

ations to support force protection equipment, operational needs and military personnel requirements of the units deployed and engaged in the Global War on Terrorism.

Included in the force protection recommendation is funding for up-armored Humvees, tactical wheeled vehicle recapitalization and modernization programs for the most heavily used vehicles in OIF and OEF, night vision devices and improvised explosive device jammers. In addition, the committee recognizes the need to replenish critical small-arms and ammunition procurement programs, including funding for the M16 rifle, M240 medium machine gun and M4 carbine modifications, and .50 caliber cartridges, 120mm tank ammunition canisters and 155mm high explosive projectiles. Incorporated in the day-to-day operation recommendation is funding to pay for food, fuel, spare parts, maintenance, transportation, base expenses, as well as costs incurred by stateside installations for increased mobilizations and demobilizations due to OIF and OEF.

Over the past four years, the committee has recommended increases in the active component manpower to sustain the full range of capabilities required of the mission assigned to the armed forces. The committee recommends funding a cumulative active component increase of 30,000 for the Army and 5,000 for the Marine Corps over the budget request.

#### HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 results from hearings that began on February 1, 2006, and that were completed on April 7, 2006. The full committee conducted fifteen sessions. In addition, a total of thirty-two 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 2007 contained \$84.2 billion for procurement. This represents a \$6.2 billion increase from the amount authorized for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends authorization of \$85.9 billion, an increase of \$1.7 billion from the fiscal year 2007 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 procurement program are identified in the table below. Major issues are discussed following the table.

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	<b>PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>										
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	3,566,483	148,300	148,300	148,300						3,714,783
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,350,898	140,000	140,000	140,000						1,490,898
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	2,301,943	33,061	33,061	303,200		(270,139)				2,335,004
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	1,903,125	(211,650)	(211,650)	15,000		(226,650)				1,691,475
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	7,778,602	(748,523)	(748,523)	61,100		(809,623)				6,970,079
	NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT		318,000	318,000	318,000						318,000
	<b>TOTAL ARMY</b>	<b>16,841,061</b>	<b>(320,812)</b>	<b>(320,812)</b>	<b>986,600</b>		<b>(1,306,412)</b>				<b>16,520,239</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>										
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	10,868,771	(108,100)	(108,100)	44,900		(153,000)				10,760,671
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	2,555,020	(38,000)	(38,000)			(38,000)				2,517,020
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS	789,943	(31,150)	(31,150)			(31,150)				758,793
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	10,578,653	604,600	604,600	604,600						11,183,153
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	4,967,916	74,850	74,850	86,850		(12,000)				5,042,766
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	1,273,513	(49,700)	(49,700)	32,000		(81,700)				1,223,813
	<b>TOTAL NAVY</b>	<b>31,033,716</b>	<b>462,600</b>	<b>462,600</b>	<b>768,350</b>		<b>(316,850)</b>				<b>31,486,216</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>										
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	11,479,810	1,562,820	1,562,820	1,801,500		(238,680)				13,042,630
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	1,072,749	4,000	4,000	4,000						1,076,749
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	4,204,145	(32,650)	(32,650)			(32,650)				4,171,495
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	15,408,086	20,550	20,550	45,300		(24,750)				15,428,636
	<b>TOTAL AIR FORCE</b>	<b>32,164,790</b>	<b>1,554,720</b>	<b>1,554,720</b>	<b>1,850,800</b>		<b>(296,080)</b>				<b>33,719,610</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>										
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	2,861,461	(5,000)	(5,000)	10,000		(15,000)				2,856,461
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT	[18,484]									[18,484]
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	1,277,304									1,277,304
	<b>TOTAL DEFENSE-WIDE</b>	<b>4,138,766</b>	<b>(5,000)</b>	<b>(5,000)</b>	<b>10,000</b>		<b>(15,000)</b>				<b>4,133,766</b>
	<b>GRAND TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE</b>	<b>84,178,322</b>	<b>1,881,408</b>	<b>1,881,408</b>	<b>3,614,760</b>		<b>(1,933,342)</b>				<b>85,869,730</b>

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$3.6 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of \$3.7 billion, an increase of \$148.3 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 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 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
<b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>											
<b>AIRCRAFT</b>											
<b>FIXED WING</b>											
1	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT	3	109,154							3	109,154
2	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	1	4,060							1	4,060
<b>ROTARY</b>											
3	ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELICOPTER	18	141,418							18	141,418
4	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	39	198,677							39	198,677
5	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	38	632,542		130,000					38	762,542
	HH-60L - USAR						115,000				
	UH-60A to L Engine Upgrade						15,000				
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(77,991)								(77,991)
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		185,845								185,845
7	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING										
<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT</b>			<b>1,193,705</b>		<b>130,000</b>		<b>130,000</b>				<b>1,323,705</b>
<b>MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT</b>											
8	GUARDRAIL MODS		58,000								58,000
9	ARL MODS		48,000								48,000
10	AH-64 MODS		794,387		7,000						801,387
	Modern Signal Processing Unit						6,000				
	Blade/foild Kits						1,000				
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(18,746)								(18,746)
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		19,000								19,000
12	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS		607,663		1,900						609,563
	Film Laminates for Windscreens						900				
	Crashworthy Ramp Gunner Seat						1,000				



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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
26	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		64,883								64,883
27	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS Aircraft Wireless Intercom System		35,346	4,000	4,000						39,346
28	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		86,351				4,000				86,351
29	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		2,100								2,100
30	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		2,353								2,353
31	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS										
<b>TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>			<b>569,666</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>4,000</b>		<b>4,000</b>				<b>573,666</b>
<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>			<b>3,566,483</b>	<b>148,300</b>	<b>148,300</b>		<b>148,300</b>				<b>3,714,783</b>

## Items of Special Interest

*AH-64 modern signal processing unit*

The budget request contained \$775.6 million for AH-64 modifications, but no funds were requested for the modern signal processing unit (MSPU) initial integration and production for the AH-64.

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

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

*Joint cargo aircraft*

The committee supports the decision to establish a joint program office and to utilize a single capability development document as the basis for requirements for the Joint Cargo Aircraft (JCA). The committee believes that cost control is the most critical factor in determining the likelihood for success of the JCA program, and that the imperative for cost containment will necessitate a strict control of requirements and the use of maximum jointness and commonality in training, sustainment and maintenance. The committee recommends that the joint program office work to develop an acquisition and sustainment strategy for JCA that is joint in all phases of the program. The acquisition and sustainment strategy should address the purchase of sufficient rights in technical data required to provide competition in maintaining and sustaining the aircraft throughout its complete lifecycle. The committee notes that it has included a provision (section 802) that would require acquisition programs to acquire sufficient technical data required for lifecycle sustainment. The committee also notes that the core logistics capability for cargo aircraft currently in the Department of Defense (DOD) inventory resides largely in the Air Force Air Logistics Centers and the committee believes the JCA should be identified as a core logistics capability under subsection (a)(2) of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, with no waiver under subsection (b), if the JCA is acquired in sufficient numbers to warrant such a designation. At a minimum, the Department should acquire the technical data necessary to enable the government to utilize its core logistics capability to maintain the JCA, if required.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the plan to acquire and sustain the JCA. The committee directs that the report be delivered no later than 60 days after the acquisition and sustainment strategy is approved by the appropriate milestone decision authority. The committee further directs that the report shall include

DOD's recommendations regarding whether or not the JCA will be identified as a core logistics capability under subsection (a)(2) of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, and if so identified, whether the Department intends to waive the limitation on contracting under subsection (b) of such section for the JCA.

*HH-60 aircraft wireless intercom system upgrade*

The budget request contained \$30.9 million for H-60 modifications, but included no funds for procurement of non-encrypted aircraft wireless intercom system (AWIS) upgrades for active and reserve HH-60 medical evacuation (MEDEVAC) helicopters.

The committee notes there is no integrated or qualified wireless communication system onboard HH-60 rotorcraft for use by crewmembers. Consequently, this does not allow onboard medical personnel, while in flight or during ground operations, freedom to use both hands to perform emergency medical procedures while communicating with the flight crew. Early fielding of non-encrypted AWIS would eliminate the operational hazards and restrictions inherent in the existing tethered system for MEDEVAC crews.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million to modify HH-60 rotorcraft with wireless intercom systems.

*UH-60A to UH-60L helicopter upgrade*

The budget request included \$554.6 million in aircraft procurement for 38 UH-60M aircraft, but included no funds for the non-recurring costs of replacement of UH-60A engine transmission and engine upgrades as part of the UH-60A upgrade program.

The committee notes the significant reduction in flying hour costs, of over \$700 per hour, offered by replacement of the original UH-60A engines.

The committee recommends an additional \$15.0 million for the non-recurring development and engineering costs of upgrading the UH-60A engine transmission and engine to the UH-60L configuration.

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$1.4 billion for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of \$1.5 billion, an increase of \$140.0 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 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 2007		Committee		Committee		FY 2007		
		Authorization	QTY.	Change	Increase	Decrease	Authorization	QTY.	COST	
		COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	
<b>MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>										
<b>OTHER MISSILES</b>										
<b>SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM</b>										
1	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY		108	489,067			108	489,067		
2	SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY:			12,039				12,039		
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)			10,000				10,000		
<b>AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM</b>										
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY									
<b>ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM</b>										
5	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY		300	104,782			300	104,782		
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)									
6	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY		949	50,541			949	50,541		
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)			(18,900)				(18,900)		
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)			32,700				32,700		
8	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)		702	147,795			702	147,795		
9	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)		3,762	20,926			3,762	20,926		
10	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS									
11	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS)		50	226,884			50	226,884		
12	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM		43	60,502			43	60,502		
<b>TOTAL OTHER MISSILES</b>				<b>1,136,336</b>				<b>1,136,336</b>		
<b>MODIFICATION OF MISSILES</b>										
<b>MODIFICATIONS</b>										
13	PATRIOT			69,856		140,000				209,856
	Program Increase									
14	JAVELIN MISSILE			10,371						10,371

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
15	ITAS/TOW		84,350								84,350
16	MLRS		6,913								6,913
17	HIMARS (NON AAO)		9,374								9,374
18	HELLFIRE										
<b>TOTAL MODIFICATIONS OF MISSILES</b>			<b>180,864</b>		<b>140,000</b>		<b>140,000</b>				<b>320,864</b>
<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>											
<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>											
19	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		25,794								25,794
<b>TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>			<b>25,794</b>								<b>25,794</b>
<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>											
<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>											
20	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,924								3,924
21	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MISSILES)		10								10
22	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		3,970								3,970
<b>TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>			<b>7,904</b>								<b>7,904</b>
<b>TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>			<b>1,350,898</b>		<b>140,000</b>		<b>140,000</b>				<b>1,490,898</b>

## Items of Special Interest

*Patriot modifications*

The budget request contained \$69.9 million for the procurement of Patriot modifications.

The committee understands that the Army has an unfunded requirement to transition or pure fleet existing Patriot Advanced Capability-2 (PAC-2) missile battalions to an upgraded PAC-3 missile battalion configuration capable of deploying the PAC-3 missile by the end of fiscal year 2009.

The committee supports this initiative and recommends \$209.9 million, an increase of \$140.0 million for the purpose of restarting the PAC-3 production line, and for upgrading tactical Patriot fire units to the PAC-3 configuration capability.

*TOW missile inventory*

The budget request contained \$31.6 million to procure 949 TOW missiles.

The committee recognizes the Army and Marine Corps face a significant challenge in maintaining an adequate inventory of TOW missiles. The TOW requirement is perceived to be at a minimum 20,000 missiles but the Army's current program of record supports an inventory of only 6,500 missiles. The committee is aware the Army and Marine Corps have fired more than 6,000 TOW missiles in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), yet by 2009, based on missile shelf life, the Army will have fewer TOW missiles in its inventory than it had at the start of the OIF.

While the committee notes the Army's intent to increase TOW procurement and encourages the Army to proceed with this course of action, the committee also notes the Army staff has not defined a minimum warfighting inventory requirement for TOW missiles.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2007, that details the acquisition strategy for TOW procurement across the Future Years Defense Program and specifies the current, minimum warfighting requirement for the TOW missile.

## WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$2.3 billion for Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of \$2.3 billion, an increase of \$33.1 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 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 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	<b>PROCUREMENT OF W&amp;TCV, ARMY</b>										
	<b>TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES</b>										
	<b>TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES</b>										
1	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD		899								899
2	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT		284,966		147,000						431,966
	Program Increase						147,000				
3	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)		4,721								4,721
4	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES		899								899
5	STRYKER VEHICLES	100	795,978							100	795,978
	<b>MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES</b>										
6	CARRIER, MOD		22,969								22,969
7	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		32,028								32,028
8	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, FIST VEHICLE		69,988								69,988
9	BFVS SERIES (MOD)		28,714								28,714
10	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)										
11	FAASV PIP TO FLEET										
12	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	12	36,494							12	36,494
13	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)		66,054								66,054
14	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		364,899		(182,450)						182,449
	Transfer to Title XV								(182,450)		
15	SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2	23	171,097		128,900					23	299,997
	Program Increase - M1A2 SEP Retrofit						128,900				
	<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>										
16	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TCV-WTCV)		422								422
17	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		11,685								11,685
	<b>TOTAL TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES</b>		<b>1,891,813</b>		<b>93,450</b>		<b>275,900</b>		<b>(182,450)</b>		<b>1,985,263</b>

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization		
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST		
<b>WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES</b>												
18	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES											
	HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM	10	20,369							10	20,369	
19	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY		32,339	(32,339)								
	Program Decrease							(32,339)				
20	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM)	3,025	43,175	(21,600)				(21,600)		3,025	21,575	
	Transfer to Title XV											
21	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM)	8,600	36,614	(18,300)				(18,300)		8,600	18,314	
	Transfer to Title XV											
22	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM)	68	1,725							68	1,725	
23	MORTAR SYSTEMS											
	M16 RIFLE	2,950	1,844							2,950	1,844	
25	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	390	8,458							390	8,458	
26	XM110 SEMI-AUTO SNIPER SYSTEM (SASS)		15,300								15,300	
27	M4 CARBINE	1,475	2,221		9,300					1,475	11,521	
	Program Increase										9,300	
28	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM				3,000						3,000	
	Multi-Purpose Area Suppression Shotgun										3,000	
29	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION											
30	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)	85	187,489							85	187,489	
<b>MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES</b>												
31	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS		3,168								3,168	
32	M4 CARBINE MODS		30,871	(15,450)							15,421	
	Transfer to Title XV										(15,450)	
33	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS											
34	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		5,253								5,253	
35	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		5,293								5,293	

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
36	PHALANX MODS										
37	HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)		692								692
38	M119 MODIFICATIONS		1,012		5,000						6,012
39	M16 RIFLE MODS						5,000				1,700
40	M203 Grenade Launch Module MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		1,700								1,700
41	<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>		507								507
42	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		6,331								6,331
43	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		3,019		10,000						13,019
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS										
	Arsenal Support Initiative - Equipment Recapitalization										
44	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		2,750								2,750
45	REF SMALL ARMS										
46	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS										
	<b>TOTAL WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES</b>		<b>410,130</b>		<b>(60,389)</b>		<b>27,300</b>		<b>(87,689)</b>		<b>349,741</b>
	<b>SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS</b>										
	<b>SPARES</b>										
47	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)										
	<b>TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS</b>										
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&amp;TCV, ARMY</b>		<b>2,301,943</b>		<b>33,061</b>		<b>303,200</b>		<b>(270,139)</b>		<b>2,335,004</b>

## Items of Special Interest

*Army current to future force modernization strategy*

The Army is implementing its current to future force modernization strategy at a time when U.S. ground forces continue to operate at high operational tempos in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as fill a critical role in the global war on terrorism. The committee notes that while the Future Combat Systems (FCS) is the Army's long-term transformation strategy, modularity and equipment reset constitutes the near-term strategy. Given fiscal realities, the Army's challenge of simultaneously funding reset and modularity, and the high technical risks associated with the development of FCS, the committee is concerned the Army may sacrifice the warfighting capability of the current force in order to resource FCS.

While conceptually supporting modularity, the committee continues to have concerns about the details, not the least of which is its escalating costs, uncertainty in adequate resources for active Army and Army National Guard equipping strategies, and whether the new modular designs for brigade combat teams (BCTs) will provide sufficient capability for sustained, high-intensity combat operations. Specifically, the committee is concerned about the Army's decision to field modular heavy BCTs with only two maneuver battalions, instead of three. The committee understands that Stryker BCTs have three maneuver battalions and FCS BCTs will also have three maneuver battalions. Accordingly, the committee is concerned that the Army's decision to field modular heavy BCTs with two instead of three maneuver battalions is resource vice strategy driven.

