify & Mitigate Operator Injury	$4,850.0	Davis (CA)	M Ship Co.	San Diego, CA
II	RDDW	1160401BB	23	Expendable Airdrop Delivery Systems	$3,500.0	Hayes	Dropmaster, Inc	Fayetteville, NC
II	RDDW	1160401BB	23	Expendable Airdrop Delivery Systems	$3,500.0	McIntyre	CopterBox/DropMaster	Fayetteville, NC
II	RDDW	1160402BB	64	Partnership for Defense Innovation Wi-Fi Laboratory Testing and Assessment Center	$3,000.0	Hayes	Partnership for Defense Innovation	Fayetteville, NC
II	RDDW	1160404BB	232	Covert Communications for SOF Operations	$4,000.0	Gingrey	Scientific Research Corporation	Atlanta, GA
II	RDDW	1160405BB	233	Advanced, Long Endurance Unattended Ground Sensor Technologies	$4,200.0	Pickering	U.S. Special Operations Command	Tampa, FL
III	OMA	ba01-2020a	030	Army Force Generation Synchronization Tool	$2,000.0	Dent	ProModel Corporation	Allentown, PA
III	OMA	ba01-2020a	030	Army Force Generation Synchronization Tool	$2,000.0	Dingell	ProModel Corporation	Ann Arbor, MI
III	OMA	ba01-2020a	050	Cognitive Air Defense Trainer System (CAD-TS)	$1,000.0	Reyes	The Institute for Creative Technologies	Manna del Ray, CA
III	OMA	ba01-2020a	050	M-Gator	$1,000.0	McIntyre	John Deere	Cary, NC
III	OMA	ba01-2020a	080	CASEVAC Medical Equipment Set (MES) Conversion Kits (Ground & Air)	$3,500.0	Bartlett	Skedco	Tualatin, OR
III	OMA	ba01-2020a	090	M24 Sniper Weapons System Upgrade	$5,400.0	Arcuri	U.S. Army Small Arms Division, Combat Developments	Fort Benning, GA
III	OMA	ba02-2020a	200	Army Manufacturing Technical Assistance Production Program (MTAPP)	$2,500.0	Markey	The AbasaGroup	Natick, MA
III	OMA	ba03-2020a	270	Leadership for Leaders	$2,000.0	Boyda	Kansas State University	Manhattan, KS
III	OMA	ba03-2020a	280	Operational/Technical Training Validation Testbed	$4,000.0	Reyes	Digital Fusion Corporation	El Paso, TX
III	OMA	ba03-2020a	280	United States Army Sergeants Major Academy Lecture Center Audio-Visual Equipment replacement	$610.0	Reyes	US Army Sergeants Major Academy	Fort Bliss, TX
III	OMA	ba03-2020a	310	Arabic Strategic Language Program North Georgia College and SU	$350.0	Gingrey	North Georgia College and State University	Dahlonega, GA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
III	OMA	ba03-2020a	310	Arabic Strategic Language Program North Georgia College and SU	$350.0	Marshall	North Georgia College and State University	Dahlonega, GA
III	OMA	ba04-2020a	200	Army Manufacturing Technical Assistance Production Program (MTAPP)	$2,500.0	Miller (MI)	Army MTAPP	Warren, MI
III	OMA	ba04-2020a	370	Condition Based Maintenance Information Management	$5,000.0	Sanchez, Loretta	Integrated Data Corporation	Culver City, CA
III	OMA	ba04-2020a	400	Army Knowledge Online Help Desk	$2,900.0	Bartlett	Enterprise Information Systems	Frederick, MD
III	OMA	ba04-2020a	400	Fort Bliss Data Center COOP	$5,000 0	Reyes	Fort Bliss	Fort Bliss, TX
III	OMN	ba01-1804n	250	Mark 75 Maintenance Facility Support and Upgrade	$3,000.0	Bartlett	OTO Melara North America Inc	Washington, DC
III	OMN	ba01-1804n	250	Mark 75 Maintenance Facility Support and Upgrade	$3,000.0	Brady (PA)	OTO Melara North America Inc	Lester, PA
III	OMN	ba01-1804n	250	Mark 75 Maintenance Facility Support and Upgrade	$3,000.0	Sestak	OTO Melara North America Inc	Washington, DC
III	OMN	ba01-1804n	250	NULKA Support	$2,000.0	Ellsworth	BAE Systems	Crane, IN
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300.0	Bartlett	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300.0	Bishop (NY)	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300.0	Boyda	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300.0	Davis (CA)	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300 0	Hayes	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300 0	Larsen	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300.0	Levin	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300.0	LoBiondo	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300.0	Ortiz	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300.0	Renzi	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300.0	Rothman	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN	ba03-1804n	440	Naval Sea Cadet Corps Operational Funding	$300.0	Sanchez, Loretta	U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMMC	ba01-1106n	010	Clothing and Flame Resistant Organizational Gear (FROG)	$44,900.0	Cummings	160s	Baltimore, MD
III	OMMC	ba01-1106n	010	Clothing and Flame Resistant Organizational Gear (FROG)	$44,900.0	Hayes	Longworth Industries	Candor, NC
III	OMMC	ba01-1106n	010	Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS)	$4,000.0	Hodes	Polartec, LLC	Hudson, NH
III	OMMC	ba01-1106n	010	Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS)	$4,000.0	Rogers (MI)	Peckham Industries	Lansing, MI
III	OMMC	ba01-1106n	010	Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS)	$4,000.0	Shea-Porter	Polartec, LLC	Hudson, NH

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
III	OMMC	ba01-1106n	010	Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS)	$4,000.0	Tsongas	Polartec, Inc.	Lawrence, MA
III	OMMC	ba01-1106n	010	Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS)	$4,000.0	Walberg	Peckham Industries	Lansing, MI
III	OMMC	ba01-1106n	020	Mobile Corrosion Prevention and Abatement Program	$7,600.0	Higgins	Carwell Products, Inc.	Cheektowaga, NY
III	OMMC	ba04-1106n	210	Heroes and Healthy Families	$1,000.0	Sanchez, Loretta	Camp Pendleton	Oceanside,CA
III	OMAF	ba03-3400f	360	Engineering Training and Knowledge Preservation System	$3,000.0	Davis (KY)	Tier 1 Performance Solutions	Covington, KY
III	OMAF	ba04-3400f	560	Wage Modification for Employees in Azores	$240.0	Frank	N/A	Portugal
III	OMAF	ba04-3400f	600	Secure Site at Ely, NV Radar Site	$700.0	McKeon	Edwards AFB	Edwards AFB, CA
III	OMDW	ba04-0100d	260	World War II Museum	$10,000.0	Alexander	National World War II Museum	New Orleans, LA
III	OMDW	ba04-0100d	260	World War II Museum	$10,000.0	Jefferson	National World War II Museum	New Orleans, LA
III	OMDW	ba04-0100d	260	World War II Museum	$10,000.0	Melancon	National World War II Museum	New Orleans, LA
III	OMDW	ba04-2065a	260	Delaware Valley Continuing Education Initiative	$1,000.0	Murphy (PA)	Collegiate Consortium for Workforce and Economic Development	Philadelphia, PA
III	OMDW	undistributed-0100d		Interdisciplinary Critical Language and Area Studies	$3,500.0	Davis (CA)	San Diego State University Research Foundation	San Diego, CA
III	OMAR	ba01-2080a	050	Mobile Corrosion Prevention and Abatement Program	$4,800.0	Higgins	Carwell Products, Inc.	Cheektowaga, NY
III	OMARNG	ba01-2065a	080	Army National Guard Mobile Corrosion Prevention and Abatement Program	$4,800.0	Higgins	Carwell Products, Inc.	Cheektowaga, NY
III	OMANG	ba01-3400f	010	MBU-20A/P Oxygen Masks with Lights	$2,000.0	Dreier	Gentex Corporation	Rancho Cucamonga, CA
III	OMA		020	Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet	$7,175.0	Saxton	Army Corps of Engineers	New Jersey
XIV	DHP			Copper Antimicrobial Research Program	$2,800.0	Arcuri	Telemedicine and Advanced Technology Research Center	Fort Detrick, MD
XIV	DHP			Copper Antimicrobial Research Program	$2,800.0	Costello	Olin Brass	East Alton, IL
XIV	DHP			Copper Antimicrobial Research Program	$2,800.0	Higgins	Luvata Buffalo	Buffalo, NY
XIV	DHP			Copper Antimicrobial Research Program	$2,800.0	Loebsack	Advanced Technology Institute	North Charleston,SC
XIV	DHP			Copper Antimicrobial Research Program	$2,800.0	Murphy (CT)	The Miller Company	Meriden, CT
XIV	DHP			DoD-VA Medical Information Sharing Project	$1,500.0	Smith (WA)	Madigan Army Medical Center	Fort Lewis, WA
XIV	DHP			Madigan Army Medical Center Trauma Assistance Program	$2,000.0	Smith (WA)	Madigan Army Medical Center, Tacoma General Hospital and St. Joseph's Hospital	Fort Lewis and Tacoma, WA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
XIV	DHP			Fort Drum Regional Health Planning Organization	$800.0	McHugh	Fort Drum Regional Health Planning Organization	Watertown, NY
XIV	DHP			PULSE!! Virtual Clinical Learning Lab	$1,000.0	Ortiz	Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi, TX
XIV	DHP			The Nursing Virtual Simulation Laboratory For Emergency Preparedness	$2,500 0	Cummings	Coppin State University	Baltimore, MD
XIV	DHP			Wide Angle Virtual Environment for the Uniformed Services University	$7,000.0	Van Hollen	Uniformed Services University	Bethesda, MD
XIV	OOM			Southwest Border Fence	$5,000.0	Hunter	California National Guard	San Diego, CA
XV	APAF		004	F-22A Raptor	$523,000 0	Allen	Pratt & Whitney	East Hartford, CT
XV	APAF		004	F-22A Raptor	$523,000.0	DeLauro	Pratt & Whitney	East Hartford / Middletown, CT
XV	APAF		004	F-22A Raptor	$523,000.0	Dicks	Lockheed Martin Corporation	Bethesda, MD
XV	APAF		004	F-22A Raptor	$523,000.0	Gingrey	Lockheed Martin Corporation	Marietta, GA
XV	APAF		004	F-22A Raptor	$523,000.0	Granger	Pratt & Whintey	East Hartford, CT
XV	APAF		004	F-22A Raptor	$523,000.0	Marshall	Pratt & Whintey	East Hartford, CT
XV	APAF		005	C-17A Globemaster III	$3,900,000.0	Akin	The Boeing Company	St. Louis, MO
XV	APAF		005	C-17A Globemaster III	$3,900,000.0	Allen	Pratt & Whitney	East Hartford, CT
XV	APAF		005	C-17A Globemaster III	$3,900,000.0	Bishop (UT)	The Boeing Company	Multiple Locations Nationwide
XV	APAF		005	C-17A Globemaster III	$3,900,000.0	Camahan	The Boeing Company	Long Beach, CA
XV	APAF		005	C-17A Globemaster III	$3,900,000.0	DeLauro	Pratt & Whitney	East Hartford / Middletown, CT
XV	APAF		005	C-17A Globemaster III	$3,900,000.0	Granger	The Boeing Company	Long Beach, CA
XV	APAF		005	C-17A Globemaster III	$3,900,000.0	Hulshof	The Boeing Company	St. Louis, MO
XV	APAF		005	C-17A Globemaster III	$3,900,000.0	Rohrabacher	The Boeing Company	Long Beach, CA
XV	APAF		005	C-17A Globemaster III	$3,900,000.0	Smith (WA)	The Boeing Company	Long Beach, CA
XV	JIEDDF			Aerial Reconnaissance Multi-Sensor (ARMS)	$50,000.0	Hunter	Sierra Nevada Corporation	Hagerstown, MD
XXI	MCA	10903		Chapel	$7,106.0	Everett	Fort Rucker	Fort Rucker, AL
XXI	MCA	17322		Fire Station	$3,000.0	Boyda	Fort Riley	Fort Riley, KS
XXI	MCA	25033		Chapel with Religious Education Facility	$18,288.0	Carter	Fort Hood	Fort Hood, TX
XXI	MCA	25033		Chapel with Religious Education Facility	$18,288.0	Edwards	Fort Hood	Fort Hood, TX
XXI	MCA	51898		Vehicle Maintenance Shop	$9,928.0	Skelton	Fort Leonard Wood	Fort Leonard Wood, MO
XXI	MCA	56336		Chapel Complex Increment II	$3,500.0	Skelton	Fort Leonard Wood	Ft. Leonard Wood, MO