The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Congressional Budget Office, and the Institute for Defense Analysis have also expressed similar concerns in reference to modularity. The committee further notes soldiers returning from Iraq have indicated that while technology can be a critical combat enabler, technology alone cannot serve as a replacement for force structure, "boots on the ground." The committee commends the Army for adding a reconnaissance battalion to the modular brigade design. The committee believes that although the reconnaissance battalion is a critical force multiplier, it alone should not be required to perform missions that would normally be performed by a third maneuver battalion.

The Army has stated that the procurement funding for modularity is within the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) and the procurement funding for FCS is beyond the FYDP. However, the committee notes this position is not supported by the information provided by the Army to the committee. The committee agrees with GAO's assessment that given the degree of uncertainty in modularity cost estimates and the likely cost growth from FCS; the Army's modularity and FCS programs are at risk of becoming unaffordable.

*Army modularity*

The committee continues to support the Army's restructuring from a division based force to a more readily deployable brigade centric force, a process known as modularity, and the committee understands that modularity remains a top priority of the Chief of

Staff of the Army. However, the committee remains concerned that the Army has not provided sufficient information for Congress to assess the capabilities, costs, affordability, and risks of the Army's modularity implementation plans. The committee notes that the Army's cost estimate for completing modularity by 2011 has grown from an initial estimate of \$28.0 billion in 2004 to a current estimate of \$52.5 billion. Further, in the "2005 Modularity" report submitted to Congress, the Army states a requirement for 77 brigade combat teams (BCTs). Of the 77 BCTs, 35 were to be heavy BCTs consisting of Abrams tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles. In the "2006 Modularity" report and the 2007 budget request the requirement is for 70 BCTs, of which 33 would be heavy BCTs. The committee is concerned about the Army's rationale to reduce the total BCT requirement and furthermore, it remains unclear to the committee what impact the current modularity strategy will have on meeting the needs of the combatant commanders.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to obtain from each combatant commander, an assessment of the Army's modularity initiative to include issues or concerns regarding modularity designs, equipment, personnel and/or rotation strategy. Further, the committee directs the Secretary to submit a report, including the assessments from the combatant commanders, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services with the submission of the President's budget for fiscal year 2008.

#### *Heavy brigade combat teams*

The budget request included \$171.1 million for the M1A2 Abrams System Enhancement Program (SEP) tank and \$285.0 million for the Bradley base sustainment program.

The committee remains concerned about the Abrams tank and Bradley fighting vehicle modernization programs and the associated funding. Current operations continue to demonstrate that there are few conflicts where main battle tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles do not play a significant role in ensuring the survivability and offensive firepower of the armed forces. The committee remains resolute in its assessment that the Army should pure fleet, at a minimum, 18 of its active component heavy brigade combat teams (BCTs) with the M1A2 Abrams SEP tank and the Bradley A3 fighting vehicle.

The committee notes that in the Army's March 2006 report to Congress, "The Army Modular Initiative," it clearly states that one of the key criteria for modularity funding was "modernization of older equipment." The report further states that modularity equipment modernization includes major systems upgrades such as Apache and Chinook helicopters, but does not include the M1A2 Abrams SEP tank or the Bradley A3 as part of modernization. The committee believes that the M1A2 Abrams SEP tank and the Bradley A3 are critical components of modular heavy BCTs.

The committee is concerned that the Army's current procurement strategy will not adequately fund the M1A2 Abrams SEP tank program and the Bradley A3 program, to at least the minimum economic quantity of approximately 60 and 144 per year, respectively. The committee is also concerned that the Army's current plan results in paying more to get fewer M1A2 Abrams SEP tanks and

Bradley A3s, which will result in a significant delay in meeting the total requirement of 18 M1A2 Abrams SEP tanks and Bradley A3 heavy BCTs. The committee notes that even if the Army develops a plan that funds the M1A2 SEP tank and the Bradley A3 production at the minimum economic quantity it will take the Army up to 10 years to meet the total requirement for 18 M1A2 Abrams SEP tank and Bradley A3 equipped heavy BCTs.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report by February 28, 2007, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services providing the feasibility and rationale for multiyear procurement authority for the M1A2 Abrams SEP tank and the Bradley A3. At a minimum, the report shall include the impact that a multiyear procurement would have on the unit cost and the impact this authority would have on meeting the total M1A2 Abrams SEP tank and Bradley A3 requirement, consisting of 18 heavy BCTs.

#### *Abrams tank modernization*

The budget request included \$171.1 million for 23 M1A2 Abrams System Enhancement Program (SEP) retrofit tanks.

The M1A2 Abrams SEP tank is an upgraded, fully digitized, first generation M1A2 Abrams tank which enhances lethality, survivability, and mobility, as well as providing improved situational awareness for its crew.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$128.9 million for the M1A2 Abrams SEP tank program.

#### *Bradley base sustainment program*

The budget request included \$285.0 million for 16 Bradley A3 fighting vehicles and 90 Operation Desert Storm (ODS) vehicles.

The Bradley base sustainment program upgrades earlier variants of the Bradley A2 ODS and the Bradley A3 standard. The Bradley A3 is more lethal and survivable; provides enhanced command and control; and allows shared situational awareness. The Bradley A3 continues to maintain combat overmatch above current and future threat forces and remains compatible with the M1A2 Abrams System Enhancement Program tank.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$147.0 million for the Bradley A3 program.

#### *Integrated air burst weapon system*

The budget request contained \$32.3 million for the integrated air burst weapon system family.

The committee understands this funding line would provide procurement dollars for the low rate initial production of the Objective Individual Combat Weapon, Increment One (OICW-1) program; a family of small arms that are projected to be replacements for existing carbines, rifles, and light machine guns. The committee is aware that the official request for proposals (RFP) for the OICW-1, originally announced in May 2005 was delayed and now has been terminated. The committee is also aware that the program was redirected to the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) for further review.

The committee notes the OICW-1 program has not yet been reviewed by the JROC nor has an estimated date for a review been

established. The committee understands that pending the outcome of this future JROC review, the new RFP would incorporate additional joint requirements that would require further development and refinement. The committee also notes the Army is currently restructuring the procurement program for small arms in support of the recently approved small arms acquisition strategy, and recognizes these funds would be redistributed to other small arms acquisition programs in accordance with this new strategy.

Therefore, the committee believes the budget request for the integrated air burst weapon system family is not justified and recommends a decrease of \$32.3 million. The committee also recommends the redistribution of these funds to other small arms acquisition programs as reflected in this report based on urgent need and in support of the Army's recently restructured small arms acquisition strategy.

#### AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, ARMY

##### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$1.9 billion for Ammunition Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of \$1.7 billion, a decrease of \$211.7 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 Ammunition Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007		Committee		Committee		FY 2007	
		Authorization	Change	Increase	Decrease	Authorization	Committee		
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
<b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY</b>									
<b>AMMUNITION</b>									
<b>SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION</b>									
1	CTG. 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		214,555	(107,300)					107,255
	Transfer to Title XV						(107,300)		
2	CTG. 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		113,555	(56,800)					56,755
	Transfer to Title XV						(56,800)		
3	CTG. 9MM, ALL TYPES		3,848						3,848
4	CTG. .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		125,112	(62,550)					62,562
	Transfer to Title XV						(62,550)		
5	CTG. 20MM, ALL TYPES		101						101
6	CTG. 25MM, ALL TYPES		32,089						32,089
7	CTG. 30MM, ALL TYPES		19,431						19,431
8	CTG. 40MM, ALL TYPES		129,409						129,409
<b>MORTAR AMMUNITION</b>									
9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		13,046						13,046
10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		54,618						54,618
11	CTG. MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES		66,506						66,506
<b>TANK AMMUNITION</b>									
12	CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES		19,584						19,584
13	120MM TANK TRAINING: ALL TYPES		142,933						142,933
14	CTG. TANK, 120MM TACTICAL, ALL TYPES		48,004						48,004
<b>ARTILLERY AMMUNITION</b>									
15	CTG. ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES		2,297						2,297
16	CTG. ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES		45,585						45,585
17	CTG. ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES		124,099						124,099
18	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982		22,971						22,971

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
19	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL 1		73,885								73,885
	ARTILLERY FUZES										
20	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES		4,083								4,083
	MINES										
21	MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES		396								396
22	MINES (CONVENTIONAL), ALL TYPES		4,221								4,221
23	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES		4,897								4,897
24	ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES		85,879								85,879
	ROCKETS										
25	SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		7,741								7,741
26	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		136,670								136,670
	OTHER AMMUNITION										
27	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		33,746								33,746
28	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		54,162								54,162
29	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		26,384								26,384
30	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		10,791								10,791
	MISCELLANEOUS										
31	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		3,407								3,407
32	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		30,089								30,089
33	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		2,628								2,628
34	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		5,493								5,493
35	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		10,306								10,306
	Desert Optimized Equipment									3,000	
	Outloading Module - Crane AAP									6,000	
	Outloading Module - McAlester AAP									6,000	
36	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		9,552								9,552
37	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		101								101

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	<b>TOTAL AMMUNITION</b>		<b>1,682,174</b>		<b>(211,650)</b>		<b>15,000</b>		<b>(226,650)</b>		<b>1,470,524</b>
	<b>AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT</b>										
	<b>PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT</b>										
38	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		116,175								116,175
39	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,064								3,064
40	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES		4,743								4,743
41	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION		94,201								94,201
42	ARMS INITIATIVE		2,768								2,768
	<b>TOTAL AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT</b>		<b>220,951</b>								<b>220,951</b>
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY</b>		<b>1,903,125</b>		<b>(211,650)</b>		<b>15,000</b>		<b>(226,650)</b>		<b>1,691,475</b>

## Items of Special Interest

*Desert optimized equipment*

The budget request contained \$10.3 million for ammunition peculiar equipment, but included no funds for desert optimized ammunition peculiar equipment.

The committee understands that the harsh desert conditions of Iraq and Afghanistan are causing ammunition peculiar equipment to degrade at a much greater rate than anticipated. The committee notes that there is great benefit to upgrading forward deployed ammunition peculiar equipment with desert optimized equipment.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to optimize ammunition peculiar equipment for desert environments.

*Modernization of .50 caliber ammunition production line*

The budget request included \$116.2 million for modernization of ammunition production facilities, but included no funds to modernize the line for production of .50 caliber ammunition.

The committee notes that much of the existing facilities and equipment used in the production of .50 caliber ammunition date from the era of World War II. While this equipment has been able to support .50 caliber ammunition production in recent years, the production line is extremely difficult to maintain and the obsolete nature of this equipment limits the ability of the Army to increase production quantities on short notice.

The committee directs the Army to develop a plan to modernize the production line for .50 caliber ammunition, and submit the plan to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2007. Furthermore, the plan should include a proposed schedule for modernization consistent with continued production of .50 caliber ammunition at levels similar to those occurring in 2006, and a recommended funding program associated with this schedule.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$7.7 billion for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of \$7.0 billion, a decrease of \$211.7 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 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 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	<b>OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>										
	<b>TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES</b>										
	<b>TACTICAL VEHICLES</b>										
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		22,961								22,961
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED		7,565								7,565
3	SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS		11,676								11,676
4	HI MOB MULTIPURP WHLDR VEH (HMMWV)		582,613								582,613
5	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)		695,121								695,121
6	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPME		29,286								29,286
7	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		353,198								353,198
8	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)		155,491		(77,750)				(77,750)		77,741
	Transfer to Title XV										
9	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY										
10	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916		31,202		9,300						40,502
	M915A3 Program Increase - ARNG						9,300				
11	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV I		220,416		(110,200)				(110,200)		110,216
	Transfer to Title XV										
12	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM		34,823		(34,823)				(34,823)		
	Transfer to Title XV										
13	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		2,562								2,562
14	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TAC VEH)										
15	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL		1,725								1,725
	<b>NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES</b>										
16	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN		609								609
17	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		640								640
18	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		3,486								3,486

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
<b>TOTAL TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES</b>			<b>2,153,374</b>		<b>(213,473)</b>		<b>9,300</b>		<b>(222,773)</b>		<b>1,939,901</b>
<b>COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT</b>											
<b>COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS</b>											
19	WIN - TACTICAL PROGRAM		4,805								4,805
20	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		16,884								16,884
21	SECOMP-I		53,616								53,616
22	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS		28,459								28,459
23	SHF TERM		833								833
24	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)		61,611								61,611
25	NAVSTAR GPS (SPACE)		62,342								62,342
26	SMART-T (SPACE)		954								954
27	SCAMP (SPACE)		16,803								16,803
28	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS		9,113								9,113
29	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)										
30	COMM - C3 SYSTEM		25,253								25,253
31	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)										
<b>COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS</b>											
32	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		4,890								4,890
33	JOINT TACTICA RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS)		1,302								1,302
34	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		3,229								3,229
35	SINGARS FAMILY		116,523		(58,250)				(58,250)		58,273
36	Transfer to Title XV										
37	MULTI-PURPOSE INFORMATION OPERATIONS SYSTEMS		10,460								10,460
38	JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS		340,231								340,231
39	BRIDGE TO FUTURE NETWORKS		5,181								5,181
40	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING										





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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
81	RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS		4,393								4,393
82	RAPID AEROSTAT INITIAL DEPLOYMENT										
83	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP		802								802
84	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS)		321								321
85	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MVS)										
86	ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SETTER		7,441								7,441
87	PROFILER		2,119								2,119
88	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		19,249		(9,600)						9,649
	Transfer to Title XV								(9,600)		
89	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)		160,060		(80,050)				(80,050)		80,010
	Transfer to Title XV										
90	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD)		50,160								50,160
91	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMC XM32										
92	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		38,971								38,971
93	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (MIP)		3,510								3,510
94	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM										
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS										
95	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS		57,707								57,707
96	ADV FA TAC DATA SYS / EFF CTRL SYS		22,035								22,035
97	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, AFATDS		5,434								5,434
98	LIGHT WEIGHT TECH FIRE DIRECTION SYS		6,042								6,042
99	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM		31,986								31,986
100	FAAD C2		21,095								21,095
101	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS		69,289								69,289
102	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE / LIGHTWEIGHT FED		9,305								9,305
103	KNIGHT FAMILY		24,233								24,233
104	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		2,022								2,022
105	LOGTECH		97,235		(10,000)						87,235



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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
123	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION		38,312								38,312
124	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM) BRIDGING EQUIPMENT		4,079								4,079
125	TACTICAL BRIDGING		69,608								69,608
126	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT		80,093								80,093
127	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-H:		52,829								52,829
128	KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING										
129	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMII) Transfer to Title XV		197,675		(66,100)				(66,100)		131,575
130	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)										
131	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPA		37,269								37,269
132	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIP COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		546								546
133	HEATERS AND ECU'S		10,575								10,575
134	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES										
135	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT Maxa Beam Strobe		9,298		1,700						10,998
136	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)										
137	DISMOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND SYS		19,226								19,226
138	MOUNTED WARRIOR										
139	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		36,874								36,874
140	CARGO AERIAL DELIVERY PROGRAM		42,653								42,653
141	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (ENG SPT)		5,552								5,552
142	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CSS EQ) PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT										
143	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		1,293								1,293
144	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		67,867								67,867

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
<b>WATER EQUIPMENT</b>											
145	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS		9,769								9,769
<b>MEDICAL EQUIPMENT</b>											
146	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		20,467		20,000						40,467
	Blood Bag Transport Modernization										
	Combat Support Hospitals						17,000				
<b>MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT</b>											
147	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)		54,732								54,732
148	WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD		3,051								3,051
149	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ)										
<b>CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT</b>											
150	GRADER, ROAD MITZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		2,902								2,902
151	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING		1,049								1,049
152	MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING		12,108								12,108
153	LOADERS		13,023								13,023
154	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR		2,475								2,475
155	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED		4,799								4,799
156	CRANES										
157	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)		47,846								47,846
158	CONST EQUIP ESP		40,209								40,209
159	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CONST EQUIP)		22,209								22,209
<b>RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT</b>											
160	SMALL TUG										
161	LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)										
162	HARBORMASTER COMMAND & CONTROL CENTER		9,265								9,265
163	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS		8,974								8,974
164	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		2,536								2,536
<b>GENERATORS</b>											



**Title 1 - PROCUREMENT**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization QTY.	COST	QTY.	Committee Change	COST	QTY.	Committee Increase	COST	QTY.	Committee Decrease	COST	QTY.	FY 2007 Committee Authorization	COST	QTY.
	<b>TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>		<b>1,640,967</b>		<b>(18,600)</b>			<b>47,500</b>			<b>(66,100)</b>				<b>1,622,367</b>	
	<b>SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS</b>															
	OPA2															
184	INITIAL SPARES - C&E		31,271												31,271	
	OPA3															
185	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP		2,202												2,202	
	<b>TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS</b>		<b>33,473</b>												<b>33,473</b>	
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		12,831												12,831	
	<b>TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>		<b>7,718,802</b>		<b>(748,523)</b>			<b>61,100</b>			<b>(809,623)</b>				<b>6,970,079</b>	
	<b>NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT</b>															
	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD															
	Restoration of ARNG End Strength Funding							318,000							318,000	
	<b>TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT</b>							<b>318,000</b>							<b>318,000</b>	
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>		<b>16,841,051</b>		<b>(320,812)</b>			<b>985,600</b>			<b>(1,306,412)</b>				<b>16,520,239</b>	

## Items of Special Interest

*Bridge to future networks*

The budget request contained \$340.2 million for bridge to future networks.

The Bridge to Future Networks program is comprised of two elements: area common user system (ACUS) modernization and joint network node (JNN). The committee is concerned about the Army's plan to meet its battle command network requirement for both the current and future force. The Army began the acquisition of the JNN with funds appropriated in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109-13) that would provide an urgent warfighting demand for a networking capability in support of the global war on terrorism. The JNN is not a program of record and the committee believes that continued procurement of JNN through emergency supplemental appropriations is not appropriate.

The committee further understands that the Department of Defense's Director of Operational Test and Evaluation and the General Counsel have determined that JNN should not proceed beyond low rate initial production before completing operational testing.

The committee also understands that the Army is developing the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T) program at the same time that it is procuring the JNN. According to the Army, WIN-T is the foundation for network-centric brigade operations and is applicable to not just the Future Combat Systems (FCS) force, but also to today's current force of modular brigade combat teams.

The committee is aware the Army has not developed a plan that assesses how best to transition from JNN to WIN-T. It remains unclear to the committee whether the Army will attempt to accelerate development of WIN-T or pursue a parallel course that continues to procure JNN while realigning the WIN-T program with FCS. Therefore, the committee included a provision (section 114) in this Act that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the analysis of how the JNN and the WIN-T will be integrated and whether or not there are opportunities to leverage JNN technologies and equipment as part of the WIN-T development effort.

*Combat medical support*

The budget request contained \$20.5 million for combat medical support, but included no funding for Golden Hour—4 units of red blood cells (GH4) and Golden Hour—30 units of red blood cells or frozen plasma (GH30) blood bags. The committee recommends more fully equipping the U.S. military with Golden Hour technology blood bags to enable safe transport of blood to the battlefield, resulting in more saved lives during military conflicts and increasing the availability of useable blood.

The committee recommends an increase of \$17.0 million for Golden Hour blood bags.

*Immersive group simulation*

The budget request included \$16.9 million for the Army's networked system of manned simulators, but included no funds for its immersive group simulation project.

The committee supports simulation efforts by the Army to replicate elements on the combined arms battlefield. This reduces overall training costs and provides training that might otherwise be foregone because of limitations on live training ranges. Immersive group simulations complement and enhance training programs by allowing groups of trainers to place groups of soldiers into synthetic training environments that replicate real world conditions to stress reactive and decision making capabilities, train on appropriate tactics and techniques, and make mistakes where the consequences are non-lethal.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$6.5 million for the immersive group simulation project.

*M915A3 production*

The budget request contained \$31.2 million for truck, tractor, and line-haul equipment, including funds to procure 160 M915A3 line-haul tractor trucks.

The M915A3 is used by Army transportation companies to transport breakbulk, containers, water and petroleum over primary and secondary roads. The committee notes that previous models of the M915 are experiencing operational readiness rates below the Army goal and are difficult to support. The committee also notes that there are significant inventory shortages across the Army, but particularly in transportation companies of the national guard and reserve forces.

The committee recommends \$40.5 million for truck, tractor, and line-haul equipment, an increase of \$9.3 million to accelerate fielding of the M915A3 to the Army National Guard.

*Simulated combat training capability for Army National Guard*

The budget request contained \$38.5 million for combat training centers support and other associated costs, but included no funds for simulated combat training capability systems for the Army National Guard.

The committee understands this system would provide effective pre-mobilization and post-mobilization home-station training for Army National Guard units engaged in the global war on terrorism. The committee recognizes that although there is no substitute for the robust live-fire and simulated training capabilities provided at Combat Training Centers (CTCs) and through the Joint National Training Capability (JNTC), this particular system would supplement CTC and JNTC activities, as well as provide additional training opportunities for Army National Guard units at their home stations. Furthermore, the committee believes that this additional training capability would potentially contribute to more effective CTC and JNTC training exercises for national guard units.

The committee recommends \$47.8 million, an increase of \$9.3 million to provide simulated, flexible and expandable combat training capability to Army National Guard units.

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$10.9 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of \$10.8 billion, a decrease of \$108.1 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 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 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	<b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>										
	<b>COMBAT AIRCRAFT</b>										
	<b>COMBAT AIRCRAFT</b>										
1	AV-8B (VSTOL)HARRIER (MYP)										
2	EA-18G	12	891,578							12	891,578
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(26,157)								(26,157)
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		39,753								39,753
4	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)										
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	30	2,362,471							30	2,362,471
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		(74,218)								(74,218)
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		52,954								52,954
6	F-35 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		245,016								245,016
	Program Decrease				(153,000)				(153,000)		
7	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	14	1,371,125							14	1,371,125
7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(66,438)								(66,438)
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		194,080								194,080
9	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	18	446,718							18	446,718
10	MH-60S (MYP)	18	573,458							18	573,458
10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(115,300)								(115,300)
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		90,401								90,401
12	MH-60R	25	911,854							25	911,854
12	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(116,592)								(116,592)
13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		120,480								120,480
14	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	2	265,015							2	265,015
14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(61,443)								(61,443)
15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)										
	<b>TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT</b>		<b>7,104,755</b>		<b>(153,000)</b>				<b>(153,000)</b>		<b>6,951,755</b>

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
<b>AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT</b>											
<b>AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT</b>											
16	UC-35										
17	C-40A										
18	C-37										
<b>TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT</b>											
<b>TRAINER AIRCRAFT</b>											
<b>TRAINER AIRCRAFT</b>											
19	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	12	376,361							12	376,361
20	JPATS Additional Systems	21	146,068	4	28,900					25	174,968
<b>TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT</b>											
			<b>522,429</b>		<b>28,900</b>		<b>28,900</b>				<b>551,329</b>
<b>OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>											
<b>OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>											
21	KC-130J	4	311,179							4	311,179
22	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(58,000)								(58,000)
23	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		45,737								45,737
24	F-5	5	2,530							5	2,530
24	VTUAV	4	37,570							4	37,570
<b>TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>											
			<b>339,016</b>								<b>339,016</b>
<b>MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT</b>											

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
<b>MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT</b>											
25	EA-6 SERIES		48,983								48,983
26	AV-8 SERIES		20,506								20,506
27	ADVERSARY		2,638								2,638
28	F-18 SERIES		411,524								411,524
29	H-46 SERIES		47,401								47,401
30	AH-1W SERIES		19,760								19,760
31	H-53 SERIES		28,252		3,000						31,252
	Emergency Egress Lighting System							3,000			
32	SH-60 SERIES		33,113								33,113
33	H-1 SERIES		7,426								7,426
34	EP-3 SERIES		56,797		10,000						66,797
	Service Life Extension							10,000			
35	P-3 SERIES		204,606		3,000						207,606
	High Resolution Digital Recorders							3,000			
36	S-3 SERIES		750								750
37	E-2 SERIES		9,087								9,087
38	TRAINER A/C SERIES		17,062								17,062
39	C-2A		37,157								37,157
40	C-130 SERIES		3,547								3,547
41	FEWSG		625								625
42	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		30,332								30,332
43	E-6 SERIES		99,184								99,184
44	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		40,190								40,190
45	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		14,300								14,300
46	T-45 SERIES		34,933								34,933
47	POWER PLANT CHANGES		24,580								24,580
48	JPATS SERIES		1,656								1,656

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
49	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		14,315								14,315
50	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		35,886								35,886
51	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		177,500								177,500
52	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		13,656								13,656
53	ID SYSTEMS		11,148								11,148
54	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		85,767								85,767
<b>TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT</b>			<b>1,532,881</b>		<b>16,000</b>		<b>16,000</b>				<b>1,548,881</b>
<b>AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>											
<b>AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>											
55	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		812,689								812,689
<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>			<b>812,689</b>								<b>812,689</b>
<b>AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT &amp; FACILITIES</b>											
<b>AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>											
56	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		426,673								426,673
57	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		9,472								9,472
58	WAR CONSUMABLES		34,916								34,916
59	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		19,501								19,501
60	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		64,968								64,968
61	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,671								1,671
62	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS										
<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>			<b>557,201</b>								<b>557,201</b>
<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>			<b>10,868,771</b>		<b>(108,100)</b>		<b>44,900</b>		<b>(153,000)</b>		<b>10,760,671</b>

## Items of Special Interest

*EP-3E service life extension*

The budget request contained \$56.8 million for EP-3E aircraft modifications, but included no funds for service life extension modifications in lieu of the Aerial Common Sensor (ACS) program cancellation.

The committee is concerned about the impact the cancelled ACS program may have on the qualitative service life of the EP-3E. The committee understands that continued support of the legacy EP-3E airframes and mission systems will be tenuous until a viable joint or service-specific replacement is identified and fully operational. The EP-3E capability contributes significantly to the national collection posture of the defense intelligence community and combatant commanders.

The committee understands that the EP-3E program was not fully prepared for the cancellation of the ACS, and that significant deficiencies to aircraft mission systems are expected in fiscal year 2007.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$66.8 million, an increase of \$10.0 million for additional service life extension modifications needed to sustain the EP-3E.

*H-53 series modifications*

The budget request contained \$28.3 million for H-53 series modifications, but included no funds for the advanced helicopter emergency egress lighting system (ADHEELS).

The ADHEELS provides crew escape lighting for helicopters in the event of water impact. The committee understands that the Department of the Navy has selected ADHEELS as its future helicopter escape lighting system due to its superior performance, significantly increased operational reliability, and lower life cycle costs, and has recently equipped all SH-60 helicopters with this system; and therefore, the committee recommends that the ADHEELS also be installed on the Navy's fleet of H-53 helicopters.

Consequently, the committee recommends \$31.3 million for H-53 series modification, an increase of \$3.0 million to begin the installation of ADHEELS in the Navy's H-53 helicopter fleet.

*P-3C modernization*

The budget request contained \$204.6 million for P-3C aircraft modifications, but contained no funds for the P-3C high resolution digital recorder.

The committee understands the P-3C aircraft has been used extensively in the global war on terrorism as a surveillance and targeting platform to provide time-sensitive targeting information to ground forces and other airborne assets. As part of the P-3C anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP) upgrade, a next generation high resolution combined video and radar recorder has been developed to replace the legacy recorder. The committee understands that without key technology upgrades and aircraft parts obsolescence management, the P-3C ability to meet the Navy's Fleet Response Plan will be degraded.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$207.6 million, an increase of \$3.0 million for procurement of ten high resolution digital recorders.

#### WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

##### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$2.6 billion for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of \$2.5 billion, a decrease of \$38.0 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 Weapons Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	<b>WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>										
	<b>BALLISTIC MISSILES</b>										
	<b>BALLISTIC MISSILES</b>										
1	TRIDENT II										
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)										
	<b>MODIFICATION OF MISSILES</b>										
2	TRIDENT II MODS		957,637		(38,000)						919,637
	Conventional Trident Modification										
	<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>										
3	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,453								3,453
	<b>TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES</b>		<b>961,090</b>		<b>(38,000)</b>						<b>923,090</b>
	<b>OTHER MISSILES</b>										
	<b>STRATEGIC MISSILES</b>										
4	TOMAHAWK	350	354,565							350	354,565
	<b>TACTICAL MISSILES</b>										
5	AMRAAM	150	98,651							150	98,651
6	SIDEWINDER	174	40,380							174	40,380
7	JSOW	397	125,551							397	125,551
8	STANDARD MISSILE	75	139,672							75	139,672
9	RAM	90	56,874							90	56,874
10	HELLFIRE										
11	AERIAL TARGETS		83,299								83,299
12	DRONES AND DECOYS										
13	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		8,990								8,990
	<b>MODIFICATION OF MISSILES</b>										

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
14	ESSM	108	99,571							108	99,571
15	STANDARD MISSILES MODS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		54,644								54,644
16	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,645								4,645
17	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		29,534								29,534
<b>TOTAL OTHER MISSILES</b>			<b>1,096,376</b>								<b>1,096,376</b>
<b>TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT</b>											
<b>TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.</b>											
18	SSTD (TORPEDO DEFENSE)	1,020	5,856							1,020	5,856
19	ASW TARGETS		25,034								25,034
<b>MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP</b>											
20	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS		96,505								96,505
21	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS		61,528								61,528
22	QUICKSTRIKE MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,103								3,103
23	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		26,345								26,345
24	ASW RANGE SUPPORT DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		13,288								13,288
25	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,259								3,259
<b>TOTAL TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT</b>			<b>234,918</b>								<b>234,918</b>
<b>OTHER WEAPONS</b>											
<b>GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS</b>											
26	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		12,508								12,508

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization		COST	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST		
<b>MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS</b>													
27	CIWS MODS		151,194									151,194	
28	COAST GUARD WEAPONS	1	5,385							1		5,385	
29	GUN MOUNT MODS		8,936									8,936	
30	PIONEER		7,056									7,056	
31	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS - MK 45	2	18,470							2		18,470	
32	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS	65	3,151							65		3,151	
33	OTHER												
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS												
<b>TOTAL OTHER WEAPONS</b>			<b>206,700</b>										<b>206,700</b>
<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>													
<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>													
34	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		55,936									55,936	
<b>TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>			<b>55,936</b>										<b>55,936</b>
<b>TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>			<b>2,555,020</b>										<b>2,517,020</b>
													<b>(38,000)</b>

## Item of Special Interest

*Conventional Trident modification*

The budget request contained \$957.6 million for Trident II missile modifications, including \$38.0 million for the conventional Trident modification (CTM) program. The budget request also contained \$111.1 million for strategic missile systems equipment, including \$12.0 million for CTM.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is working to develop the prompt, precision, global conventional strike capability called for in the 2001 Nuclear Posture Review, and in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review. The committee also understands that the existing Trident II weapons system provides an opportunity to develop a long range conventional strike capability by leveraging existing technology at relatively low risk.

However, the committee is concerned that the development of this conventional ballistic missile capability for a submarine that has historically carried nuclear armed ballistic missiles could cause a missile launch misinterpretation regarding which type of a warhead a ballistic missile may be carrying. The committee is encouraged that the Department has begun to engage military and civilian leaders of the international community to discuss the United States' intent behind this conventional strike capability, and is also developing measures to preclude misinterpretation of a conventional launch.

However, until this vital policy matter can be resolved, the committee recommends \$919.6 million for Trident II missile modifications, a decrease of \$38.0 million, and \$99.1 million for strategic missile systems equipment, a decrease of \$12.0 million.

## AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, NAVY &amp; MARINE CORPS

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$789.9 million for Ammunition Procurement, Navy & Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of \$758.8 million, a decrease of \$31.2 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 Ammunition Procurement, Navy & Marine Corps program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy & Marine Corps request are discussed following the table.