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
XXI	MCA	57711		Fire Station Number 2	$7,211.0	McHugh	Fort Drum	Ft. Drum, NY
XXI	MCA	57894		Hatfield Gate Expansion	$300.0	Moran (VA)	Fort Myer	Arlington, VA
XXI	MCA	58346		AP3 Connecting Rail	$6,061.0	Boren	McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	McAlester, OK
XXI	MCA	61035		Chapel	$11,600.0	McIntyre	Fort Bragg	Ft. Bragg, NC
XXI	MCA	61539		Fort Bragg Access Roads, Phase I (Bragg Boulevard/Murchison Road)	$8,600.0	Hayes	Fort Bragg	Ft. Bragg, NC
XXI	MCA	61539		Fort Bragg Access Roads, Phase I (Bragg Boulevard/Murchison Road)	$8,600.0	McIntyre	Fort Bragg	Ft. Bragg, NC
XXI	MCA	63241		Upgrade Munition Igloos, Phase 2	$7,500.0	Shuster	Letterkenny Army Depot	Franklin County, PA
XXI	MCA	63573		Defense Access Road	$10,350.0	Abercrombie	Bradshaw Airfield/Pohakuloa Training Area Base Camp	Honolulu, HI
XXI	MCA	063618		Medical Parking Garage	$12,500.0	Reyes	Fort Bliss	El Paso, TX
XXI	MCA	66725		Ballistic Evaluation Facility (Phase 1)	$10,791.0	Frelinghuysen	Picatinney Arsenal	Picatinny, NJ
XXI	MCA	66907		Lake Yard Interchange	$1,463.0	Rogers (AL)	Anniston Army Depot	Anniston, AL
XXI	MCA	67014		Live Fire Exercise Shoothouse	$4,389.0	Rodriguez	Camp Bullis	San Antonio, TX
XXI	MCA	67471		Air Traffic Control Radar Operations Building Upgrade/Expansion	$2,000.0	Giffords	Fort Huachuca	Sierra Vista, AZ
XXI	MCA	70157		Chapel Complex Construction, 2nd Phase	$4,389.0	Boyda	Fort Leavenworth	Leavenworth, KS
XXI	MCA	71530		Vehicle Paint Facility	$4,076.0	Scott (VA)	Fort Eustis	Newport News, VA
XXI	MCA	71530		Vehicle Paint Facility	$4,076.0	Wittman	Fort Eustis	Newport News, VA
XXI	MCA	08448-9		Womack Army Medical Center MASCAL/DECON Facility	$1,359.0	Etheridge	Fort Bragg	Ft. Bragg, NC
XXII	MCN	082		Unmanned ASW Support Facility	$10,550.0	Kennedy	Naval Station Newport	Newport, RI
XXII	MCN	190		Aircraft Refueling	$3,530.0	Crenshaw	Naval Station Mayport	Jacksonville, FL
XXII	MCN	282		Consolidated Global Sub Component, Phase 1	$10,360.0	Shea-Porter	Portsmouth Naval Shipyard	Portsmouth, ME
XXII	MCN	448		Parking Apron Recapitalization	$3,850.0	Ortiz	Naval Air Station Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi, TX
XXII	MCN	701		Fire and Emergency Services Station	$10,360.0	Drake	Naval Air Station Norfolk	Norfolk, VA
XXII	MCN	P-		Pool Replacement at NAB	$7,130.0	Davis (CA)	Naval Air Station North Island	Coronado, CA
XXII	MCN	P-0926A		Library/Lifelong Learning Center	$10,060.0	Lewis	Marine Corps Base Twentynine Palms	Twentynine Palms, CA
XXII	MCN	P-166		Energetics systems and Technology Laboratory Complex Phase I (P-166)	$12,467.0	Hoyer	Indian Head	Indian Head, MD
XXII	MCN	P-188		RDT&E Support Facility at NSWC Carderock Division, MILCON (P-188)	$7,180.0	Van Hollen	Carderock Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center	Bethesda, MD