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
<b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY &amp; MARINE CORPS</b>											
<b>PROC AMMO, NAVY</b>											
<b>NAVY AMMUNITION</b>											
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		119,561								119,561
2	JDAM	3,400	84,014							3,400	84,014
3	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		15,473								15,473
4	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		16,140								16,140
5	PRACTICE BOMBS		44,573								44,573
6	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		33,999								33,999
7	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS		11,029								11,029
8	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		72,935								72,935
9	JATOS		4,643								4,643
10	5 INCH/64 GUN AMMUNITION		24,547								24,547
11	76MM GUN AMMUNITION										
12	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMO		5,729								5,729
13	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		21,772								21,772
14	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		32,647								32,647
15	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		9,189								9,189
16	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		1,197								1,197
<b>TOTAL PROC AMMO, NAVY</b>			<b>497,448</b>								<b>497,448</b>
<b>PROC AMMO, MC</b>											
<b>MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION</b>											
17	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES		24,365		(12,200)						12,165
	Transfer to Title XV										
18	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES		14,814		(7,400)						7,414

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	Transfer to Title XV										
19	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		8,032								8,032
20	.50 CALIBER		6,440		(3,200)						3,240
	Transfer to Title XV										
21	40 MM, ALL TYPES		39,369								39,369
22	60MM, ALL TYPES		2,947								2,947
23	81MM, ALL TYPES		57,351								57,351
24	120MM, ALL TYPES		32,858								32,858
25	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		9,536								9,536
26	9 MM ALL TYPES		4,197								4,197
27	GRENADAES, ALL TYPES		16,733		(8,350)						8,383
	Transfer to Title XV										
28	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		10,201						(8,350)		10,201
29	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		35,514								35,514
30	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE		9,529								9,529
31	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		8,282								8,282
32	FUZE, ALL TYPES		565								565
33	NON LETHALS		4,030								4,030
34	AMMO MODERNIZATION		7,732								7,732
35	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION										
	<b>TOTAL PROC. AMMO, MC</b>		<b>292,495</b>		<b>(31,150)</b>				<b>(31,150)</b>		<b>261,345</b>
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY &amp; MARINE CC</b>		<b>789,943</b>		<b>(31,150)</b>				<b>(31,150)</b>		<b>758,793</b>

## SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$10.6 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of \$11.2 billion, an increase of \$604.6 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 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 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization		COST
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST		
15	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)											200,000
16	DDG MODERNIZATION PROGRAM Program Increase		200,000			200,000						
17	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	2	520,670							2		520,670
<b>TOTAL OTHER WARSHIPS</b>			<b>8,000,715</b>		<b>600,000</b>	<b>600,000</b>						<b>8,600,715</b>
<b>AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS</b>												
<b>AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS</b>												
18	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP											3,469
18	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)											(3,469)
19	LPD-17											297,492
19	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)											(297,492)
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)											1,433,560
21	LHA (R)	1	1,433,560							1		1,433,560
21	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)											(297,643)
22	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)											(297,643)
<b>TOTAL AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS</b>			<b>1,433,409</b>									<b>1,433,409</b>
<b>AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM</b>												
<b>AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST</b>												
23	SPECIAL PURPOSE											
24	LCU(X)											410,643
25	OUTFITTING											49,845
26	SERVICE CRAFT											
	Weapon Retrieval Vehicle		4,600	1		4,600				1		4,600
27	LCAC SLEEP	6	110,692							6		110,692

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
28	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		577,849								577,849
28	SSN-774 (MEMO NON ADD)		[13,600]								[13,600]
28	LPD (MEMO NON ADD)		[93,400]								[93,400]
29	POWER UNIT ASSEMBLY FACILITY										
<b>TOTAL AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAMS</b>			<b>1,144,429</b>		<b>4,600</b>		<b>4,600</b>				<b>1,149,029</b>
<b>TOTAL SHIPBUILDING &amp; CONVERSION, NAVY</b>			<b>10,578,553</b>		<b>604,600</b>		<b>604,600</b>				<b>11,183,153</b>

## Items of Special Interest

*313 ship navy force structure*

The committee applauds the Chief of Naval Operations for developing the Navy's future force structure and the accompanying long-term shipbuilding plan to build it. This long-term plan provides the shipbuilding industry a view into the future that has been lacking. However, the committee is concerned that the plan was developed using unrealistic assumptions that will not make the plan executable. Of greatest concern to the committee is the affordability of the ship construction plan. According to the Navy's estimates, execution of this plan requires a significant increase in shipbuilding funds from \$8.7 billion in fiscal year 2006 to \$17.2 billion in fiscal year 2011. Obtaining these additional funds in a period of anticipated federal spending reductions will be difficult. The plan also assumes that individual ship acquisition programs can avoid the cost growth that has plagued most Navy ship acquisition programs.

The committee is concerned about the affordability of the Navy's long-term shipbuilding plan, recreating much of the uncertainty about the future of naval shipbuilding that the plan was designed to eliminate.

*Aircraft carrier force structure requirements*

The committee is concerned by the Chief of Naval Operations' plan to retire the USS *John F. Kennedy*. According to the Navy's long range shipbuilding plan, if the Navy retires the *Kennedy*, then the aircraft carrier force will drop to 11 between now and 2012, and then drop to 10 in 2013 and 2014. With the commissioning of CVN-78 in 2015, the aircraft carrier force increases to 11 and then back to 12 in 2019 and beyond.

The committee believes it is the objective of the Chief of Naval Operations to maintain a force of 12 aircraft carriers since the long range shipbuilding plan shows a total of 12 aircraft carriers between 2019 and the far range of the plan in 2036. It is apparent to the committee that the decision to allow the force structure to fall to 10 in the near future is fiscally rather than operationally driven.

The committee believes that the Navy should continue to maintain no less than 12 operational aircraft carriers in order to meet potential global commitments. The committee believes that a reduction below 12 aircraft carriers puts the nation in a position of unacceptable risk.

*Arleigh Burke class destroyer modernization*

The budget request contained \$2.2 million for the *Arleigh Burke* class destroyer (DDG-51) modernization program.

The committee understands that the DDG-51 modernization program is a comprehensive mid-life modernization effort to ensure mission relevant service life of 35 years for the *Arleigh Burke* class destroyers. The modernization will include hull, mechanical and electrical technology upgrades to reduce manning and total ownership costs, combat system integrated warfighting improvements, and installation of an open architecture computing environment to allow future ballistic missile defense, air defense and other upgrades. The committee also understands that this modernization ef-

fort will focus on earlier Flight I ships (DDG-51 to DDG-71) to ensure they support the Chief of Naval Operations Sea Power 21 requirements of Sea Strike, Sea Shield and ForceNet. The committee believes that because the next generation destroyer, DD(X), will not be fielded until 2013, the DDG-51 fleet must be modernized at an accelerated rate to take earlier advantage of the operating cost reductions and the improved combat system capabilities.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$200.0 million to accelerate the modernization program by two years.

#### *Battleship transfer*

In the conference report (H. Rept. 109-360) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006, the committee included instructions regarding the transfer of the battleships USS *Wisconsin* and USS *Iowa* to the Commonwealth of Virginia and State of California, respectively, and the President's reversion authority pursuant to a national emergency. The committee seeks to clarify that the battleships USS *Wisconsin* and USS *Iowa* must be regarded as potential mobilization assets and both the recipients and the U.S. Navy are instructed to treat them as such. The committee notes that the following measures should be taken: (1) the ships must not be altered in any way that would impair their military utility; (2) the ships must be preserved in their present condition through the continued use of cathodic protection and dehumidification systems and any other preservation methods as needed; (3) spare parts and unique equipment such as 16-inch gun barrels and projectiles, be preserved in adequate numbers to support the two ships, if reactivated; and (4) the Navy must prepare plans for the rapid reactivation of the two battleships should they be returned to the Navy in the event of a national emergency.

#### *Incremental funding for shipbuilding*

The budget request recommends incremental funding for 3 of the 7 ships in the request, including for the first time construction of a surface combatant, the next-generation destroyer DD(X). Furthermore, during the consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163), the Navy sought and was granted the authority to use incremental funding for the next aircraft carrier, which will be recorded as procured in 2008.

The committee remains concerned that the use of incremental funding is not a solution to the Navy's problem in funding shipbuilding. While incremental funding can allow the Navy to smooth out the dramatic spikes in shipbuilding funding required as a result of aircraft carrier construction every four or five years, it does not fundamentally increase the number of ships that a given amount of money will purchase. During the committee's hearings on shipbuilding, all witnesses emphasized the importance of program and funding stability as the top priority for reducing the cost of shipbuilding and sustaining the shipbuilding industrial base. The committee notes that Congress adopted the full funding policy in the 1950s in part because of a concern that incremental funding was detrimental to funding stability. Future congresses may find themselves unwilling, or unable, to fund completion of ships begun in prior years and only partially funded. The committee remains

convinced that the full funding policy is the correct policy for funding shipbuilding.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense this year considered submission of a legislative proposal that would permanently authorize the use of “split funding” for aircraft carriers and large deck amphibious ships, and the Navy’s fiscal year 2007 shipbuilding plan already assumes such authority for the second LHA class amphibious assault ship. The committee has approved the use of split funding for certain ships in certain cases. However, the committee does not believe that a blanket policy supporting incremental funding for any class of ship is appropriate, and has not included such a provision in the bill.

#### *Littoral combat ship program*

The committee is concerned about the uncertainty in the Navy’s acquisition strategy for the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS). The Navy recently announced its intention to continue with the Flight Zero design through fiscal year 2009. The Navy plans to procure 15 LCSs through this initial design phase. How long the Navy intends to continue with two separate designs for these vessels remains unclear. The committee believes that it is also unclear when the Navy will place this program into the discipline of the normal acquisition process with definitive and mature requirements and Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, review before continuing with procurement. The Navy’s long-range shipbuilding plan calls for procuring 55 LCSs, and the committee encourages the Navy to develop an acquisition strategy for the long-term that clarifies any ambiguity in the current build profile. The committee further encourages the Navy to downselect to one of the two LCS variants currently in procurement in order to achieve economy of scale, or present a compelling case to the congressional defense committees on why both variants should be procured.

#### *Next generation destroyer*

The budget request contained \$2.6 billion for split procurement of two next generation destroyers (DD(X)).

The committee does not believe the DD(X) is affordable. The committee supports recent efforts by the Navy to “design cost out” of the lead ship and to focus on threshold instead of objective requirements in an effort to reduce the risk of cost growth. However, due to the unusually large number of new technologies being integrated on the next generation destroyer, the committee understands there is no prospect of being able to design and build the two lead ships for the \$6.6 billion budgeted.

The committee is concerned that the Navy is attempting to insert too much capability into a single platform. As a result, the DD(X) is now expected to displace over 14,000 tons and by the Navy’s estimate, cost almost \$3.3 billion each. Originally, the Navy proposed building 32 next generation destroyers, reduced that to 24, then finally to 7 in order to make the program affordable. In such small numbers, the committee struggles to see how the original requirements for the next generation destroyer, for example providing naval surface fire support, can be met. In this day of netted operations, the committee advocates reducing the capabilities resident on the next generation destroyer, to instead rely on the netted sen-

sors and weapons systems of other ships in the strike group. By reducing the requirements for the DD(X), a smaller, less expensive destroyer could be procured in greater numbers.

Because of its expense, the committee does not believe that DD(X) will be procured in sufficient numbers to meet the operational need. However, the committee does believe that the DD(X) program's engineering development models show the potential for some impressive advances in warfighting capability. The committee supports the construction of up to two DD(X)s to demonstrate technologies that could be incorporated into future, more affordable, major surface combatants. The committee recommends that these ships demonstrate as wide a range of technologies as is reasonably feasible, including both the advanced induction and permanent magnet motor propulsion concepts that were originally investigated for DD(X).

Therefore, the committee recommends \$2.6 billion to fund one next generation destroyer as a technology demonstrator.

#### *Shipbuilding/ship repair industrial base capacity*

The committee believes that the ability to build naval ships and submarines is a critical national asset. Therefore, it is imperative that the United States sustain a healthy ship design, engineering and construction capability.

The first tier shipbuilding/ship repair industrial base is made up of six private and four public shipyards. Since there is very little commercial large-ship shipbuilding currently being executed in these shipyards, all 10 shipyards are almost wholly dependent on Department of Defense (DOD) work for sustainment.

The committee is concerned that the U.S. shipbuilding/ship repair industrial base has significant capacity beyond what is necessary for all anticipated DOD new construction and maintenance work, and believes that Navy ship acquisition programs are paying the price.

The Navy recently published a long-term shipbuilding plan that supports the goal of building and maintaining a 313 ship Navy by 2020. Although this plan provides the needed "stability" that the U.S. shipbuilding industry has been looking for, it does not appear to generate enough work to keep the major U.S. shipbuilders operating at their current capacity. Evidence of this is most obvious at General Dynamics Electric Boat Division where the contractor is planning to lay off hundreds of designers and engineers and thousands of production workers in the next several years. The plan to increase the procurement of *Virginia* class submarines from 1 to 2 per year has been delayed for over 10 years and the latest plan has the increase happening in fiscal year 2012. Similar challenges will affect the shipyards now constructing the last of the DDG-51 destroyers. Those yards are starting to ramp up to build the next generation destroyer, however, the next generation destroyer is not expected to be built in a sufficient quantity to keep the current workforce fully employed.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees on measures that can be taken to manage the capacity of the shipbuilding/ship repair industrial base in a manner that would make Navy shipbuilding more affordable. Such report shall be submitted by the submission of the President's

request for fiscal year 2008, as required by section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

#### *Ship cost estimates*

The committee is deeply concerned about the process used for establishing the Navy's ship cost estimates. The committee notes that the original cost estimates on numerous existing ship classes have regularly been described by the Navy as inaccurate and unrealistic when those ships near completion of construction. The committee notes that in several cases it has been informed that ship cost estimates delivered to the committee in prior years either intentionally or unintentionally excluded certain known shipbuilding costs such as escalation, and that these cost estimates were known to be inaccurate on the day they were first delivered to the committee. The committee recommends that the process for deriving ship cost estimates be revised to ensure that all major known elements of ship cost are routinely included in all ship cost estimates.

The committee notes that Sections 122, 123, and 124 of the bill would impose cost limitations on three current ship classes based on the Navy's latest costs estimates. The committee further notes that the imposition of these statutory cost limitations makes the need for a high level of confidence in the cost estimates for these ship classes unusually important. Accordingly, the committee directs that the Secretary of the Navy revalidate the cost estimates for CVN-21, for the ships currently programmed in the LHA Replacement program, and for the eight ships of the *San Antonio* class amphibious ship that follow the lead ship. The committee further directs that the revalidated costs estimates be submitted for review and approval by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. Finally, the committee directs that no later than July 1, 2006, the Secretary of the Navy submit a report in writing to the congressional defense committees containing the revalidated cost estimates for these ship classes including a certification by the Secretary that all known and anticipated major elements of cost have been included in the estimate.

#### *Virginia class submarine*

The budget request contained \$676.6 million for advance procurement funding for *Virginia* class submarines.

The committee believes that the Navy's attack submarine force structure must be maintained at no less than 48 submarines in order to meet potential global commitments. The Navy's Annual Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels for fiscal year 2007 shows that the force will decrease below 48 attack submarines between 2020 and 2033, reaching a low of 40 attack submarines in 2028 and 2029. The committee believes that a reduction below 48 attack submarines puts the country in a position of unacceptable risk.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$1.1 billion for advance procurement of *Virginia* class submarines, an increase of \$400.0 million for the procurement of a second *Virginia* class submarine in fiscal year 2009.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$5.0 billion for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of \$5.0 billion, an increase of \$74.9 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 Other Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.









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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
<b>SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS</b>											
76	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT		666								666
77	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		87,900								87,900
<b>SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS</b>											
78	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		12,291		2,100						14,391
	Mini-DAMA on Submarines										
<b>SHORE COMMUNICATIONS</b>											
79	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		2,788								2,788
80	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		1,145								1,145
81	NSIPS										
82	JEDMICS										
83	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		50,429								50,429
<b>CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT</b>											
84	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		101,749								101,749
<b>CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT</b>											
85	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		21,758								21,758
<b>OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT</b>											
86	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		41,133								41,133
<b>DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT</b>											
87	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT										
<b>TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT</b>			<b>1,721,323</b>		<b>15,350</b>		<b>15,350</b>				<b>1,736,673</b>
<b>AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>											
<b>SONOBUOYS</b>											
88	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES		66,943								66,943
<b>AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>											
89	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		56,226		8,000						64,226







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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization		Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
138	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		15,270										15,270
139	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		10,685										10,685
140	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		16,138										16,138
141	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		166,302										166,302
142	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		3,995										3,995
145	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT												
	OTHER												
146	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS												
<b>TOTAL PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>			<b>295,168</b>		<b>23,000</b>		<b>23,000</b>						<b>318,168</b>
<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>													
147	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		219,886										219,886
<b>TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>			<b>219,886</b>										<b>219,886</b>
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		8,841										8,841
<b>TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>			<b>4,967,916</b>		<b>74,850</b>		<b>86,850</b>		<b>(12,000)</b>				<b>5,042,766</b>

## Items of Special Interest

*AEGIS land-based test site modernization*

The budget request contained \$75.3 million for AEGIS support equipment, but included no funds for modernizing AEGIS land-based test sites.

The committee understands that the AEGIS land-based test sites are essential to the operational effectiveness of the AEGIS weapons system, including the development of an integrated missile defense system capable of providing a layered defense against ballistic and cruise missiles. The committee is aware that in order to maintain the highest possible level of effectiveness, the land-based test sites require state-of-the-art upgrades to peripheral emulators and switching systems used to collect and analyze combat system performance data. Modernization of the emulators and switches will ensure timely testing, certification and delivery of updated AEGIS baselines to the fleet.

The committee recommends \$80.3 million for AEGIS Support Equipment, an increase of \$5.0 million to be used for modernizing AEGIS land-based test sites.

*Amphibious ship integrated bridge system*

The budget request contained \$31.0 million for other navigation equipment, but included no funds for the amphibious ship integrated bridge system.

The committee is aware that the Navy has directed that all ships in the fleet will use electronic navigation/electronic charting by the end of fiscal year 2009. The committee believes that additional funding will allow for the conversion of amphibious ships to electronic navigation/electronic charting, allowing them to meet the Navy's goal. Conversion to electronic navigation/electronic charting will allow a reduction in bridge manning, saving an estimated \$0.6 million per ship per year, more than paying for the conversion in less than three years.

The committee recommends \$35.5 million for other navigation equipment, an increase of \$4.5 million to be used for the amphibious ship integrated bridge system.

*AN/SPQ-9B radar*

The budget request contained \$2.5 million for the AN/SPQ-9B radar, but included no funds for testing of the AN/SPQ-9B on the littoral combat ship (LCS).

The committee is aware that the two LCS variants now under construction are to be delivered with tactical/fire control radars chosen by the prime contractors. The committee believes that the AN/SPQ-9B tactical/fire control radar, already in the Navy inventory, may provide superior self-protection against anti-ship sea skimming missiles than the radars being provided. The AN/SPQ-9B radar has been thoroughly tested by the Navy and a successful radar operational assessment was completed in September 2002. The committee is aware that an identification friend or foe capability, an LCS requirement, was successfully added in 2005. The ability to provide volume surveillance, another LCS requirement, is presently under development and scheduled for completion in the spring or summer of 2006. The committee believes that additional

funds will be used for the procurement of the AN/SPQ-9B radar for the LCS program.

The committee recommends \$8.5 million for the AN/SPQ-9B radar, an increase of \$6.0 million to be used for the testing of the AN/SPQ-9B on the LCS.

*AN/SPS-48 radar obsolescence, availability and recovery*

The budget request contained no funds for radar support and no funds for the AN/SPS-48 radar obsolescence, availability and recovery (ROAR) program.

The committee is aware that the AN/SPS-48 ROAR program's goal is to maintain and support the air defense capabilities on aircraft carriers, amphibious assault ships and the *San Antonio* class amphibious warfare ships.

The committee recommends \$7.3 million for the AN/SPS-48 radar obsolescence, availability and recovery program to accelerate the ROAR program by two years.

*Boat lifts for small boats*

The budget request contained \$41.1 million for standard boats, but included no funds for boat lifts for shore-based small boats.

The committee understands that the current inventory and generally poor material condition of boat lifts at shore activities has reduced the level of boat readiness and increased lifecycle costs. The committee is aware that modern, state-of-the-art boat lifts, due to their design and capabilities, will expand boat service life, reduce maintenance costs, and permit quick and safe docking and boarding. Therefore, the committee recommends that modern commercial-off-the-shelf boat lifts be purchased and installed at small boat shore facilities to reduce lifecycle costs and improve operational readiness of the shore-based small boat fleet.

The committee recommends \$42.1 million for standard boats, an increase of \$1.0 million to be used for the procurement of modern boat lifts for shore activities.

*Canned lube pumps for amphibious ships*

The budget request contained \$172.8 million for items under \$5.0 million, but included no funds for installing canned lube pumps on the *Harpers Ferry* and *Whidbey Island* class amphibious ships.

The committee believes that the currently installed lube oil pumps have a high failure rate, leak excessively, and are driving up maintenance costs. Installation of the canned lube oil pumps will provide operating efficiency and reduce maintenance costs.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for items under \$5.0 million, to be used for installing canned lube pumps on the *Harpers Ferry* and *Whidbey Island* class amphibious ships.

*CVN propeller replacement program*

The budget request contained \$172.8 million for items under \$5.0 million, but included no funds for the CVN propeller replacement program.

The committee understands that the old-design propellers on the *Nimitz* class aircraft carriers suffer from blade erosion caused by cavitation and the high operating tempo of recent years. Propeller refurbishment on the outboard and inboard propellers is required

every three and six years, respectively. The committee believes that the new-design propellers will require refurbishment every 12 years, more closely corresponding to the interval of aircraft carrier drydockings. The committee also believes that propeller replacement will lead to increased ship operational availability and reduced disruptions to planned maintenance schedules.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million for items under \$5.0 million, to be used for the CVN propeller replacement program.

#### *Laser marksmanship training systems*

The budget request contained \$18.2 million for training support equipment, but included no funds to procure laser marksmanship training systems (LMTS) for the Navy Reserve.

The LMTS is a proven laser-based marksmanship training system that simulates live-fire training, can be used in various environmental conditions and locations, as well as allowing sailors to train with their own primary personal defense weapon to engage various types of targets.

The committee is aware this system contributes to individual sailor and unit readiness, improves skill retention, reduces unit training costs and achieves environmental cost avoidance associated with traditional live-fire training exercises. The committee understands the Navy Reserve has a program to field LMTS to all Navy Reserve Centers.

The committee recommends \$26.2 million for training support equipment, an increase of \$8.0 million to accelerate the fielding of LMTS to all Navy Reserve Centers.

#### *Man overboard identification system*

The budget request contained \$58.6 million for command support equipment, but included no funds for the man overboard identification system.

The committee is aware that the man overboard identification system provides an active means by which a Navy ship can be immediately alerted to a man-overboard incident and further allows for precise location of the individual in the water, thus reducing the chance of serious injury or death. Each sailor or marine wears a small transmitter on his life jacket, that, when activated upon water entry, transmits a signal to the ship identifying the specific sailor, the ship from which he fell and the global positioning system coordinates of the incident. A direction finder then tracks the location of the man-overboard during the rescue effort. Under the current installation plan, the Navy would provide man-overboard transmitters only to those sailors and marines identified as at risk, approximately a third of all crew onboard. The committee believes that the Navy needs to consider providing a transmitter for every crewmember on the ship, not just those considered at risk.

The committee recommends \$67.4 million for command support equipment, an increase of \$8.8 million to be used for the man overboard identification system.

#### *Materials handling equipment*

The budget request contained \$13.7 million for materials handling equipment (MHE), but contained no funding to procure an

11,000 pound rough terrain, self deployable, manually operated forklift system capable of operating efficiently in nuclear, biological, and chemical environments for the Navy Construction Force (NCF) Seabees.

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

The committee notes this system would address NCF Seabees lift requirements for fiscal year 2007. The committee recommends \$23.7 million in materials handling equipment, an increase of \$10.0 million to accelerate the procurement and delivery of 100 forklift material handling equipment systems for the NCF Seabees.

#### *Medical support equipment*

The budget request contained \$5.6 million for medical support equipment, but included no funding for 3,600 lightweight and NATO-standard litters and litter load carriage tools; 2,500 lightweight, combat medics' bags; or 4,500 onboard kits for tactical vehicles, which include pelvic stabilization devices, ear nose and throat packs, airway tools, and tourniquets. The committee recommends more fully equipping naval expeditionary forces to enable field medical personnel in tactical units to stabilize and evacuate casualties more rapidly, efficiently, and safely.

The committee recommends \$11.8 million for medical support equipment, an increase of \$6.2 million for combat casualty care equipment upgrades.

#### *Multi-climate protective system*

The budget request contained \$18.6 million for various aviation life support items, but included no funds for the multi-climate protective system (MCPS).

The MCPS is a modular protective aircrew clothing ensemble that provides flame protection, thermal protection, and sufficient insulation while reducing the heat stress and bulk commonly associated with cold weather clothing systems. Components of the system can be used in a wide range of temperatures and climate conditions. The committee understands that funding to procure 5,532 MCPSs has been obligated thus far, and that the Department of the Navy's MCPS requirement is for 25,000 systems. The committee believes that procurement of the MCPS should continue.

Accordingly, the committee recommends \$22.6 million for aviation life support, an increase of \$4.0 million for procurement of the MCPS. Additionally, the committee strongly encourages the Department of the Navy to include the necessary funds for the MCPS in its future budget requests to meet MCPS requirements.

#### *Multi-spectral threat emitter system*

The budget request contained \$56.2 million for weapons range support equipment, but included no funds for the multi-spectral threat emitter system (MTES).

The MTES provides a mobile surface-to-air and air defense artillery electronic threat simulation for aircraft along the East Coast of the United States to provide for more realistic aircrew proficiency training. The committee notes that Congress appropriated \$2.5 million for fiscal year 2005 and \$2.1 million for fiscal year 2006 for the MTES, and recommends authorization of additional funds to complete the procurement of two MTES systems.

Accordingly, the committee recommends \$64.2 million for weapons range support equipment, an increase of \$8.0 million for procurement of two MTESs.

*Serial number tracking system*

The budget request contained \$12.1 million for other supply support equipment, but included no funds for implementation of the serial number tracking system.

The serial number tracking system provides a web-based, cradle-to-grave total asset visibility of individual components through the supply, maintenance and transportation processes. The technology enables rapid and accurate data collection for information systems and permits logistics data to be used Navy-wide for increased readiness. The committee recommends the implementation of the serial number tracking system application in the areas of shipboard medical equipment, warehouse and ground support equipment management at Naval and Marine Corps Air Stations. The committee believes that the use of modern commercial-off-the-shelf automatic identification and data collection technologies like the serial number tracking system for critical asset management will yield significant improvements in productivity and effectiveness.

The committee recommends \$15.1 million for command support equipment, an increase of \$3.0 million to be used for implementation of the serial number tracking system.

*Submarine communications upgrades*

The budget request contained \$12.3 million for satellite communications systems, but included no funds for the Miniaturized Demand Assigned Multiple Access (mini-DAMA) communications set upgrades.

The committee understands that the mini-DAMA communications set provides communications links necessary for command and control of battlegroups, as well as for control, targeting and battle damage assessment for deployed tomahawk weapons. The committee is aware that due to program delays in the Joint Tactical Radio System, it is necessary to perform mini-DAMA upgrades in the submarine fleet to avoid degradation of combat missions.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.1 million to be used for mini-DAMA communications set upgrades in the submarine fleet.

*Submarine non-tactical application delivery interface system shore interface*

The budget request contained \$24.8 million for submarine training device mods, including \$2.9 million for the submarine non-tactical application delivery interface system (SNADIS) shore interface.

The committee recommends authorizing additional funds to allow the Navy to accelerate the development and integration of the shore command system with the existing deployed ship based SNADIS. When these two systems are fully integrated and sharing information, both the ship's commanding officer and shore commander will have the information available to assess and evaluate the readiness of the submarine force.

The committee recommends \$27.8 million for submarine training device mods, an increase of \$3.0 million to be used for the SNADIS shore interface.

#### *Ultrasonic maintenance tools*

The budget request contained \$172.8 million for items less than \$5.0 million, but included no funds for ultrasonic maintenance tools.

The committee understands that ultrasonic maintenance tools have the potential to significantly reduce ship maintenance man-hours by eliminating several time consuming maintenance procedures currently used to locate and identify compartment integrity breeches, fluid system leaks, bearing and gear anomalies and clogged engine fuel injectors. The committee believes significant cost-savings may be attained with maintenance reducing technology.

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

### PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

#### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$1.3 billion for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of \$1.2 billion, a decrease of \$49.7 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 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 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
<b>TOTAL WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES</b>			507,988	7,900	12,400	(4,500)					515,888
<b>GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT</b>											
<b>GUIDED MISSILES</b>											
19	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		3,894								3,894
20	JAVELIN										
21	HIMARS ROCKETS										
22	COMPLEMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPON SYSTEM	1	3,155							1	3,155
23	OTHER SUPPORT										
23	MISSILE MODIFICATION KITS - TOW	78	3,282							78	3,282
<b>TOTAL GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT</b>			10,331								10,331
<b>COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT</b>											
<b>COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS</b>											
24	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		7,752								7,752
25	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		13,088								13,088
26	AUTO TEST SYSTEMS										
27	GENERAL PURPOSE TOOLS & TEST SYSTEMS										
28	CALIBRATION FACILITIES										
28	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)										
29	GCCS - MC		14,304								14,304
30	MODIFICATION KITS		17,456								17,456
<b>COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)</b>											
31	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM										
32	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		4,061								4,061

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
			41,056								41,056
33	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS										
34	MAGTF CSSE &SE										
35	MULTIPLE ROLE RADAR SYSTEM										
36	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS										
	<b>RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)</b>										
37	RADAR SYSTEMS										14,796
38	RADAR SET AN/TPS-59										
39	TRANSITION SWITCH MODULE										
	<b>INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)</b>										
40	TACTICAL REMOTE SENSOR SYSTEM										
41	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEMS										
	Envelope Protective Covers for MEU Weapon Systems										
42	SMALL UNIT REMOTE SCOUTING SYSTEM (SURSS)										34,808
43	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
44	MOD KITS (INTEL)										
	<b>REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)</b>										
45	VISUAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS (VIS)										
	<b>OTHER COMMELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)</b>										
46	COMPLEMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPONS SYSTEM										
47	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT										
	Transfer to Title XV										
	<b>OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)</b>										
48	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES										67,230
49	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS										19,747
50	RADIO SYSTEMS										26,771
	Transfer to Title XV										
51	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS										49,190
52	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT										17,137





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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007		Committee		Committee		Committee		FY 2007	
		QTY.	COST	Change	Increase	Decrease	QTY.	COST	Authorization	QTY.	COST
	<b>TOTAL ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT</b>		158,774	9,200	16,600	(7,400)		167,974			
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
88	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		35,837					35,837			
	<b>TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>		35,837					35,837			
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS</b>		1,273,513	(49,700)	32,000	(81,700)		1,223,813			
	<b>TOTAL NAVY PROCUREMENT</b>		31,033,716	452,500	768,350	(315,850)		31,486,216			

## Items of Special Interest

*Envelope protective covers for marine expeditionary unit weapon systems and platforms*

The budget request contained \$31.8 million for fire support systems, but included no funds to procure envelope protective covers for Marine Corps Expeditionary Units' (MEUs) weapon systems and platforms.

The committee understands the Navy currently employs envelope protective covers for equipment platforms and weapon systems. The committee notes that widespread use of envelope protective covers by the Navy is generating higher equipment readiness ratings for protected naval weapon systems and platforms, as well as lower maintenance requirements, reduced manpower requirements, and higher return on equipment investments. The committee encourages the Marine Corps to field similar envelope protective covers to seven MEUs to cover such equipment platforms as the M777 lightweight 155mm howitzers and M198 155mm howitzers, as well as to capitalize on the economic and performance benefits provided by these protective covers.

The committee recommends \$34.8 million in fire support systems, an increase of \$3.0 million to procure envelope protective equipment covers for seven MEUs.

*Intelligent surveillance systems*

The budget request contained \$13.8 million for training devices, but contained no funding for a modular intelligent surveillance training system.

The committee understands a modular intelligent surveillance system would provide Marine Corps trainers with improved situational awareness of military personnel conducting urban training exercises, and would provide immediate feedback to the training unit in after action review format. Further, the committee is aware this system would allow trainers to observe in real-time a training event either from a "blue" or "opposing" force perspective; a capability not currently employed by existing training systems.

The committee recommends \$18.8 million for training devices, an increase of \$5.0 million to procure modular intelligent surveillance training systems.

*Laser perimeter awareness system*

The budget request contained \$5.2 million for physical security equipment, but included no funds to procure laser perimeter awareness systems (LPAS).