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
XXII	MCN	P-197		NPS Graduate School of Business and Public Policy	$10,480 0	Farr	Naval Postgraduate School	Monterey, CA
XXII	MCN	P-206		NAS Whidbey Firefighting Facility	$6,340.0	Larsen	Naval Air Station Whidbey	Oak Harbor, WA
XXII	MCN	P-215		Battalion Maintenance Facility and Equipment Yard	$6,180.0	Taylor	CBC Gulfport	Gulfport, MS
XXII	MCN	P-268		Waterfront Support Facility	$1,450.0	Allen	Portsmouth Naval Shipyard	Kittery, ME
XXII	MCN	P-279		Fitness Center, Naval Air Station Kingsville	$12,020.0	Ortiz	Naval Sir Station Kingsville	Kingsville, TX
XXII	MCN	P-402		Saltwater Cooling And Fire Protection Improvements	$5,493.0	Dicks	Naval Base Kitsap	Bremerton, WA
XXII	MCN	P-570		OCS Headquarters Facility	$6,530.0	Wittman	Marine Corps Base Quantico	Quantico, VA
XXII	MCN	P-581		Industrial Access Improvements, Main Gate 15	$10,590.0	Forbes	Norfolk Naval Shipyard	Portsmouth, VA
XXII	MCN	P-581		Industrial Access Improvements, Main Gate 15	$10,590.0	Scott (VA)	Norfolk Naval Shipyard	Portsmouth, VA
XXII	MCN	P-602		Addition to Limited Area Reaction Force Facility	$6,370.0	Kingston	Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay	Kings Bay, GA
XXIII	MCAF	AJJY059112		ISF/STF Realign Arc Light Boulevard	$5,670.0	Bordallo	Andersen Air Force Base	Yigo, GU
XXIII	MCAF	CZQZ063027		SOF CV-22 Simulator Facility	$9,047.0	Udall (NM)	Cannon Air Force Base	Clovis, NM
XXIII	MCAF	FMKM059001		Replacement Fuel Cell Hangar Minnesota	$4,800.0	Oberstar	148th Air Wing	Duluth, MN
XXIII	MCAF	FSPM063509D		Edwards AFB Main Base Runway replacement	$6,000.0	McCarthy (CA)	Edwards Air Force Base	Edwards, CA
XXIII	MCAF	FSPM063509D		Edwards AFB Main Base Runway replacement	$6,000.0	McKeon	Edwards Air Force Base	Edwards, CA
XXIII	MCAF	KRSM093002		Three-Bay Fire Station	$5,670.0	Bishop (UT)	Hill Air Force Base	UT
XXIII	MCAF	MPLS993284A		Consolidated Security Forces Operations Center Phase 1	$900.0	Gonzalez	Lackland Air Force Base 37 TRW	San Antonio, TX
XXIII	MCAF	MXDP993002P2		Student Officer Quarters PH-2	$1,440.0	Rodriguez	Laughlin Air Force Base	Del Rio, TX
XXIII	MCAF	NUEX013014		Luke AFB Runway Rehabilitation Construction	$1,755.0	Pastor	Luke Air Force Base	Phoenix
XXIII	MCAF	NVZR063714		MacDill AFB Combat Training Facility	$5,450.0	Castor	MacDill Air Force Base	Tampa, FL
XXIII	MCAF	PRQE 07-5110P2		MXG Consolidation and Forward Logistic Center, Phase 2	$7,412.0	Tiahrt	McConnell Air Force Base	Wichita, KS
XXIII	MCAF	QJVF012002		Air Traffic Control Complex	$1,704.0	Pomeroy	Minot Air Force Base	Minot, ND
XXIII	MCAF	SPBN079049		TFI- Digital Ground Station FOC Beddown	$1,700.0	Delahunt	Otis Air National Guard Base	Bourne, MA
XXIII	MCAF	TYMX053001		Fire and Rescue Station	$972.0	Cuellar	Randolph AFB	San Antonio, TX
XXIII	MCAF	UHHZ033013		116th ACW Avionics Facility	$5,723.0	Marshall	Warner Robins AFB	Warner Robins, GA
XXIII	MCAF	VLSB043001R3		Shaw AFB Physical Fitness Center	$10,791.0	Spratt	Shaw Air Force Base	Sumter, SC
XXIII	MCAF	WWYK033005		Realign Air Depot Street at Tinker Gate	$5,670.0	Cole	Tinker Air Force Base	OK

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
XXIII	MCAF	XLWU063004		Air Command and Operations Classroom Facility	$12,644.0	Boyd	Tyndall Air Force Base	Panama City, FL
XXIII	MCAF	YWHG041005		Security Forces Animal Clinic/Kennel	$4,578.0	Skelton	Whiteman Air Force Base	MO
XXIII	MCAF	ZHTV063202		Security Forces Operations Facility	$14,700.0	Turner	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	Dayton, OH
XXIV	MCDW	270259		Arden Hills Army Training Site (AHATS) Infrastructure Development Plan	$1,005.0	McCollum	Minnesota National Guard	St. Paul, MN
XXIV	MCDW	PTFL073003P1		Unified Security Forces Operations Facility Phase 1	$7,848.0	Saxton	McGuire Air Force Base	NJ
XXVI	MCAR	69675		Army Reserve Center	$920.0	Edwards	Army Reserve	Bryan, TX
XXVI	MCAR	180137		Muscatatuck Urban Training Center Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	$6,000.0	Visclosky	Indiana National Guard	Indianapolis, IN
XXVI	MCARNG	10263		Readiness Center Phase II	$200.0	Rogers (AL)	Fort McClellan Training Center	Anniston, AL
XXVI	MCARNG	26010		Live Fire Shoot House and Urban Assault Course	$4,360.0	Knollenberg	Camp Grayling	Lansing, MI
XXVI	MCARNG	050167		Cabot Readiness Center	$11,846.0	Berry	Arkansas National Guard Cabot Readiness Center	North Little Rock, AR
XXVI	MCARNG	66839		Readiness Center Addition	$1,085.0	Moran (VA)	Fort Belvoir	Arlington, VA
XXVI	MCARNG	120191		Florida Regional Training Institute (RTI) Phase IV	$20,907.0	Young (FL)	Camp Blanding Joint Training Center	Starke, FL
XXVI	MCARNG	190134		Military Operations In Urbanized Terrain (MOUT) training site	$1,635.0	Boswell	Camp Dodge	Johnston, IA
XXVI	MCARNG	190136		Davenport Aviation Readiness Center	$1,685.0	Braley	Camp Dodge	Davenport, IA
XXVI	MCARNG	190146		Mount Pleasant Readiness Center	$1,635.0	Loebsack	Mount Pleasant Readiness Center	Johnston, IA
XXVI	MCARNG	240017		Dundalk Readiness Center	$579.0	Ruppersberger	Maryland National Guard	Dundalk, MD
XXVI	MCARNG	370084		Training Complex	$1,376.0	Miller (NC)	North Carolina National Guard	Camp Butner, NC
XXVI	MCARNG	420103		Combined Support Maintenance Shop, Coraopolis, PA	$3,250.0	Murtha	Pennsylvania National Guard	Ft. Indiantown Gap, PA
XXVI	MCARNG	450185		Hemingway Field Maintenance Shop Phase I	$7,500.0	Clyburn	Army National Guard	Columbia, SC
XXVI	MCARNG	450368		Sumter Readiness Center	$382.0	Clyburn	Army National Guard	Columbia, SC
XXVI	MCARNG	500052		Readiness Center	$323.0	Welch	Ethan Allen Firing Range	Jericho, VT
XXVI	MCARNG	390257A		Barracks Housing	$2,000.0	Kaptur	Camp Perry	Port Clinton, OH
XXVI	MCARNG	390257A		Barracks Housing	$2,000.0	Latta	Camp Perry	Port Clinton, OH
XXVI	MCARNG	420511A		Honesdale Readiness Center, Addition/Alteration	$6,621.0	Carney	Honesdale Readiness Center	Honesdale, PA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
XXVI	MCARNG	470043A		Tullahoma Readiness Center	$10,372.0	Davis, Lincoln	Tullahoma Readiness Center	Tullahoma, TN
XXVI	MCARNG	470043A		Tullahoma Readiness Center	$10,372.0	Wamp	Tullahoma Readiness Center	Tullahoma, TN
XXVI	MCARNG	54006A		Shoot House	$2,175.0	Mollohan	Camp Dawson	Charleston, WV
XXVI	MCARNG	540111A		Multi-Purpose Building Phase II	$5,000.0	Mollohan	Camp Dawson	Charleston, WV
XXVI	MCARNG	540205A		Access Control Point	$2,175.0	Mollohan	Camp Dawson	Charleston, WV
XXVI	MCARNG	INSNO 39430		Barracks, INSNO 39430	$2,125.0	Ryan	Ravenna Training and Logistics Site	Columbus, OH
XXVI	MCARNG	N/A		Readiness Center Phase 3-London Joint Support Operations Center	$7,836.0	Rogers (KY)	Kentucky National Guard	London, KY
XXVI	MCARNG	WKVB079038		Replace pararescue operations facility	$7,500.0	Israel	Francis S. Gabreski Airport	Westhampton, NY
XXVI	MCAFR	RVKQ 08-9092		Dining Facility/Community Center	$9,810.0	Slaughter	Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station	Lockport, NY
XXVI	MCAFR	YTPM029002P1		Joint Service Lodging Facility	$943.0	Olver	Westover Air Reserve Base	Chicopee, MA
XXVI	MCANG	959554		Replace Fire Station	$7,900.0	Bartlett	Martin State Airport	Baltimore, MD
XXVI	MCANG	AQRC039059		Training and Operations Facility	$8,500.0	LoBiondo	177th Fighter Wing	Egg Harbor Township, NJ
XXVI	MCANG	ATQZ049049		Fort Wayne Aircraft Shelter/ Fuel Fill Project	$5,600.0	Souder	Fort Wayne International Airport	Fort Wayne, IN
XXVI	MCANG	CEKT069119		TFI - Upgrade Engine Shop	$7,200.0	Courtney	Bradley Air National Guard Base	Windsor Locks, CT
XXVI	MCANG	CEKT069119		TFI - Upgrade Engine Shop	$7,200.0	Larson	Bradley Air National Guard Base	Windsor Locks, CT
XXVI	MCANG	DDPM009116		Security Forces Building, 136th Airlift Wing, Fort Worth	$5,100.0	Granger	Texas Air National Guard	Fort Worth, TX
XXVI	MCANG	FWJH069154		Air Support Operations Squadron	$7,600.0	Lampson	Ellington Field	Houston, TX
XXVI	MCANG	HAAW039012		TFI- Upgrade ASOS Facilities	$5,600.0	Walsh	Hancock Field	Syracuse, NY
XXVI	MCANG	HEMT039066		Vehicle Maintenance/Communications Training Center	$5,600.0	Latham	Camp Dodge	Fort Dodge, IA
XXVI	MCANG	JLQN069160		C-130 Squadron Operations Facility	$400.0	LaHood	Greater Peoria Regional Airport	Peoria, IL
XXVI	MCANG	LUXC 07089		Relocate Aircraft Ready Shelters and AMU Upgrade	$4,700.0	Herseth Sandlin	Joe Foss Field	Sioux Falls, SD
XXVI	MCANG	NKAK049051		Replace Engine Shop	$4,000.0	Snyder	Little Rock Air Force Base	Little Rock, AR
XXVI	MCANG	PQWY059045		262 Information Warfare Aggressor Squadron (IWAS) Facility	$8,600.0	Smith (WA)	Washington Air National Guard	McChord AFB,WA
XXVI	MCANG	QJKL079050		Construct Aircraft Deicing Pad and Install Underground Storage Tank	$1,635 0	Ellison	Minneapolis St. Paul International Airport	Minneapolis, MN
XXVI	MCANG	TWLR039186		Replace Control Tower	$600.0	Langevin	Quonset State Airport	North Kingstown, RI
XXVI	MCANG	WAAR009098		Combat Communications Training Complex	$13,900.0	Hobson	Springfield Air National Guard Base	Springfield, OH

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI
(Dollars in Thousands)

TITLE	ACCT	PE OR PROJECT	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER	INTENDED RECIPIENT	INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE
XXVI	MCANG	XDQU069146		Troop Training Quarters	$7,500.0	Barrow	Georgia Air National Guard	Savannah, GA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	Baird	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	Blumenauer	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	DeFazio	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	Dicks	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	Hastings (WA)	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	Hooley	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	Inslee	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	Larsen	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	McDermott	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	Smith (WA)	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	Walden	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Environmental Management at the Hanford Site	$10,000.0	Wu	U.S. Department of Energy	Hanford Site, WA
XXXI	DOE-EM			Operable Unit-1 (OU-1) Cleanup at the Miamisburg Mound	$10,000.0	Turner	Miamisburg Mound	Miamisburg OH
XXXI	DOE-NA			De-Inventory of Special Nuclear Material from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	$10,000.0	Tauscher	Livermore National Laboratory	Livermore, CA
XXXI	DOE-NA			Facility-Free Hydrotest Capability. Portable X-ray Radiography for the Stockpile	$5,000.0	Tauscher	Livermore National Laboratory	Livermore, CA
XXXI	DOE-NA			National Ignition Campaign (NIC) – Facility Operations and Target Production	$10,000.0	Tauscher	Livermore National Laboratory	Livermore, CA
XXXI	DOE-NA			RTBF - Operations of Facilities Funding	$5,000.0	Wamp	Y-12 National Security Complex	Oak Ridge, CA
XXXI	DOE-NA			RTBF – Storage Funding	$2,000.0	Wamp	Y-12 National Security Complex	Oak Ridge, CA
XXXI	DOE-NA			S&S Physical Security Funding Request	$3,000.0	Wamp	Y-12 National Security Complex	Oak Ridge, CA

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) 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 provide the necessary resources and authorities to restore military readiness, take care of service members and their families, increase focus on the war in Afghanistan, and improve interagency cooperation, all of which further the national security interests of the United States.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of restoring military readiness and reducing strategic risk, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Address manpower needs with an increase of 7,000 personnel in the Army, 5,000 in the Marine Corps, 1,023 in the Navy, and 450 in the Air Force in 2009. This would bring end strength levels to 532,400 for the Army, 194,000 for the Marine Corps, 326,323 for the Navy, and 317,050 for the Air Force.

(2) Direct approximately $2 billion toward unfunded readiness initiatives requested by the services;

(3) Authorize $8.6 billion for the Army and $1.8 billion for the Marine Corps to fully fund equipment reset requirements;

(4) Authorize $932.2 million for equipment shortfalls and equipment maintenance and authorize $800 million for the National Guard and Reserve to purchase equipment on its unfunded requirements list;

(5) Provide $650 million in addition to the President's request for Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization accounts to keep defense facilities in good working order and to address urgent issues such as dilapidated military barracks.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of taking care of service members and their families, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide a 3.9 percent across the board pay raise for our men and women in uniform. The raise would reduce the pay gap between the military and private sector pay to 2.9 percent;

(2) Prohibit increases in both TRICARE and pharmacy user fees, which would prevent over $1.2 billion in healthcare costs from being passed on to service members; and

(3) Meet the needs of today's service members and their families by increasing funding for family support programs by $15

million, establishing a tuition assistance program for eligible military spouses, authorizing a career intermission pilot program, and creating new preventive health care initiatives.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of increasing focus on the war in Afghanistan, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Address the need to improve the command and control structure for military forces operating in Afghanistan to better coordinate military operations and achieve a unity of command;

(2) Require more robust congressional reporting on the Afghan National Security Forces; and

(3) Require the administration to submit separate budget requests for operations in Afghanistan and Iraq.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of increasing interagency cooperation, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Require the President to develop and implement a system to measure the performance of U.S.-led Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Iraq and Afghanistan; and

(2) Require reports on PRT personnel recruitment and training, planning for future requirements, security for PRTs, and planning for future stability operations.

(3) Establish a Strategic Communication Management Board including interagency participation to provide strategic direction to the Department of Defense's efforts this area.

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 votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 5658. The record of these votes is contained in the following pages.

The committee ordered H.R. 5658 reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 61–0, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
110TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 44 revised **Date: May 14, 2008**

Description: Increase funding to Future Combat System beyond President's proposed level **Offered by: Mr. Saxton**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton		x		Mr. Hunter	x		
Mr. Spratt		x		Mr. Saxton	x		
Mr. Ortiz		x		Mr. McHugh	x		
Mr. Taylor		x		Mr. Everett	x		
Mr. Abercrombie		x		Mr. Bartlett	x		
Mr. Reyes		x		Mr. McKeon			
Dr. Snyder		x		Mr. Thornberry	x		
Mr. Smith		x		Mr. Jones	x		
Ms. Sanchez		x		Mr. Hayes	x		
Mr. McIntyre		x		Mr. Akin	x		
Ms. Tauscher		x		Mr. Forbes	x		
Mr. Brady		x		Mr. Miller (FL)	x		
Mr. Andrews		x		Mr. Wilson	x		
Mrs. Davis (CA)		x		Mr. LoBiondo	x		
Mr. Larsen		x		Mr. Cole			
Mr. Cooper		x		Mr. Bishop			
Mr. Marshall		x		Mr. Turner	x		
Ms. Bordallo		x		Mr. Kline	x		
Mr. Udall		x		Dr. Gingrey	x		
Mr. Boren		x		Mr. Rogers	x		
Mr. Ellsworth		x		Mr. Franks	x		
Mrs. Boyda		x		Mr. Shuster			
Mr. Murphy		x		Mrs. Drake	x		
Mr. Johnson		x		Mrs. McMorris Rodgers			
Ms. Shea-Porter		x		Mr. Conaway	x		
Mr. Courtney		x		Mr. Davis (KY)	x		
Mr. Loebsack		x		Mr. Lamborn	x		
Ms. Gillibrand		x		Mr. Wittman	x		
Mr. Sestak		x					
Ms. Giffords		x					
Ms. Tsongas		x					
Mr. Cummings							
Mr. Meek		x					
Ms. Castor		x					

Roll Call Vote Total: **23 Ayes 33 Noes Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
110TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 150 revised **Date: May 14, 2008**

Description: **Restore European missile defense to President's proposed level** **Offered by: Mr. Everett**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton		x		Mr. Hunter	x		
Mr. Spratt		x		Mr. Saxton	x		
Mr. Ortiz		x		Mr. McHugh	x		
Mr. Taylor		x		Mr. Everett	x		
Mr. Abercrombie		x		Mr. Bartlett	x		
Mr. Reyes		x		Mr. McKeon	x		
Dr. Snyder		x		Mr. Thornberry	x		
Mr. Smith		x		Mr. Jones		x	
Ms. Sanchez		x		Mr. Hayes	x		
Mr. McIntyre		x		Mr. Akin	x		
Ms. Tauscher		x		Mr. Forbes	x		
Mr. Brady		x		Mr. Miller (FL)	x		
Mr. Andrews		x		Mr. Wilson	x		
Mrs. Davis (CA)		x		Mr. LoBiondo	x		
Mr. Larsen		x		Mr. Cole			
Mr. Cooper		x		Mr. Bishop	x		
Mr. Marshall	x			Mr. Turner	x		
Ms. Bordallo		x		Mr. Kline	x		
Mr. Udall		x		Dr. Gingrey	x		
Mr. Boren		x		Mr. Rogers			
Mr. Ellsworth		x		Mr. Franks	x		
Mrs. Boyda		x		Mr. Shuster			
Mr. Murphy		x		Mrs. Drake	x		
Mr. Johnson		x		Mrs. McMorris Rodgers			
Ms. Shea-Porter		x		Mr. Conaway	x		
Mr. Courtney		x		Mr. Davis (KY)	x		
Mr. Loebsack		x		Mr. Lamborn	x		
Ms. Gillibrand		x		Mr. Wittman	x		
Mr. Sestak		x					
Ms. Giffords		x					
Ms. Tsongas		x					
Mr. Cummings		x					
Mr. Meek		x					
Ms. Castor		x					

Roll Call Vote Total: **24 Ayes 34 Noes Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
110TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 91 **Date: May 14, 2008**