The LPAS is an all-weather surveillance sensor system that would detect the presence and track the motion of intruders, locating them in range, bearing, and elevation with respect to the position of the sensor.

The committee understands Marine Corps regulations governing the security of arms, ammunition, and explosives, as well as aviation assets, mandate constant surveillance and restricted access to these assets. The committee is aware that Marine Corps installations are currently equipped with base-wide electronic security systems that are outdated and require extensive modernization. The committee notes the LPAS would provide critical enhancements to

existing security and force protection technology to meet current Marine Corps security requirements outlined in the Marine Corps's Flightline Security Enhancement Program (FSEP), as well as increase the effectiveness of available security manpower.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$14.7 million for physical security equipment, an increase of \$9.5 million to procure three LPAS and associated equipment, as well as to address a Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded requirement.

#### AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

##### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$11.5 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of \$13.0 billion, an increase of \$1.6 billion, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 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 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
<b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>											
<b>COMBAT AIRCRAFT</b>											
<b>TACTICAL FORCES</b>											
1	F-35	5	988,109							5	988,109
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(118,405)								(118,405)
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		145,310		(88,000)						57,310
	Program Decrease								(88,000)		
3	F-22A		1,503,898	20	1,400,000					20	2,903,898
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)										
	Program Increase					20	1,400,000				
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		477,404								477,404
5	F-15E										
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)										
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)										
<b>TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT</b>			<b>2,996,316</b>		<b>1,312,000</b>		<b>1,400,000</b>		<b>(88,000)</b>		<b>4,308,316</b>
<b>AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT</b>											
<b>TACTICAL AIRLIFT</b>											
7	C-17A (MYP)	12	3,306,394	3	299,800	3	299,800			15	3,606,194
	Program Increase										
7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)				(670,202)						(670,202)
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)										
9	C-17 ICS										
<b>OTHER AIRLIFT</b>											
10	C-40										
11	C-130J	9	806,974							9	806,974



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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
23	GLOBAL HAWK	6	493,417							6	493,417
23	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(64,129)								(64,129)
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		63,903								63,903
25	PREDATOR UAV	26	229,095							26	114,545
	Transfer to Title XV				(114,550)				(114,550)		
	<b>TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>		<b>1,049,484</b>		<b>(106,550)</b>		<b>8,000</b>		<b>(114,550)</b>		<b>942,934</b>
	<b>MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT</b>										
	<b>STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT</b>										
26	B-2A		191,282								191,282
27	B-1B		53,255		4,500		4,500				57,755
	MSOGS Improvement Program										
28	B-52		70,147								70,147
29	F-117		24,422								24,422
	<b>TACTICAL AIRCRAFT</b>										
30	A-10		107,432								107,432
31	F-15		92,901								92,901
32	F-16		352,054								352,054
33	F-22A		216,095								216,095
34	T/AT-37										
	<b>AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT</b>										
35	C-5		176,112		44,500		44,500				220,612
35	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(19,734)								(19,734)
	AMP Kits			8			32,000			8	
	Defensive System Upgrade			10			12,500			10	
36	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		66,700		22,200		22,200				88,900
	RERP Kit										

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
37	C-9										
38	C-17A		251,404								251,404
39	C-21		1,322								1,322
40	C-32A		198								198
41	C-37A		404								404
	<b>TRAINER AIRCRAFT</b>										
42	GLIDERS		115								115
43	T-6		6,164								6,164
44	T-1		188								188
45	T-38		143,701								143,701
46	T-41 AIRCRAFT										
47	T-43		2,139								2,139
	<b>OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>										
48	KC-10A (ATCA)		6,761								6,761
49	C-12		929								929
50	C-20		513								513
51	VC-25A		1,027								1,027
52	C-40		198								198
53	C-130		217,677								236,977
	APN-241 Radar				19,300						
	Scathe View Communications						5,500				
	Senior Scout Shelter						1,800				
	Project RAINCOAT						7,000				
54	C-130J		39,001								39,001
55	C-135		83,541								83,541
56	COMPASS CALL		46,818								46,818
57	C-29A										
58	DARF		89,796								89,796



Title I - PROCUREMENT  
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
76	F-15		10,741								10,741
77	F-16		12,245								12,245
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS										
78	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		23,524								23,524
	WAR CONSUMABLES										
79	WAR CONSUMABLES		25,438								25,438
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES										
80	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		474,853		3,200						478,053
	P5 Combat Training System										
81	DEPOT MODERNIZATION		1,370								1,370
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS										
XX	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						3,200				
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF										
XX	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF										
85	CANCELLED ACCT ADJUSTMENTS										
	DARP										
86	DARP		13,000								13,000
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		8,572								8,572
<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>			<b>746,464</b>		<b>3,200</b>		<b>3,200</b>				<b>749,664</b>
<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>			<b>11,479,810</b>		<b>1,562,820</b>		<b>1,801,500</b>		<b>(238,680)</b>		<b>13,042,630</b>

## Items of Special Interest

*B-1B molecular sieve oxygen generation system*

The budget request contained \$53.1 million for B-1B aircraft modifications, but included no funds for the molecular sieve oxygen generation system (MSOGS) reliability improvement program.

The committee understands the MSOGS is the B-1B oxygen generation system which consists of a concentrator, water separator, and a back-up oxygen system that provides the aircrew with an unlimited source of oxygen for breathing during flight. The committee notes that while operating in forward basing locations containing a high humidity level, the rate of repair for the MSOGS has doubled causing negative impacts to operationally available aircraft. The committee is aware that the original equipment manufacturer has identified an improved, high-efficiency water separator that would enhance the reliability of the MSOGS, increase operational availability of the aircraft, and eliminate the need for a depot level repair.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$57.6 million, an increase of \$4.5 million for the MSOGS reliability improvement program.

*B-2 radar modification program*

The budget request contained \$191.3 million for B-2 modernization, including \$160.7 million for the B-2 radar modification program (RMP).

The committee understands that in October 2000, the Department of Commerce notified the Department of Defense that the B-2 must vacate its current operating frequency before a classified near-term date (NTD) and relocate to a frequency band where the U.S. Government is the primary user. The committee understands that this raised a significant challenge for the Air Force due to budget cycle timing. The committee notes the Air Force started the program in fiscal year 2003 to replace the B-2 radar system by the NTD and modeled the program around a traditional acquisition structure.

The committee notes the B-2 RMP plans to make a low-rate production decision in February 2007, to procure four radar modification units in fiscal year 2007. However, the committee understands that radar flight testing will not have progressed to the point that the first of two planned radar software blocks is fully tested and certified until the beginning of fiscal year 2008. Although flight testing will be underway, only 23 percent of the flight testing is expected to be completed by the beginning of fiscal year 2007. The committee recognizes that producing RMP units before ensuring that the design is mature and functions in its intended environment can increase the likelihood of design changes that lead to cost growth, schedule delays, and performance problems.

Although the committee realizes the challenges presented to the Air Force to correct the radar frequency issue promptly, the committee strongly discourages future programs from this methodology of proceeding into low-rate production before program components have been fully tested and certified.

*B-52 force structure*

The budget request included a proposal to retire 18 B-52 aircraft in fiscal year 2007, and 20 B-52 aircraft in fiscal year 2008.

The committee understands that the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review directed the Air Force to reduce the B-52 force to 56 aircraft and use the savings to fully modernize the remaining B-52s, B-1s, and B-2s to support global strike operations. However, the committee understands that the estimated \$680.0 million savings garnered from the proposed B-52 retirement in the remaining Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) has not been reinvested into modernizing the current bomber force, but has instead been applied towards Air Force transformational activities. The committee also understands that the current B-52 combat coded force structure is insufficient to meet combatant commander requirements for conventional long-range strike, if the need should arise to conduct simultaneous operations in two major regional conflicts.

Additionally, the committee is concerned that the decision to retire 38 B-52 aircraft is primarily based on the nuclear warfighting requirements of the Strategic Integrated Operations Plan, and did not consider the role of the B-52 in meeting combatant commander's conventional long-range strike requirements. The committee disagrees with the decision to reduce the B-52 force structure given that the Air Force has not begun the planned analysis of alternatives to determine what conventional long-range strike capabilities and platforms will be needed to meet future requirements.

The committee is deeply concerned that retirement of any B-52 aircraft prior to a replacement long-range strike aircraft reaching initial operational capability status is premature. Further, the committee strongly opposes a strategy to reduce capability in present day conventional long-range strike capability in order to provide funding for a replacement capability that is not projected to achieve initial operational capability until well into the future.

Therefore, the committee included a provision (section 131) in this Act that would prohibit the Air Force from retiring any B-52 aircraft, except for the one B-52 aircraft no longer in use by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for testing. Additionally, this section would require the Air Force to maintain a minimum B-52 force structure of 44 combat coded aircraft until the year 2018, or until a long-range strike replacement aircraft with equal or greater capability than the B-52H model has attained initial operational capability status.

*C-130 modifications*

The budget request contained \$217.7 million for C-130 modifications, but included no funds for the C-130 scathe view communication systems improvement, or for procurement of the AN/APN-241 radar for the Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC).

The C-130 scathe view system provides a near-real-time imaging capability to support humanitarian relief and non-combatant evacuation operations. The committee understands that the C-130 scathe view system currently has a short-range, line-of-sight capability to transmit full motion video, but this capability could be extended to longer ranges with a tactical common data link (TCDL) upgrade. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.8

million for procurement of a TCDL upgrade to the C-130 scathe view system.

The AN/APN-241 is a weather and navigation radar that replaces the 1950's-era AN/APN-59 radar currently installed on the AFRC's C-130 aircraft fleet. The committee understands that the AN/APN-241 radar has significantly improved performance capabilities and a much lower mean-time-between-failure rate. The committee also understands that procurement and installation of the AN/APN-241 radar is the second highest C-130 unfunded priority for the AFRC. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.5 million to procure AN/APN-241 radars for the AFRC's C-130 fleet.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.8 million for the C-130 scathe view communication systems improvement and an increase of \$5.5 million for the AN/APN-241 radar for the AFRC.

#### *C-5 modernization programs*

The budget request contained \$223.1 million for C-5 modernization programs, including \$50.4 million for the C-5 avionics modernization program (AMP), \$66.7 million for advanced procurement of three reliability and re-engining program (RERP) kits, and \$28.9 million for aircraft defensive systems.

The committee understands that the average C-5 aircraft has approximately 70 percent of its forecasted structural life remaining and supports the initiatives to modernize the C-5 fleet. The committee notes that the AMP and the RERP are expected to increase the C-5 wartime operational availability from a current average of 60 percent, to at least 75 percent. Further, the committee understands that the AMP and the RERP have the potential to reduce the total ownership cost of the C-5 aircraft fleet by \$24.0 billion (fiscal year 2005 dollars) over the remaining service life of the fleet, and that a return on investment of approximately \$13.0 billion (fiscal year 2005 dollars) could be realized by the year 2028.

The committee understands that C-5A aircraft are prohibited from directly delivering cargo into airfields assessed as having a man-portable air defense system (MANPADS) threat. Further, the committee understands that the C-5A aircraft must land at a base outside of these MANPADS threat areas and transfer its cargo onto another aircraft installed with an operational missile warning and countermeasure system, causing an increased delay in getting supplies and equipment to the warfighter.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$289.8 million, an increase of \$32.0 million for procurement of 8 additional AMP kits; an increase of \$12.5 million for procurement of 10, AN/AAR-47 and AN/ALE-47 missile warning and countermeasure dispensing systems; and an increase of \$22.2 million for advanced procurement of 1 additional RERP kit.

#### *C-9 hush kits*

The committee understands that funds appropriated in fiscal year 2005 for Department of the Air Force C-9 hush kits remain unobligated due to the near-term retirement of these aircraft from the inventory. Hush kits are required to allow the ground maintenance of C-9 engines to meet various locality noise standards for

engine ground-run maintenance. The committee also understands that the Department of the Navy plans to maintain its C-9 aircraft for at least the next 10 years, and therefore encourages the Department of Defense to transfer the funding provided for Department of the Air Force C-9 hush kits to the Department of the Navy, ensuring that these funds will be executed to best support the needs of the Department of Defense.

#### *F-22*

The budget request contained \$1.5 billion for the F-22 aircraft procurement program, but included insufficient funds to procure 20 F-22 aircraft in fiscal year 2007. 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 F-22 achieved its initial operational capability in the first quarter of fiscal year 2006.

The budget request included an F-22 multiyear acquisition strategy to procure 3 lots, numbered as lots 7 through 9, each consisting of 20 aircraft, between fiscal years 2008 and 2010. As part of this strategy, the budget request included a plan to incrementally fund each of these three lots over a three year period through budgeting for advance procurement two years prior to full funding, sub-assembly activities to be budgeted one year prior to full funding, and final assembly to be budgeted in the third year. The committee understands that the Department of Defense's F-22 multiyear acquisition strategy is inconsistent with the full-funding policy which would allow for advance procurement of long-lead items to protect a delivery schedule, and require a budget for procurement of complete and useable end items in a fiscal year.

The committee considers the F-22 incremental funding acquisition strategy to be wholly unacceptable. The committee believes that the full-funding policy should apply to the F-22 aircraft procurement program, and any other Department of Defense aircraft procurement program contemplated in the foreseeable future. The committee further believes that incremental funding of aircraft procurement programs presents an unacceptable budgeting risk that, due to unforeseen circumstances, future funding increments may not be authorized and appropriated to provide the required funding increments which would result in partially completed end items that are of no military value to the Department of Defense or to warfighting commands.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$2.9 billion to fully fund and procure 20 F-22 aircraft in fiscal year 2007, an increase of \$1.4 billion. The committee very strongly urges the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force to restructure its future F-22 procurement budget plans to comply with the full-funding policy.

#### *F-35*

The budget request contained \$245.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy for F-35 advance procurement to procure the long-lead items necessary to build eight short take-off and vertical land (STOVL) Navy and Marine Corps variants, which would be fully

funded in fiscal year 2008. The budget request also contained \$118.3 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for F-35 advance procurement to procure the long-lead items necessary to build eight conventional take-off and landing (CTOL) Air Force variants, which would also be fully funded in fiscal year 2008. Additionally, the budget request contained \$869.7 million for the first five CTOL Air Force F-35 variants.

The F-35 program, also known as the joint strike fighter (JSF) program, is developing a family of three strike fighter aircraft for the Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps. About 70 percent of the parts for all three fighter variants will be common. The Air Force CTOL variant will replace the F-16 and A-10 fleets; the Navy variant, or aircraft carrier version (CV), will complement the F/A-18E/F; and the Marine Corps variant, or short take-off, vertical landing (STOVL) version, will replace the AV-8B and the F/A-18C/D fleets.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 109-89) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, the committee recommended that the F-35 program not begin its low-rate initial procurement program in fiscal year 2007 because testing to determine whether or not the redesigned, lower-weight F-35 production configuration would meet mission requirements would not be known until after the first flights of the lower-weight STOVL and CTOL test aircraft. The committee notes that the first flight of the higher-weight CTOL aircraft has been delayed by three months, resulting in corresponding delays in the first flights of the lower-weight STOVL and CTOL test aircraft, now planned for the second and fourth quarters of fiscal year 2008, respectively.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on March 16, 2006, at which the Government Accountability Office (GAO) witness testified, that, "the JSF program remains committed to a business case that invests heavily in production before testing has demonstrated an acceptable level of performance of the aircraft," and that the "program expects to begin low-rate initial procurement in 2007 with less than one percent of the flight test program completed and no production representative prototypes built for the three JSF variants." As a result, the committee remains very concerned that concurrent development and production of the F-35 is likely to result in further cost increases and schedule delays. The committee notes that the GAO reports that only three percent of the flight test program will be complete in fiscal year 2008, and believes that JSF procurement for fiscal year 2008 should also remain at the fiscal year 2007 procurement quantity of five aircraft.

Accordingly, the committee recommends \$92.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy for the advance procurement of long-lead components for three STOVL F-35 aircraft in fiscal year 2008, a decrease of \$153.0 million. The committee also recommends \$30.3 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for the advance procurement of long-lead components for two CTOL F-35 aircraft in fiscal year 2008, a decrease of \$88.0 million.

#### *KC-135 aerial refueling aircraft recapitalization program*

The budget request contained \$36.1 million for advanced procurement for the KC-135 aerial refueling aircraft recapitalization pro-

gram (KC-X). The budget request included a proposal to retire 78 KC-135E aircraft.