Description: Restore $100 million to Missile Defense Agency for Multiple Kill Vehicle **Offered by: Mr. Franks**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton		x		Mr. Hunter	x		
Mr. Spratt		x		Mr. Saxton	x		
Mr. Ortiz		x		Mr. McHugh	x		
Mr. Taylor		x		Mr. Everett	x		
Mr. Abercrombie		x		Mr. Bartlett	x		
Mr. Reyes		x		Mr. McKeon	x		
Dr. Snyder		x		Mr. Thornberry	x		
Mr. Smith		x		Mr. Jones		x	
Ms. Sanchez		x		Mr. Hayes	x		
Mr. McIntyre		x		Mr. Akin	x		
Ms. Tauscher		x		Mr. Forbes	x		
Mr. Brady		x		Mr. Miller (FL)	x		
Mr. Andrews		x		Mr. Wilson	x		
Mrs. Davis (CA)		x		Mr. LoBiondo	x		
Mr. Larsen		x		Mr. Cole			
Mr. Cooper		x		Mr. Bishop	x		
Mr. Marshall	x			Mr. Turner	x		
Ms. Bordallo		x		Mr. Kline	x		
Mr. Udall		x		Dr. Gingrey	x		
Mr. Boren		x		Mr. Rogers	x		
Mr. Ellsworth		x		Mr. Franks	x		
Mrs. Boyda		x		Mr. Shuster			
Mr. Murphy		x		Mrs. Drake	x		
Mr. Johnson		x		Mrs. McMorris Rodgers			
Ms. Shea-Porter		x		Mr. Conaway	x		
Mr. Courtney		x		Mr. Davis (KY)	x		
Mr. Loebsack		x		Mr. Lamborn	x		
Ms. Gillibrand		x		Mr. Wittman	x		
Mr. Sestak		x					
Ms. Giffords		x					
Ms. Tsongas		x					
Mr. Cummings		x					
Mr. Meek		x					
Ms. Castor		x					

Roll Call Vote Total: **25 Ayes 34 Noes** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
110TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 73 **Date: May 14, 2008**

Description: Direct FFRDC to conduct study on developing space-based defense system **Offered by: Mr. Everett**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton		x		Mr. Hunter	x		
Mr. Spratt		x		Mr. Saxton	x		
Mr. Ortiz		x		Mr. McHugh	x		
Mr. Taylor		x		Mr. Everett	x		
Mr. Abercrombie		x		Mr. Bartlett	x		
Mr. Reyes		x		Mr. McKeon	x		
Dr. Snyder		x		Mr. Thornberry	x		
Mr. Smith		x		Mr. Jones	x		
Ms. Sanchez		x		Mr. Hayes	x		
Mr. McIntyre		x		Mr. Akin	x		
Ms. Tauscher		x		Mr. Forbes	x		
Mr. Brady		x		Mr. Miller (FL)	x		
Mr. Andrews		x		Mr. Wilson	x		
Mrs. Davis (CA)		x		Mr. LoBiondo	x		
Mr. Larsen		x		Mr. Cole			
Mr. Cooper		x		Mr. Bishop	x		
Mr. Marshall	x			Mr. Turner	x		
Ms. Bordallo		x		Mr. Kline	x		
Mr. Udall		x		Dr. Gingrey	x		
Mr. Boren		x		Mr. Rogers	x		
Mr. Ellsworth		x		Mr. Franks	x		
Mrs. Boyda		x		Mr. Shuster			
Mr. Murphy		x		Mrs. Drake	x		
Mr. Johnson		x		Mrs. McMorris Rodgers			
Ms. Shea-Porter		x		Mr. Conaway	x		
Mr. Courtney		x		Mr. Davis (KY)	x		
Mr. Loebsack		x		Mr. Lamborn	x		
Ms. Gillibrand		x		Mr. Wittman	x		
Mr. Sestak		x					
Ms. Giffords		x					
Ms. Tsongas		x					
Mr. Cummings		x					
Mr. Meek		x					
Ms. Castor		x					

Roll Call Vote Total: **26 Ayes 33 Noes** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
110TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # **Date: May 14, 2008**

Description: Motion to table motion to appeal Chair's ruling **Offered by: Mr. Ortiz**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton	x			Mr. Hunter		x	
Mr. Spratt				Mr. Saxton		x	
Mr. Ortiz	x			Mr. McHugh		x	
Mr. Taylor	x			Mr. Everett		x	
Mr. Abercrombie	x			Mr. Bartlett		x	
Mr. Reyes	x			Mr. McKeon		x	
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Thornberry		x	
Mr. Smith	x			Mr. Jones		x	
Ms. Sanchez	x			Mr. Hayes		x	
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. Akin		x	
Ms. Tauscher	x			Mr. Forbes		x	
Mr. Brady	x			Mr. Miller (FL)		x	
Mr. Andrews				Mr. Wilson		x	
Mrs. Davis (CA)	x			Mr. LoBiondo		x	
Mr. Larsen	x			Mr. Cole		x	
Mr. Cooper	x			Mr. Bishop		x	
Mr. Marshall	x			Mr. Turner			
Ms. Bordallo	x			Mr. Kline		x	
Mr. Udall	x			Dr. Gingrey		x	
Mr. Boren	x			Mr. Rogers		x	
Mr. Ellsworth	x			Mr. Franks		x	
Mrs. Boyda	x			Mr. Shuster		x	
Mr. Murphy	x			Mrs. Drake		x	
Mr. Johnson	x			Mrs. McMorris Rodgers		x	
Ms. Shea-Porter	x			Mr. Conaway		x	
Mr. Courtney	x			Mr. Davis (KY)		x	
Mr. Loebsack	x			Mr. Lamborn			
Ms. Gillibrand	x			Mr. Wittman		x	
Mr. Sestak	x						
Ms. Giffords	x						
Ms. Tsongas	x						
Mr. Cummings	x						
Mr. Meek	x						
Ms. Castor	x						

Roll Call Vote Total: **32 Ayes 26 Noes** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
110TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 180 **Date: May 14, 2008**

Description: Substitute to Boyda #40 temporary suspension of public-private competitions **Offered by: Mr. Forbes**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton		x		Mr. Hunter	x		
Mr. Spratt		x		Mr. Saxton	x		
Mr. Ortiz		x		Mr. McHugh		x	
Mr. Taylor		x		Mr. Everett	x		
Mr. Abercrombie		x		Mr. Bartlett	x		
Mr. Reyes		x		Mr. McKeon	x		
Dr. Snyder		x		Mr. Thornberry	x		
Mr. Smith		x		Mr. Jones		x	
Ms. Sanchez		x		Mr. Hayes	x		
Mr. McIntyre		x		Mr. Akin	x		
Ms. Tauscher		x		Mr. Forbes	x		
Mr. Brady		x		Mr. Miller (FL)	x		
Mr. Andrews				Mr. Wilson	x		
Mrs. Davis (CA)		x		Mr. LoBiondo		x	
Mr. Larsen		x		Mr. Cole		x	
Mr. Cooper		x		Mr. Bishop			x
Mr. Marshall		x		Mr. Turner	x		
Ms. Bordallo		x		Mr. Kline	x		
Mr. Udall				Dr. Gingrey	x		
Mr. Boren		x		Mr. Rogers		x	
Mr. Ellsworth		x		Mr. Franks	x		
Mrs. Boyda		x		Mr. Shuster	x		
Mr. Murphy		x		Mrs. Drake	x		
Mr. Johnson		x		Mrs. McMorris Rodgers	x		
Ms. Shea-Porter		x		Mr. Conaway	x		
Mr. Courtney		x		Mr. Davis (KY)			
Mr. Loebsack		x		Mr. Lamborn	x		
Ms. Gillibrand		x		Mr. Wittman	x		
Mr. Sestak		x					
Ms. Giffords		x					
Ms. Tsongas		x					
Mr. Cummings		x					
Mr. Meek		x					
Ms. Castor		x					

Roll Call Vote Total: **21 Ayes 37 Noes 1 Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
110TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 168 **Date: May 14, 2008**

Description: 2nd degree to Forbes #87 **Offered by: Mr. Skelton**
SOC to pass FY 2007
GWOT supplemental
immediately

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton	x			Mr. Hunter		x	
Mr. Spratt	x			Mr. Saxton		x	
Mr. Ortiz	x			Mr. McHugh		x	
Mr. Taylor	x			Mr. Everett		x	
Mr. Abercrombie	x			Mr. Bartlett		x	
Mr. Reyes	x			Mr. McKeon		x	
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Thornberry		x	
Mr. Smith	x			Mr. Jones		x	
Ms. Sanchez	x			Mr. Hayes		x	
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. Akin		x	
Ms. Tauscher	x			Mr. Forbes		x	
Mr. Brady	x			Mr. Miller (FL)		x	
Mr. Andrews	x			Mr. Wilson		x	
Mrs. Davis (CA)	x			Mr. LoBiondo		x	
Mr. Larsen	x			Mr. Cole		x	
Mr. Cooper	x			Mr. Bishop		x	
Mr. Marshall	x			Mr. Turner		x	
Ms. Bordallo	x			Mr. Kline		x	
Mr. Udall	x			Dr. Gingrey		x	
Mr. Boren	x			Mr. Rogers		x	
Mr. Ellsworth	x			Mr. Franks		x	
Mrs. Boyda	x			Mr. Shuster		x	
Mr. Murphy	x			Mrs. Drake		x	
Mr. Johnson	x			Mrs. McMorris Rodgers		x	
Ms. Shea-Porter	x			Mr. Conaway		x	
Mr. Courtney	x			Mr. Davis (KY)		x	
Mr. Loebsack	x			Mr. Lamborn		x	
Ms. Gillibrand				Mr. Wittman		x	
Mr. Sestak	x						
Ms. Giffords	x						
Ms. Tsongas	x						
Mr. Cummings	x						
Mr. Meek	x						
Ms. Castor	x						

Roll Call Vote Total: **33 Ayes 28 Noes** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
110TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment #160 **Date: May 14, 2008**

Description: Substitute to Saxton #45 **Offered by: Mr. Spratt**
Four percent of GDP
for DOD budget

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton	x			Mr. Hunter		x	
Mr. Spratt	x			Mr. Saxton		x	
Mr. Ortiz	x			Mr. McHugh		x	
Mr. Taylor	x			Mr. Everett		x	
Mr. Abercrombie	x			Mr. Bartlett		x	
Mr. Reyes	x			Mr. McKeon		x	
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Thornberry		x	
Mr. Smith	x			Mr. Jones	x		
Ms. Sanchez	x			Mr. Hayes		x	
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. Akin		x	
Ms. Tauscher	x			Mr. Forbes		x	
Mr. Brady	x			Mr. Miller (FL)		x	
Mr. Andrews	x			Mr. Wilson		x	
Mrs. Davis (CA)	x			Mr. LoBiondo		x	
Mr. Larsen	x			Mr. Cole		x	
Mr. Cooper	x			Mr. Bishop		x	
Mr. Marshall		x		Mr. Turner		x	
Ms. Bordallo	x			Mr. Kline		x	
Mr. Udall	x			Dr. Gingrey		x	
Mr. Boren	x			Mr. Rogers		x	
Mr. Ellsworth	x			Mr. Franks		x	
Mrs. Boyda	x			Mr. Shuster		x	
Mr. Murphy	x			Mrs. Drake		x	
Mr. Johnson	x			Mrs. McMorris Rodgers		x	
Ms. Shea-Porter	x			Mr. Conaway		x	
Mr. Courtney	x			Mr. Davis (KY)	x		
Mr. Loebsack	x			Mr. Lamborn		x	
Ms. Gillibrand				Mr. Wittman		x	
Mr. Sestak	x						
Ms. Giffords	x						
Ms. Tsongas	x						
Mr. Cummings	x						
Mr. Meek	x						
Ms. Castor	x						

Roll Call Vote Total: **34 Ayes 27 Noes** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
110TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 107 **Date: May 14, 2008**

Description: Amend section 831 of Title 8 of the Chairman's Mark re: entities holding facility clearances **Offered by: Mr. Hunter**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton		x		Mr. Hunter	x		
Mr. Spratt		x		Mr. Saxton	x		
Mr. Ortiz		x		Mr. McHugh	x		
Mr. Taylor	x			Mr. Everett	x		
Mr. Abercrombie		x		Mr. Bartlett	x		
Mr. Reyes		x		Mr. McKeon	x		
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Thornberry	x		
Mr. Smith		x		Mr. Jones	x		
Ms. Sanchez		x		Mr. Hayes	x		
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. Akin	x		
Ms. Tauscher		x		Mr. Forbes	x		
Mr. Brady		x		Mr. Miller (FL)	x		
Mr. Andrews		x		Mr. Wilson	x		
Mrs. Davis (CA)		x		Mr. LoBiondo	x		
Mr. Larsen		x		Mr. Cole	x		
Mr. Cooper		x		Mr. Bishop	x		
Mr. Marshall	x			Mr. Turner	x		
Ms. Bordallo		x		Mr. Kline	x		
Mr. Udall		x		Dr. Gingrey	x		
Mr. Boren		x		Mr. Rogers	x		
Mr. Ellsworth		x		Mr. Franks	x		
Mrs. Boyda	x			Mr. Shuster	x		
Mr. Murphy		x		Mrs. Drake	x		
Mr. Johnson		x		Mrs. McMorris Rodgers	x		
Ms. Shea-Porter		x		Mr. Conaway	x		
Mr. Courtney		x		Mr. Davis (KY)	x		
Mr. Loebsack		x		Mr. Lamborn	x		
Ms. Gillibrand				Mr. Wittman	x		
Mr. Sestak		x					
Ms. Giffords		x					
Ms. Tsongas		x					
Mr. Cummings		x					
Mr. Meek		x					
Ms. Castor		x					

Roll Call Vote Total: **33 Ayes 28 Noes** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
110TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 188 revised **Date: May 14, 2008**
Description: Substitute to Hunter #100 $5 million for southwest border fence **Offered by: Mr. Ortiz**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton	x			Mr. Hunter		x	
Mr. Spratt	x			Mr. Saxton		x	
Mr. Ortiz	x			Mr. McHugh		x	
Mr. Taylor		x		Mr. Everett		x	
Mr. Abercrombie	x			Mr. Bartlett		x	
Mr. Reyes	x			Mr. McKeon		x	
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Thornberry		x	
Mr. Smith	x			Mr. Jones		x	
Ms. Sanchez	x			Mr. Hayes		x	
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. Akin		x	
Ms. Tauscher	x			Mr. Forbes		x	
Mr. Brady	x			Mr. Miller (FL)		x	
Mr. Andrews	x			Mr. Wilson		x	
Mrs. Davis (CA)	x			Mr. LoBiondo		x	
Mr. Larsen	x			Mr. Cole		x	
Mr. Cooper	x			Mr. Bishop		x	
Mr. Marshall		x		Mr. Turner		x	
Ms. Bordallo	x			Mr. Kline		x	
Mr. Udall	x			Dr. Gingrey		x	
Mr. Boren		x		Mr. Rogers		x	
Mr. Ellsworth		x		Mr. Franks		x	
Mrs. Boyda		x		Mr. Shuster		x	
Mr. Murphy		x		Mrs. Drake		x	
Mr. Johnson	x			Mrs. McMorris Rodgers		x	
Ms. Shea-Porter	x			Mr. Conaway		x	
Mr. Courtney	x			Mr. Davis (KY)		x	
Mr. Loebsack	x			Mr. Lamborn		x	
Ms. Gillibrand				Mr. Wittman		x	
Mr. Sestak		x					
Ms. Giffords	x						
Ms. Tsongas	x						
Mr. Cummings	x						
Mr. Meek	x						
Ms. Castor	x						

Roll Call Vote Total: **26 Ayes 35 Noes Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
110TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # **Date: May 14, 2008**

Description: Final Passage of H.R. 5658, as amended

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton	x			Mr. Hunter	x		
Mr. Spratt	x			Mr. Saxton	x		
Mr. Ortiz	x			Mr. McHugh	x		
Mr. Taylor	x			Mr. Everett	x		
Mr. Abercrombie	x			Mr. Bartlett	x		
Mr. Reyes	x			Mr. McKeon	x		
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Thornberry	x		
Mr. Smith	x			Mr. Jones	x		
Ms. Sanchez	x			Mr. Hayes	x		
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. Akin	x		
Ms. Tauscher	x			Mr. Forbes	x		
Mr. Brady	x			Mr. Miller (FL)	x		
Mr. Andrews	x			Mr. Wilson	x		
Mrs. Davis (CA)	x			Mr. LoBiondo	x		
Mr. Larsen	x			Mr. Cole	x		
Mr. Cooper	x			Mr. Bishop	x		
Mr. Marshall	x			Mr. Turner	x		
Ms. Bordallo	x			Mr. Kline	x		
Mr. Udall	x			Dr. Gingrey	x		
Mr. Boren	x			Mr. Rogers	x		
Mr. Ellsworth	x			Mr. Franks	x		
Mrs. Boyda	x			Mr. Shuster	x		
Mr. Murphy	x			Mrs. Drake	x		
Mr. Johnson	x			Mrs. McMorris Rodgers	x		
Ms. Shea-Porter	x			Mr. Conaway	x		
Mr. Courtney	x			Mr. Davis (KY)	x		
Mr. Loebsack	x			Mr. Lamborn	x		
Ms. Gillibrand				Mr. Wittman	x		
Mr. Sestak	x						
Ms. Giffords	x						
Ms. Tsongas	x						
Mr. Cummings	x						
Mr. Meek	x						
Ms. Castor	x						

Roll Call Vote Total: **61 Ayes** **Noes** **Present**

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

The committee has taken 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, and will make the analysis available as soon as possible.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

We support H.R. 5658 and feel that it reflects our committee's strong and continued support for the brave men and women of the United States armed forces. In many ways, this bill is a good bill. It authorizes the President's request for $531.4 billion for the Fiscal Year 2009 base budget of the Department of Defense and national security programs of the Department of Energy. Additionally, it includes more than $70 billion to fund war costs for the first few months of Fiscal Year 2009.

The Army and Marine Corps end-strength growth in this legislation continues initiatives started by this committee several years ago: in Fiscal Year 2009, the Army would be authorized 532,400 active duty personnel—7,000 more than authorized last year—and the Marine Corps would be authorized 194,000 active duty personnel—5,000 more than last year. It continues this committee's commitment to force protection by adding $2.4 billion for the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle.