The committee fully supports recapitalization of the KC-135 aerial refueling fleet. The committee notes that a system development and design contract would likely not be awarded until the end of fiscal year 2007, in accordance with the estimated acquisition schedule of the Air Force. The committee believes it is premature to authorize advanced procurement funding at such an early stage of the KC-X program.

The committee notes that the Air Force has been restricted since fiscal year 2004 from retiring KC-135E aircraft. However, the committee believes that it is premature to retire 78 KC-135E aircraft in fiscal year 2007 based on the tanker recapitalization program still being in its early stages of execution. The committee recognizes that 29 of the requested 78 KC-135E aircraft selected for retirement have been grounded from flight since fiscal year 2004.

Therefore, the committee included a provision (section 135) in this Act that would permit the Secretary of the Air Force to retire the 29 KC-135E grounded aircraft, and require the Secretary of the Air Force to maintain all retired KC-135Es, beginning in fiscal year 2007, in a condition that would allow recall to future service in the Air Force reserve, guard, or active forces aerial refueling force structure. The committee will consider additional KC-135E retirements based on the future progress of the KC-X program. Lastly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$36.1 million for advanced procurement for the KC-X program.

#### *P5 combat training systems*

The budget request contained \$474.9 million for other production charges, including \$4.9 million for the P5 combat training system (P5CTS).

The P5CTS is an airborne instrumentation subsystem pod used by fighter and attack aircraft which provides the capability to conduct air-to-air, air-to-surface, and electronic warfare combat training while providing real-time aircraft monitoring and recording events for post-mission debrief and analysis. The committee notes that the P5CTS budget for fiscal year 2006 was \$13.9 million and had been planned for \$14.1 million in fiscal year 2007, but understands that this amount was decreased to \$4.9 million because the Department of the Air Force reprogrammed \$9.2 million for other purposes. As a result, the committee further understands that this decrease will delay P5CTS fielding at various Air Force Bases (AFB), including Shaw AFB where the current P5CTS fielding plan will meet only half of its requirement for 48 P5CTSs.

To address this shortfall, the committee recommends \$478.1 million for other production charges, an increase of \$3.2 million to procure 24 additional P5CTSs.

#### *Strategic airlift force structure*

The budget request contained \$2.6 billion for procurement of 12 C-17s, including \$389.6 million for shutdown costs of the production line.

The Commander, U.S. Transportation Command and the Commander, Air Mobility Command, both testified before the House Committee on Armed Services March 2, 2006, that no more than

20 C-17s, in addition to the 180 C-17s currently in the Department of Defense's program of record, are needed to meet both the inter-theater and intra-theater airlift requirements, and provide a recapitalization solution for older C-17s being used at a higher than planned utilization rate. Further, the Commanders testified that the range of 292 to 383 strategic airlift aircraft set forth in the Mobility Capability Study (MCS), should not be considered a strict composition of a specific type of aircraft, but should instead be considered a capacity requirement based on an acceptable level of risk. Lastly, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force identified seven additional C-17s as the number one request on the Air Force's unfunded priority list.

The committee is concerned that the decision by the Department to maintain a strategic airlift force structure of 292 aircraft is not based on meeting future airlift requirements, but based on fiscal constraints. Further, the committee is concerned about the acceptable level of risk provided with a strategic airlift force structure of 292 aircraft with critical uncertainties such as defining future Army modularity and intra-theater airlift requirements, the outcome of the C-5 modernization program, the C-130 wing-box repair strategy, and the viability of the Civil Reserve Airlift Fleet to augment future airlift requirements. The committee is concerned that the MCS scenarios used for the modeled year were not intended to fully stress the defense transportation system and is deeply concerned by the shortsightedness of the MCS to project capabilities required past the year 2012. The committee supports the initiative to modernize the C-5 fleet and supports the evaluation of a C-5A aircraft in the Reliability Enhancement and Re-engining Program (RERP) configuration. Lastly, the committee urges the Secretary of the Air Force when determining the composition of the future strategic airlift fleet, to thoroughly examine the benefits of including both the C-5 and C-17 platforms.

Therefore, the committee included a provision (section 132) in this Act that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to maintain a minimum strategic airlift aircraft force structure of 299 aircraft beginning in fiscal year 2009. Additionally, the provision would repeal section 132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136), to allow the Air Force flexibility in managing its strategic airlift fleet composition. Lastly, the committee recommends \$2.9 billion, an increase of \$299.8 million for procurement of 3 additional C-17s. The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to apply the \$389.6 million of shutdown costs towards the procurement of these 3 additional C-17s.

#### *T-38 ejection seat upgrade program*

The T-38 ejection seat upgrade program (ESUP) upgrades the T-38 ejection seat system with an inter-seat sequencing system that would accommodate a larger population of pilot heights and weights.

The committee notes that the Air Force maintains an inventory of 509 T-38 aircraft, but only 243 aircraft are planned for the ESUP. The committee strongly encourages the Air Force to budget for the ESUP for the entire T-38 fleet.

## AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$1.1 billion for Ammunition Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of \$1.1 billion, an increase of \$4.0 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 Ammunition Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY	COST	QTY	COST	QTY	COST	QTY	COST	QTY	COST
<b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE</b>											
<b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE</b>											
<b>ROCKETS</b>											
1	ROCKETS		58,671								58,671
<b>CARTRIDGES</b>											
2	CARTRIDGES		168,499								168,499
<b>BOMBS</b>											
3	PRACTICE BOMBS		15,036								15,036
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS Insensitive Munitions Upgrade		235,533	4,000			4,000				239,533
5	SENSOR FUZED WEAPONS	305	118,887							305	118,887
6	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	7,261	175,013							7,261	175,013
7	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER FLARE, IR MJU-7B	250	34,704							250	34,704
8	CADIPAD		29,909								29,909
9	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL		3,091								3,091
10	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		4,705								4,705
11	INITIAL SPARES										
12	MODIFICATIONS		919								919
13	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 M		4,083								4,083
<b>FUZES</b>											
14	FLARES		161,958								161,958
15	FUZES		56,777								56,777
<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE</b>			<b>1,067,785</b>	<b>4,000</b>		<b>4,000</b>		<b>4,000</b>			<b>1,071,785</b>
<b>WEAPONS</b>											

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	<b>SMALL ARMS</b>										
16	SMALL ARMS		4,964								4,964
	<b>TOTAL WEAPONS</b>		<b>4,964</b>								<b>4,964</b>
<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE</b>			<b>1,072,749</b>		<b>4,000</b>		<b>4,000</b>		<b>4,000</b>		<b>1,076,749</b>

## Item of Special Interest

*Insensitive munitions upgrade*

The budget request contained \$235.5 million for general purpose bombs of various types and weights. The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force indicates that 40 percent of the MK-84 2,000-pound general purpose (GP) bombs requested for fiscal year 2007 would be loaded, assembled and packed with a new, more expensive explosive fill, known as MNX-795, instead of trinitrotoluene (TNT), which are classified as insensitive munitions (IMs).

IMs are those providing a higher degree of safety in the handling, manufacturing, storage, and use because they are more insensitive to unplanned stimuli. The committee understands that IMs will provide substantial improvements in decreasing unplanned high-order detonations due to heat induced by fire, bullet impact, fragment impact, and adjacent detonations; and the committee believes that the percentage of IMs procured for fiscal year 2007 should be expanded.

Accordingly, the committee recommends \$239.5 million for general purpose bombs, an increase of \$4.0 million to procure additional IMs.

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$4.2 billion for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of \$4.2 billion, a decrease of \$32.7 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	<b>MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>										
	<b>BALLISTIC MISSILES</b>										
	<b>MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC</b>										
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIP - BALLISTIC		34,344								34,344
	<b>TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES</b>		<b>34,344</b>								<b>34,344</b>
	<b>OTHER MISSILES</b>										
	<b>TACTICAL</b>										
2	JASSM	234	187,165							234	187,165
3	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON										
4	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	195	43,834							195	43,834
5	AMRAAM	215	135,869							215	135,869
6	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	677	65,312							677	32,662
	Transfer to Title XV						(32,650)				
7	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	1,343	99,062							1,343	99,062
	<b>INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES</b>										
8	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS/POL PREVENTION		2,236								2,236
	<b>TOTAL OTHER MISSILES</b>		<b>533,478</b>				<b>(32,650)</b>				<b>500,828</b>
	<b>MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES</b>										
	<b>CLASS IV</b>										
9	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		1,352								1,352
10	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIP - BALLISTIC		833								833
11	MM III		691,657								691,657
12	AGM-65D MAVERICK		246								246

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
13	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE		9,708								9,708
<b>TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES</b>			<b>703,796</b>								<b>703,796</b>
<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>											
14	MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS		50,602								50,602
<b>TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>			<b>50,602</b>								<b>50,602</b>
<b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>											
<b>SPACE PROGRAMS</b>											
15	ADVANCED EHF										
16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)										
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)										
17	WIDEBAND GAPPILLER SATELLITE (SPACE)	1	413,868							1	413,868
17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(50,217)								(50,217)
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		50,700								50,700
19	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		10,085								10,085
20	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		139,182								139,182
20	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(42,000)								(42,000)
21	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT		43,259								43,259
22	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		86,720								86,720
23	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)		38,391								38,391
24	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM (SPACE)										
25	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS (SPACE)		31,126								31,126
26	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH (SPACE)	4	936,490							4	936,490
27	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)		102,004								102,004



## OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$15.4 billion for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of \$15.4 billion, an increase of \$20.6 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 Other Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.













## Items of Special Interest

*Cheyenne Mountain complex*

The budget request contained \$19.3 million for procurement of the Cheyenne Mountain Complex, including \$14.9 million for tactical warning/attack assessment systems.

The committee believes that the modernization and integration of the command and control systems at Cheyenne Mountain, Colorado is critical to adequately support the North American Aerospace Defense Command, U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Strategic Command. However, the committee is aware of management deficiencies in the Commander's integrated command and control system (CCIC2S) program, which are resulting in a significant cost overrun and an undefined delivery schedule. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to maintain essential operation and maintenance activities, and limit future investment to only the developmental activities deemed essential to national security needs.

The committee recommends \$4.4 million for procurement of the Cheyenne Mountain Complex, a decrease of \$14.9 million.

*Combat survivor radios*

The budget request contained a total of \$69.2 million for combat survivor evader locator (CSEL) radios for the Departments of the Army, Navy and Air Force.

The CSEL radio provides combat forces with secure, encrypted, low probability of exploitation, two-way, over the horizon, near real-time data-burst communications with precise location and non-secure, unencrypted line-of-site voice and beacon capability to support survival evasion, and personnel recovery operations. In the committee report (H. Rept. 109-89) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, the committee expressed its belief that procurement funds should be made available for either the CSEL, or an alternate survival radio, to meet immediate user requirements since the CSEL radio program was late in delivering radios to meet warfighter needs. The committee understands that the Department of Defense requires over 40,000 survival radios, that the CSEL radio program has been able to meet less than a third of those requirements thus far, and that combatant commanders still have an urgent need for survival radios.

Therefore, the committee directs that procurement funds requested for CSEL radios be made available to procure either CSEL radios or alternate survival radio systems that can address the urgent survival radio need.

*Combat training ranges*

The budget request contained \$35.4 million for combat training ranges, but included no funds for the unmanned threat emitter (UMTE) modernization program.

The UMTE modernization program provides updated electronic threat simulations for combat aircrew training. The committee understands that the UMTEs located at the Eielson Air Combat Training Range have been modernized to more accurately replicate current electronic threat systems and that this upgrade has also reduced manpower, operations and support costs. The committee fur-

ther understands that five UMTEs located at the Nellis Test and Training Range require the UMTE modernization, and believes that these systems should be upgraded.

Consequently, the committee recommends \$47.4 million for combat training ranges, an increase of \$12.0 million for the UMTE modernization program.

*Enterprise data collection solution*

The budget request contained \$14.6 million for mechanized material handling equipment, but included no funding for the Enterprise Data Collection Solution (EDCS). The committee understands that the EDCS assembles data from various Air Force logistics systems across the enterprise, thus eliminating the need to manually enter data for each transaction. This system will not only save time and money, but it will reduce errors and speed the flow of logistics.

The committee recommends \$18.6 million for mechanized material handling equipment, an increase of \$4.0 million for the procurement of common EDCS equipment for four key Air Force installations.

*Force protection near real time surveillance*

The budget request contained \$41.4 million for various types of Air Force physical security systems, but included no funds for the force protection surveillance system (FPSS).

The FPSS consists of a tactical communications intercept system, a near real-time video surveillance system, and a tactical internet communications system for dissemination of surveillance information. The committee notes that Congress appropriated an increase of \$1.0 million for fiscal year 2006, and believes that additional FPSSs should be acquired.

Accordingly, the committee recommends \$44.4 million for Air Force physical security systems, an increase of \$3.0 million for the acquisition, deployment and integration of the FPSS into mission planning systems and surveillance platforms.

*High frequency ground control station antennas*

The budget request contained \$7.7 million for radio equipment, including \$1.3 million for high frequency ground control station (HFGCS) antennas.

The HFGCS is a strategic and tactical command and control network that provides beyond line-of-sight interoperable voice and data for aircrews. The HFGCS serves as the primary command and control resource for the Air Mobility Command's (AMC) cargo and tanker aircraft. The committee understands that most of AMC's HFGCS antenna inventory is nearing or past its design life and that numerous high frequency antenna are inoperative. The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff included 20 additional HFGCS antennas among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2007.

Consequently, the committee recommends \$12.7 million for radio equipment, an increase of \$5.0 million for the procurement of 20 HFGCS antennas.

*Mobile approach control system*

The budget request contained \$6.2 million for air traffic control and landing systems, but included no funds to procure a mobile approach control system (MACS).

The MACS provides military forces with next-generation mobile air traffic control services, day and night, in all weather conditions, to military and civilian aircraft, and will replace the aging TPN-19 and MPN-14K landing control centers employed by the Department of the Air Force combat communications squadrons and Air National Guard (ANG) air traffic control squadrons. The committee understands that of 10 ANG air traffic control squadrons, only 4 have the MACS, and believes that its procurement for the ANG should continue.

Consequently, the committee recommends \$23.5 million for air traffic control and landing systems, an increase of \$17.3 million for one MACS for the ANG.

*Self-deploying infra-red streamer*

The budget request contained no funds for personal safety and rescue equipment items less than \$2.0 million, or for the self-deploying infra-red streamer (SDIRS) system.

The SDIRS system is an 11-inch by 40 foot orange rescue streamer distress signal which includes a water-activated light system. The SDIRS is used in ejection seat-equipped aircraft and is automatically deployed in the event of a water landing. The committee believes that this system assists in more rapidly locating and rescuing downed crew members and that it should be installed on all Department of the Air Force ejection seat-equipped aircraft.

Consequently, the committee recommends \$4.0 million for personal safety and rescue equipment items less than \$2.0 million, an increase of \$4.0 million for procurement and installation of 5500 SDIRS systems.

## PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 contained \$2.9 billion for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authorization of \$2.9 billion, a decrease of \$5.0 million, for fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2007 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.