In addition, we commend the insertion of a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual report on the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear capabilities. We observe that Iran continues to enrich uranium—a pacing item for a nuclear weapons capability—and expand its enrichment capability, but we do not have insight into these activities. Our national and international security depends upon a transparent understanding of Iran's nuclear enrichment capabilities and intentions.

As proud as we are of this legislation, we also recognize that this bill is not a perfect bill.

As a nation, we can never adequately repay our brave men and women in uniform and their families for the sacrifices they make to protect our freedom. In that regard, we believe that Congress has the unmistakable obligation to ensure that our troops and their families, and in particular their survivors, are afforded every benefit to the full extent intended to support their needs arising from military service.

Thus, we regret and express our disappointment that the committee did not enact an amendment to increase payments to military surviving spouses and children by repealing the SBP-DIC offset or Widow's Tax. The amendment directed the chairman of the Budget Committee to use the authority in the House-passed fiscal year 2009 budget resolution to provide the mandatory and discretionary spending necessary to eliminate SBP-DIC offsets.

The chairman of the House Budget Committee has the authority in Section 301 of H. Con. Res. 312 to "revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels...for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that.....(4) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation pay and retired pay and (5) eliminates the off-

set between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation."

We are also severely disappointed in the budget gimmick used to fund the prohibition on TRICARE pharmacy co-pay increases. Instead of finding a reasonable approach to adjusting mandatory spending levels to assist the committee in finding $40 million in mandatory spending offsets, the House leadership suggested a budgetary gimmick that requires military retirees to take a cut of one percent in their retired pay for a month.

We believe that all Members of Congress owe our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines the very best available equipment, training, and support. To fulfill this obligation, Armed Services Committee members must authorize policies, programs, and appropriations that provide our courageous servicemembers with the best possible tools to undertake their missions. This is especially true during a time of war.

Therefore, we must express our strong disappointment, concern, and frustration with the failure of this committee to adopt an amendment that would have made it the policy of the United States to commit a minimum of 4 percent of the Nation's gross domestic product to the base defense budget, or $606 billion in fiscal year 2009.

Rogue nations such as Iran and North Korea are expanding their arsenals of ballistic missiles and proliferating both missile and nuclear technology. Our North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies recognize this threat and in April 2008 provided unanimous endorsement of the "substantial contribution to the protection of Allies from long-range ballistic missiles to be provided by the planned deployment of European-based United States missile defence assets." This initiative would also protect the American people and our forward-deployed forces, and complement other U.S. and NATO missile defense systems.

The Administration and our NATO allies have committed to our collective security, the Congress has demanded it, and yet this legislation significantly reduces funds for the European missile defense initiative. We believe this sends a terrible signal to our allies and emboldens Iran. This is a crucial time for the U.S. to continue its leadership; in addition to NATO, we have key allies such as Israel and Japan who are relying on U.S. commitments to missile defense.

We are therefore dismayed that the committee would waiver in its support of this effort, particularly after significant progress has been made to meet the conditions outlined in last year's legislation. We are equally concerned that the committee was unwilling to restore funds for the Multiple Kill Vehicle program, which is a key investment program to address more sophisticated ballistic missile threats that we see on the horizon. As the Secretary General of NATO said at a speech in Prague on May 5, 2008, "In tomorrow's uncertain world, we can not wait for threats to mature before deciding how to counter them."

We also remain concerned about China's actions in space. According to the Pentagon's annual China military report, its undeclared and unexplained January 2007 anti-satellite test is only one part of a larger Chinese counterspace program to prevent the use of

space. Thus, we were strongly disappointed and troubled by the rejection of an amendment that would have directed an independent study to examine the feasibility of space-based defense concepts. Such a system might also provide another layer of defense against ballistic missile threats.

H.R. 5658 also reflects a funding reduction of $233 million to the Army's Future Combat Systems (FCS) program. This represents the fourth consecutive funding cut to the FCS program totaling over $1 billion dollars. We agree that the Army needs a higher topline, but the Army's funding crisis cannot be solved by making year after year funding reductions to critical modernization programs such as the FCS program. This committee has been asking the hard questions in regard to FCS all the way back to 2004. Consequently, the Army has made some positive changes to the program as a result of our oversight activities and direction.

We believe that four consecutive years of funding reductions will have a negative impact on the program. Work will have to be deferred which means critical decision points will have to be moved to the right. The Government Accountability Office (GAO), at our direction, does a detailed report on FCS every year. We believe that the GAO does very good work, and over the years they have highlighted many issues and concerns with the FCS program which the committee has taken into consideration in the form of legislation.

The title of this year's report is: '2009 Review of Future Combat System Is Critical to Program's Direction.' They chose this title because in 2007 this committee wrote and the President signed into law a provision that directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a 'Go, No-Go' review of the FCS program following its Preliminary Design Review in 2009. We directed that at the end of the 2009 review the Secretary of Defense must decide to continue the FCS program as planned, restructure the program, or terminate the program.

At some point Congress must give the Army the opportunity to demonstrate whether the system can perform. We believe the Army should have at least one year of stable funding in order to let the Secretary of Defense and the Army decide the fate of the FCS program in 2009.

In addition to the funding cut to the FCS program, H.R. 5658 includes a provision that would prevent the Army from using a Lead Systems Integrator during low rate initial production and full rate production. We support this provision, but believe that it might need to be modified in conference to ensure that there is no negative impact to the Army's ability to conduct a successful Initial Operational Test and Evaluation.

As a nation, we face a multitude of threats to our way of life and our national security interests. As legislators, we must accept that it is our duty to ensure that our men and women in uniform, who have bravely volunteered to serve our nation, have the best available tools at their disposal to combat those threats and protect those interests. This bill goes a considerable way in demonstrating this committee's resolve, but we can—and should—improve it.

We owe that much to our men and women, who answer the call in defense of our nation.

DUNCAN HUNTER.

JIM SAXTON.
JOHN M. MCHUGH.
TERRY EVERETT.
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT.
HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON.
MAC THORNBERRY.
ROBIN HAYES.
W. TODD AKIN.
J. RANDY FORBES.
JOE WILSON.
FRANK A. LOBIONDO.
TOM COLE.
ROB BISHOP.
JOHN KLINE.
PHIL GINGREY.
MIKE ROGERS.
TRENT FRANKS.
BILL SHUSTER.
THELMA D. DRAKE.
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY.
DOUG LAMBORN.
ROBERT J. WITTMAN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES JIM MARSHALL, TOM COLE, ROB BISHOP AND MICHAEL TURNER.

We submit additional views concerning Section 327, Guidance for performance of civilian personnel work under Air Force civilian consolidation plan, the Committee's guidance to the Secretary of the Air Force regarding efforts to centralize personnel management services, particularly as this effort affects the large civilian work centers ("LCCs" which include Wright-Patterson, Robins, Tinker, Hill and Bolling Air Force Bases).

Pursuant to a 1993 DoD directive, the Air Force has sought, with varying levels of enthusiasm, to centralize personnel management functions in one location, largely removing them from the on-site control of the base commander. Unlike most AF instillations, the success of the mission at its large civilian work centers (Wright-Patterson, Robins, Tinker, Hill and Bolling AFBs, the "LCCs") depends upon a complicated civilian workforce numbering in the thousands with hundreds of job classifications. So AF rightly delayed removing major personnel functions from the LCCs, centralizing only those personnel services that might easily be provided by email or telephone (e.g. some IT support, responding to routine employee inquiries about benefits, etc.).

Aware that Air Force was balking, DoD sought to use the recent BRAC process to advance total centralization of the Air Force personnel functions. But the BRAC Commissioners rejected DoD's proposed BRAC language on this subject. Instead, for the LCCs, the Commissioners directed that each LCC "retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support . . . the civilian workforce." For each LCC, the Commissioners directed that only the "transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office" would be moved to Randolph AFB, the currently planned site for centralization.

Mr. Marshall's amendment makes clear that the meaning of "transactional" and "non-transactional" will vary depending upon the nature of the affected installation, furthering the BRAC Commissioners' goal of assuring that LCCs "retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services . . . necessary to support . . . the civilian workforce," a goal that is vitally important to mission performance at each LCC.

Missions and activities have different levels of value and importance. Some are critical. Some are not. For example, a brief interruption of IT service for one activity (landing aircraft) might cause grave problems while elimination of IT service altogether for another (scheduling lawn service) might be no big deal. Besides such differences in criticality, the cost or practicality of delivering services will vary for different missions and activities. Infantrymen on patrol do not enjoy food service levels comparable to soldiers sta-

tioned in large bases, yet food for the active infantryman is more important than for those in the rear. It is laudable but typically impractical and wasteful to try to provide the highest level of civilian personnel management services to all AF bases. AFPC's service delivery targets will have to vary among installations and missions. There is no other practical, cost effective alternative. AF Commanders accept and understand that. In all walks of life—business, government, education, even pastoring—uniform provision of services is the exception, not the rule.

By postponing centralization of the Civilian Personnel Offices of the AF large civilian work centers ("LCCs"—Bolling, Hill, Robins, Tinker and Wright Pat), AF has already treated them differently from other commands. The LCCs are different. Their missions are civilian driven. Productivity of their civilian workforce is critical. Productivity will suffer significantly if key personnel management functions are removed to a different command and location. A remotely located management team responding to a separate command is also more remote from consequences and feedback. Its motivation, responsiveness and understanding cannot equal that of a management team that is part of the overall LCC team. Centralization of this sort did not work for the Soviet Union. It will not work for the Air Force.

Mr. Marshall's amendment directs that certain personnel management functions must remain staffed at the LCCs, commanded by the LCC commander. These include: Staffing positions filled through internal or external recruitment processes, Development of position classifications or job descriptions, Employee management relations, including performance management programs, conduct or discipline programs and labor management programs, Labor force planning and management, including internal pay pool management and employee performance reviews, and Managing workers compensation program pursuant to chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, or relevant State Workers' compensation programs.

JIM MARSHALL.
TOM COLE.
ROB BISHOP.
MICHAEL TURNER.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES ROB BISHOP

While I support H.R. 5658 as a good, bi-partisan bill providing for our nation's defense for fiscal year FY'09, I have some serious reservations.

It was disappointing that the Administration submitted an FY'09 defense budget which was a record $17 billion short of meeting verified military requirements. While this Committee tried its best to fill in some of the blanks, it too did not go far enough in several critical areas, such as aircraft procurement, because it was hemmed-in by the FY'09 Budget Resolution proffered by the House Democratic Leadership which shortchanges defense to fund misplaced priorities. We cannot continue to go down the road of placing demands on our military with aging equipment and 40-year old jet fighters, and still expect that our nation retain its status as a military superpower. We either need to reduce the demands that are placed upon the military, which is not always possible given emerging world threats, or else we remember our Constitutional duty to provide for the common defense and provide the resources needed to fulfill the military's mission. We now have aging F-15 aircraft disintegrating in mid-flight. We cannot continue to ask our pilots to fly fourth-generation fighters, which are nearing the end of their service life, without adequately providing for fifth-generation fighters in sufficient numbers to fulfill validated requirements and provide manufacturing efficiencies.

The Army has not given sufficient attention to adequately funding its Military Construction (MILCON) program. When reviewing the Army's MILCON priorities again in FY'09, it is clear that they are placing nearly all of their dollars into Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) mandated moves and the "Grow the Force" initiative for the forseeable future, and are neglecting non-BRAC bases or supporting installations. This disinvestment creates serious consequences for both readiness and morale at those other locations.

A case-in point is Tooele Army Depot, Utah, with World War II era facilities, and 489 full-time Army civilian employees and 102 contractor employees. More munitions have been shipped to supply our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan from Tooele than from any other location in the CONUS, and yet, the civilian workforce works on loading docks and other facilities that are over 60 years of age with no upgrades in sight. Tooele has not had any of its identified MILCON or improvement projects forwarded to Congress by the Army in over fifteen years. The Army keeps slipping Tooele's projects off of its five year defense plan (FYDP) in what's become an annual budgetary game. Even the most fiscally-conservative private business enterprise recognizes that it must invest a minimum of 3–5% in facilities upkeep and modernization just to stay ahead of the profit and loss curve. Some of the facilities at Tooele are so

far gone that they must simply be razed due to deterioration, but the Army hasn't even funded that. If the Army continues to rely on Tooele to do a mission, then it must adequately provide for it and not expect the workforce to continue to do more with facilities falling down around them, especially when hundreds of millions, and even billions of dollars, are flowing to other Army installations around the country each year for MILCON projects.

Another area of chronic neglect is in the area of environmentally-responsible Conventional Munitions disposal at Tooele and elsewhere. The Army's open-pit, open-burn method of disposal grows increasingly intolerable due to environmental concerns. This is something the Army should address in a more aggressive manner.

The Army has also neglected Dugway Proving Grounds. Workload at Dugway has increased by nearly 800 percent since September 11, 2001 in chemical and biological defense testing, even as the Army has actually disinvested in Dugway's facilities. As a result, a vitally needed laboratory addition project has been continuously postponed in the Army's budget submission for the last several years. Army scientists at Dugway have no choice but to conduct sensitive BioLevel–3 level testing work in crowded and inadequate temporary trailers. Dugway's water system is 50 years old, deteriorating, and fails to meet basic water quality standards. Yet, the MILCON project to upgrade the water system continually falls off the Army's FYDP. The quality of life for persons living at Dugway's remote and isolated location is being neglected. Dugway's community club, the only retail dining opportunity for residents within an hour's drive of the base, has been partially condemned due to lack of running water and asbestos tile hazards. It is a monumental embarrassment. A small MILCON project to replace it has been postponed for several years, and this year, was completely removed by the Army from the FYDP even though Congress provided design money for the project two years ago. These disinvestments risk alienation of state and community support.

Finally, I am greatly concerned that the 110th Congress passed an Energy Bill that included Section 526 virtually precluding contracts between the Department of Defense and other entities engaged in alternative energy projects. As fuel costs increase, they are wreaking havoc on the Department's budgets. Since 2001, the amount spent for fuel by the Department for regular operations, not including wartime efforts, has more than doubled to nearly $7 billion. Every penny increase in the cost of jet fuel costs the services tens of millions of dollars that have to come out of personnel, modernization or facilities.

Energy is one of the most critical national defense commodities. And yet, the House Democratic Leadership has precluded any common-sense, rational alternative fuels development by virtually prohibiting any Department of Defense support for oil shale extraction or coals to liquid fuel production by passing Section 526 of the recently enacted Democratic Energy bill.

The United States has the largest known reserves of oil shale deposits in the entire world. According to the Energy Department, there are over 1 trillion barrels of recoverable oil locked into oil shale deposits in 3 western states of Utah, Colorado and Wyoming. This was recognized decades ago when the Department of Defense

set aside significant Naval Oil Shale reserves in Eastern Utah. They were viewed specifically as a key component of our defense energy security reserves.

Modern oil shale extraction technologies have advanced greatly and are much more environmentally sensitive. It is commercially viable and competitive with conventional oil sources at $50 a barrel. Would that we could return to the days of $50 a barrel!

Another aspect of refining jet fuel derived from oil shale is the higher energy or BTU content when compared with conventional fuel sources. This could be important in extending the range of fighter jet aircraft. That benefit is also being precluded by Section 526. As enacted, Section 526 is the wrong policy and must be modified to include a waiver by the Department of Defense.

Congress should be encouraging, not discouraging, domestic oil shale and coal-to-liquids development for use by the Department of Defense. Section 526 should be repealed or modified as quickly as possible. Such a repeal or modifying amendment was not possible during the Armed Services Committee deliberations on H.R. 5658 due to procedural and jurisdictional concerns among House committees. This is a vital issue that deserves a re-examination on the House floor when this bill is debated and voted by the Full membership of the House.

ROB BISHOP.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE NIKI TSONGAS

I strongly support the underlying authorization. I also applaud the work of the Seapower Subcommittee, for their commitment to a 313 ship fleet and their efforts to control the ever increasing cost of shipbuilding in this country while supporting the industrial base. However, I am concerned by the potential consequences of the proposed pause in continued procurement of follow-on ships of the DDG–1000 ZUMWALT class. I appreciate that the Committee recommends $400 million for advanced procurement for surface combatants so that Navy has the flexibility to move forward with DDG–1000 or restart DDG–51 procurement, but I am concerned about the impacts that this will have on our surface fleet manufacturing and technology base and on the future of our surface combatant capabilities.

The DDG–1000 is the primary development program for the Navy's Family of Ships (FoS) strategy. Eliminating the authorization for funding the DDG–1000 class in this bill could dramatically increase the cost of current and future Navy shipbuilding programs, including the next generation cruiser, CG(X). Additionally, the industrial base that is so vital to our transition to a 21st century fleet of surface combatants could be decimated. There are more than 10,000 skilled workers in the U.S. working on the Mission Systems Equipment that is intended to support not only DDG–1000, but the entire Family of Ships. It will be extremely difficult and costly to reconstitute this workforce in the future.

Sustaining this program lays the groundwork for the Navy's long standing plan, which includes the transition from this new destroyer to the next generation cruiser, CG(X), using the ZUMWALT hull and systems. Funding the third ship in the ZUMWALT Class is essential in FY09 to avoid the potential cost and long-term schedule implications of a break in production.

I am also concerned that restarting procurement of the DDG–51 could have unforeseen costs that could negate the perceived financial benefit of returning to the older class of ship. The Chief of Naval Operations submitted the request for the DDG–1000 and clearly stated the Navy's need to build a total of 7 ships of this class. The Navy has ensured that the ten key technologies incorporated into this new ship class have been well tested and their performance verified, and the ship design prior to start of construction will be more mature than that for any other surface combatant ship—indicators that the Navy well understands the program's costs. The Navy and Congress have supported this critical multipurpose ship for fleet operations as a result of rigorous review, engineering development model risk reduction, computer-aided design, significant research and development investment, and updated cost modeling.

This ship is designed to provide critical capabilities to defeat current and future evolving threats. DDG–1000 has been designed to carry out Navy missions while putting half as many sailors at risk when compared to the ships the Navy currently has to do complete these missions. It is designed for higher operational tempo and lower life-cycle costs than current Navy destroyers. Again, I appreciate the expertise of the Seapower Subcommittee and full Committee on these issues and for their dedication to our men and women of the Navy and Marine Corps. I ask that consideration of the above concerns be made as we move forward.

NIKI TSONGAS.

○