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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
36	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		86,758								86,758
37	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS										
38	MC-130H AIR REFUELING SYSTEM		1,522								1,522
39	MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM		59,812								59,812
40	MH-60 SOF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		91,902								91,902
41	MC-130H, COMBAT TALON II		158,824								158,824
42	CV-22 SOF MOD		168,780								168,780
43	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION	2	1,131							2	1,131
44	C-130 MODIFICATIONS		49,763								49,763
45	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		1,143								1,143
	<b>SHIPBUILDING</b>										
46	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)		12,629								12,629
47	MK8 MOD1 SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE		2,473								2,473
	<b>AMMUNITION PROGRAMS</b>										
48	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT		43,679								43,679
49	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION		13,604								13,604
	<b>OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS</b>										
50	COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS		70,410								70,410
51	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		32,743								32,743
52	SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS		105,788								105,788
54	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS		1,831								1,831
55	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES		9,608								9,608
56	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		20,204								20,204
57	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		5,302								5,302
59	TACTICAL VEHICLES		13,196								13,196
60	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATIONS SYS		12,841								12,841
61	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS										
62	MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT		3,090								3,090

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007 Authorization		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee Authorization		COST
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	
63	UNMANNED VEHICLES		20,700									20,700
65	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT		2,655									2,655
66	DRUG INTERDICTION											
67	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		13,074									13,074
68	SPECIAL OPERATIONS MISSION PLANNING ENVIRONMENT											
69	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		434,472		10,000							444,472
	Craft Modifications											
	LAN Crypto Devices						8,200					
70	PSYOP EQUIPMENT		93,881				1,800					93,881
	<b>TOTAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND</b>		<b>1,531,815</b>		<b>10,000</b>		<b>10,000</b>					<b>1,541,815</b>
	<b>CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE</b>											
	<b>CBDP</b>											
71	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION		86,157									86,157
72	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION		76,732									76,732
73	DECONTAMINATION		16,793									16,793
74	JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM		47,113									47,113
75	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION		43,508									43,508
76	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE		236,120									236,120
	<b>TOTAL CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE</b>		<b>506,423</b>									<b>506,423</b>
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		414,328									414,328
	<b>TOTAL CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>		<b>414,328</b>									<b>414,328</b>
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>		<b>2,861,461</b>		<b>(5,000)</b>		<b>10,000</b>		<b>(15,000)</b>			<b>2,856,461</b>

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

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2007		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2007 Committee	
		Authorization	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	Authorization	QTY.
1	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES			[18,484]							[18,484]
<b>TOTAL DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES</b>											
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION											
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION-O&M											
OPERATIONS AND MAINTANCE											
1	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M			1,046,290							1,046,290
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION- RDT&E											
2	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDT&E			231,014							231,014
PROCUREMENT											
3	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION- PROC										
<b>TOTAL CHEM AGENTS &amp; MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION</b>											
				1,277,304							1,277,304
<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT</b>											
				84,178,322		1,681,408		3,614,750		(1,933,342)	85,859,730

## Items of Special Interest

*Advanced SEAL Delivery System*

The committee acknowledges the Department of Defense's recent decision to cancel the Advanced SEAL Delivery System (ASDS) program due to its performance and reliability to date. The committee has expressed its continued concern regarding technical issues, contractor performance, and cost growths throughout the life of the program and will continue to closely monitor the development and fielding of this capability. Additionally, due to the troubled history surrounding the development of ASDS, the committee wants to ensure that the ASDS improvement program (AIP) and accompanying ASDS concept study consider the most current technologies for incorporation into future ASDS capabilities and designs.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an ASDS design competition during fiscal year 2007 and authorize an additional \$10.0 million in research and development funding specifically for this competition. Design competition in fiscal year 2007 will ensure that ASDS program decisions made upon completion of the critical systems review portion of the AIP and of phase three of the ASDS concept study take into account current technologies and designs available through related industry research and development as well as the lessons learned from the critical systems review and ASDS concept study. Finally, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by June 1, 2007, on the results of the AIP's critical systems review and on the status of an overall ASDS program decision.

*Chemical and biological defense procurement*

Section 1703 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160) establishes the Chemical and Biological Defense Program. The Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical and Biological Defense (JPEO(CBD)) is now the joint services single focal point for advanced research and development, acquisition, fielding, and lifecycle support of chemical and biological defense equipment. Nevertheless, the military services possess legacy chemical and biological defense equipment, procured prior to the establishment of the JPEO(CBD). The committee directs the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Chemical and Biological Defense Programs, acting through the JPEO(CBD), in coordination with the military services, to develop a modernization plan for legacy nuclear, biological, and chemical contamination avoidance; biological defense; collective protection; individual protection; and decontamination systems and to also develop service sustainment plans for systems initially fielded by the JPEO(CBD).

*Special operations forces operational enhancements*

The budget request contained \$434.5 million for special operations forces (SOF) operational enhancements, but included no funds for secure wireless local area network (LAN) cryptographic devices, and only \$2.5 million for craft modifications.

The committee recognizes that U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) has the need to access and transmit classified data over a wireless LAN. Funding would allow USSOCOM to replace the legacy SECNET 11 wireless card with the SECNET 54 card. The committee notes that this item is on the unfunded priority list of the Commander, USSOCOM to provide required secure wireless capability.

The committee recognizes that naval special warfare relies on maritime combatant craft platforms to conduct target interdiction and insertion/extraction of combatant forces. Additional funds for craft modifications would fully equip the entire operational inventory with key technological upgrades. The committee notes that this item is on the unfunded priority list of the Commander, USSOCOM to accelerate technology insertion into this platform.

The committee recommends \$444.5 million for SOF operational enhancements, an increase of \$1.8 million for the procurement of secure wireless LAN cryptographic devices, and an increase of \$8.2 million for craft modifications.

#### *Unmanned aerial systems to counter improvised explosive devices*

The committee is aware of numerous systems being offered by non-traditional defense companies seeking to support the global war on terrorism by providing already developed capabilities to counter the improvised explosive device threat.

The committee recommends that the Department of Defense fully review and consider all viable sensor technologies and currently available conventional and vertical take-off and landing unmanned aerial vehicles to address the improvised explosive device threat.

#### *U.S. Special Operations Command aviation modernization*

The committee recognizes that U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) relies primarily on the modification of C-130 aircraft to special operations-capable aircraft to provide its fixed wing special operations mission capability. USSOCOM has maintained its AC-130 and MC-130 fleet through several upgrade programs, to sustain USSOCOM's mission capability until a future fleet of special operations aircraft could be developed and fielded. Because of the increased operating hours placed on USSOCOM's fleet from on-going combat operations, USSOCOM will be unable to maintain its fixed wing capability until a future fleet can be fielded. The committee further understands that the C-130J model aircraft offers USSOCOM a platform that can be recapitalized and modified into tanker, infiltration/exfiltration, and gunship platforms.

Further, the committee recognizes that USSOCOM is expanding its fixed wing fleet with the CV-22 aircraft. The current CV-22 program projects an initial operating capability of 10 aircraft by fiscal year 2009 and a full operational capability of 50 aircraft by fiscal year 2017.

The committee believes that accelerated procurement both of the C-130J for conversion into special operations capable aircraft and of the CV-22 would allow USSOCOM to maintain its special operations mission capability that is currently stretched due to USSOCOM's high operational tempo. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by April 1, 2007, to the

Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the feasibility of accelerated procurement of the CV-22 and the C-130J aircraft.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

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

These sections would authorize the recommended fiscal year 2007 funding levels for all procurement accounts.

### SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

#### Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles

This section would grant authority to the Secretary of the Army in fiscal year 2008 to enter into a 3-year multiyear procurement (MYP) contract for the family of medium tactical vehicles (FMTV) for fiscal years 2008–2010. This section would require that should the Secretary of the Army exercise his MYP authority for FMTVs, the contract would follow all federal procurement regulations including full and open competition. Finally, this section would also require that FMTVs procured under this MYP contract to incorporate improvements from lessons learned from operations involving the global war on terrorism, as well as existing FMTV product improvement programs in the areas of force protection, survivability, reliability, network communications, situational awareness and safety.

The committee recognizes the current 5-year MYP contract for FMTV A1R vehicles ends with fiscal year 2007 funding and calendar year 2008 deliveries. The committee notes the Army's Tactical Wheeled Vehicle (TWV) Modernization Strategy Report to Congress stated, "As a risk mitigator, use of contract options will be sought to permit extension of current production models to avoid any breaks in vehicle supply." The committee is concerned that single year contract awards would be extremely costly for the Army given the large quantity requirements that continue to exist for FMTVs within the modular force construct as well as the quantity requirements that should result from the Army "resetting the force" through repair, recapitalization and replacement of vehicles across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee expects the Army to modernize and recapitalize its TWV fleet with a more capable vehicle or platform that would at the minimum incorporate lessons learned from Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF).

The committee is aware approximately 31,000 FMTVs have been produced under three successive multiyear contracts that have saved approximately 6–10 percent versus single year procurements. Furthermore, the committee notes that a MYP contract would potentially assure favorable, cost effective prices for a more advanced configuration FMTV that would incorporate lessons learned from OIF, as well as ensure stability in the industrial base.

The committee is aware the Army is conducting an advanced concept technology demonstration (ACTD) for a future tactical truck system as part of its TWV Modernization Strategy. The com-

mittee notes an essential component of this ACTD is the maneuver sustainment vehicle (MSV). The committee also notes this vehicle would potentially replace the FMTV and other heavy TWVs, as well as understands the MSV would help shape requirements for the next medium to heavy TWV. The committee notes no formal production schedule exists for the MSV other than the Army would conduct a system demonstration in late calendar year 2006. The committee recognizes that previous comparable TWV schedules would indicate a notional schedule for an MSV production beginning in the 2011 timeframe.

#### Section 112—Multiyear Procurement Authority for MH-60R Helicopters and Mission Equipment

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting as the executive agent for the Department of the Navy, to enter into a five-year, multiyear procurement contract for 144 MH-60R helicopters and associated mission equipment beginning with the fiscal year 2007 program year. Further, the multiyear procurement contract authority would be executed in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code.

#### Section 113—Funding Profile for Modular Force Initiative of the Army

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to include the M1A2 Abrams SEP tank and Bradley A3 fighting vehicles within the Army's modularity funding profile beginning with the 2008 budget submission, in accordance with the March 2006 Army report to Congress, "The Army Modular Initiative."

#### Section 114—Bridge to Future Networks Program

This section would limit the amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to the authorization of appropriations for the bridge to future networks program, to not more than 70 percent until the Secretary of the Army submits a report to the congressional defense committees. The report would include an analysis of how the Joint Network Node (JNN) and the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T) will be integrated and whether or not there are opportunities to leverage JNN technologies and equipment as part of the WIN-T development effort. The report would also describe the extent to which JNN and WIN-T components would be used together as elements of a single tactical network and the Army's strategy for completing the systems engineering necessary to ensure the end-to-end interoperability of this network.

### SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

#### Section 121—Attack Submarine Force Structure

This section would amend section 5062 of title 10, United States Code, mandating the Secretary of Defense maintain a minimum force structure of 48 operational attack submarines.

Section 122—Adherence to Navy Cost Estimates for CVN-21 Class of Aircraft Carriers

This section would limit the total amount to be obligated or expended from funds appropriated or otherwise made available for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, or for any other procurement account, for the detail design, non-recurring engineering and actual construction of the lead ship of the CVN-21 class aircraft carrier program to \$10.5 billion. This section would further limit the total amount to be obligated or expended from funds appropriated or otherwise made available for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, or for any other procurement account, for the actual construction of the follow-on ships of the CVN-21 class aircraft carrier program to \$8.1 billion. This section would allow the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the limitation amount for economic inflation; changes in federal, State or local laws enacted after September 30, 2006; outfitting and post-delivery costs; and the amounts of increases or decreases in costs of the ship that are attributable to the insertion of new technology. The insertion of new technology would be limited to those technologies that could be used to either lower lifecycle costs or meet an emerging threat. This section would require the Secretary to report any adjustment to the cost limitation with the submission of the annual budget request.

Section 123—Adherence to Navy Cost Estimates for LHA Replacement Amphibious Assault Ship Program

This section would limit the total amount to be obligated or expended from funds appropriated or otherwise made available for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, or for any other procurement account, for each ship of the LHA replacement amphibious assault ship program to \$2.8 billion. This section would allow the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the limitation amount for economic inflation; changes in federal, State or local laws enacted after September 30, 2006; outfitting and post-delivery costs; and the amounts of increases or decreases in costs of the ship that are attributable to the insertion of new technology. The insertion of new technology would be limited to those technologies that could be used to either lower lifecycle costs or meet an emerging threat. This section would require the Secretary to report any adjustment to the cost limitation with the submission of the annual budget request.

Section 124—Adherence to Navy Cost Estimates for San Antonio (LPD-17) Class Amphibious Ship Program

This section would limit the total amount to be obligated or expended from funds appropriated or otherwise made available for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, or for any other procurement account, for eight San Antonio class amphibious ships (LPD-18, LPD-19, LPD-20, LPD-21, LPD-22, LPD-23, LPD-24 and LPD-25) to the cost estimates submitted for those ships with the fiscal year 2007 budget request. This section would allow the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the limitation amounts for economic inflation; changes in federal, State or local laws enacted after September 30, 2006; outfitting and post-delivery costs; and the amounts of increases or decreases in costs of the ship that are attributable to the insertion of new technology. The insertion of new technology would

be limited to those technologies that could be used to either lower lifecycle costs or meet an emerging threat. This section would require the Secretary to report any adjustment to the cost limitation with the submission of the annual budget request.

Section 125—Multiyear Procurement Authority for V-22 Tiltrotor Aircraft Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy, acting as executive agent for the Secretary of the Air Force and the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to enter into a multiyear contract, beginning with the fiscal year 2008 program year, for procurement of up to 211 V-22 tiltrotor aircraft, of which not more than 185 would be in the MV-22 configuration and not more than 26 would be in the CV-22 configuration.

Section 126—Quality Control in Procurement of Ship Critical Safety Items and Related Services

This section would amend chapter 633 of title 10, United States Code, by appending a new section 7317 that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe in regulations a quality control policy for the procurement of ship critical safety items and the procurement of modifications, repair, and overhaul of such items. This section would require the head of the design control activity for ship critical safety items establish processes to identify and manage these activities, the head of the contracting activity for a ship critical safety item enter into a contract for these activities only with an approved source, and the ship critical safety items delivered and the services performed meet the technical and quality requirements specified by the design control activity. This section would define the term “ship critical safety item” as any part, assembly, or support equipment of a vessel, the failure, malfunction, or absence of which may cause a catastrophic or critical failure resulting in loss or serious damage to the vessel, or unacceptable risk of personal injury or loss of life. This section would also make conforming amendments to section 2319 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 127—DD(X) Next-Generation Destroyer Program

This section would authorize \$2.6 billion in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for the next generation destroyer (DD(X)) program. This section would further authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into two contracts simultaneously for the DD(X) program during fiscal year 2007. One contract would provide for detail design and construction of a DD(X), while the other contract would provide only for detail design of a DD(X).

Section 128—Sense of Congress that the Navy Make Greater Use of Nuclear-Powered Propulsion Systems in its Future Fleet of Surface Combatants

This section finds that securing and maintaining access to affordable sources of oil is a vital national security interest for the United States, and that the nation’s dependence of foreign oil is a threat to that security. The section expresses the sense of Congress that the Navy should make greater use of alternative technologies,

including nuclear power, as a means of vessel propulsion for its future fleet of surface combatants.

#### SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

##### Section 131—Requirement for B-52 Force Structure

This section would prohibit the Air Force from retiring any B-52 aircraft, except for the one B-52 aircraft no longer in use by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for testing. Additionally, this section would require the Air Force to maintain a minimum B-52 force structure of 44 combat coded aircraft until the year 2018, or until a long-range strike replacement aircraft with equal or greater capability than the B-52H model has attained initial operational capability status.

##### Section 132—Strategic Airlift Force Structure

This section would require the Air Force to maintain a minimum strategic airlift aircraft force structure of 299 aircraft beginning in fiscal year 2009, and would repeal section 132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136).

##### SECTION 133—LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT OF U-2 AIRCRAFT

This section would preclude the Department of Defense from retiring the U-2 aircraft in fiscal year 2007, and would permit retirement after fiscal year 2007 only if the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that the U-2's intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities are no longer required.

##### Section 134—Multiyear Procurement Authority for F-22A Raptor Fighter Aircraft

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into a multiyear contract, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, beginning with the fiscal year 2007 program year, for procurement of up to 60 F-22A Raptor fighter aircraft, for three program years, subject to the Secretary of Defense's certification that the conditions specified in subsection (a) of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, have been satisfied with respect to that contract, and 30 days have elapsed after the date on which the Secretary has submitted the certification to Congress.

##### Section 135—Limitation on Retirement of KC-135E Aircraft During Fiscal Year 2007

This section would prohibit the Air Force from retiring more than 29 KC-135E aircraft during fiscal year 2007, and require the Secretary of the Air Force to maintain all retired KC-135Es, beginning in fiscal year 2007, in a condition that would allow recall to future service in the Air Force reserve, guard, or active forces aerial refueling force structure.

Section 136—Limitation on Retirement of F-117A Aircraft During  
Fiscal Year 2007

This section would limit the number of F-117A aircraft to be retired by the Secretary of the Air Force in fiscal year 2007 to 10 aircraft, and would require that the Secretary of the Air Force maintain each F-117A aircraft, retired after September 30, 2006, in a condition that would allow recall of that aircraft to future service.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, &  
EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained \$73.2 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E). The committee recommends \$74.1 billion, an increase of \$908.6 million to the budget request.